International Journal of Comparative Studies in International Relations and Development
p-ISSN: 2354-4198 | e-ISSN: 2354-4201
Volume 11, Number 1 February, 2026
IJCSIRD

Planning and Implementation in Nigeria's Development Programmes: A Qualitative Assessment

[1]Bassey Ekpenyong Anam, [2]Kelly Ndoma Ogar & [3]Emmnauel Peter Isek
[1,2&3]Institute of Public Policy and Administration,
University of Calabar

Article DOI: 10.48028/iiprds/ijcsird.v11.i1.16

Abstract

Planning and implementation constitute two interdependent pillars of effective development administration. In Nigeria, however, the relationship between these components has been characterized by persistent disconnects that have hindered the realization of national development objectives. This paper critically evaluates the relationship between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes, with reference to major national initiatives such as the National Development Plans (1962–1985), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), Vision 20:2020, and the National Development Plan (NDP) 2021–2025. Adopting a qualitative research design and relying on secondary data obtained from government documents, policy reports, scholarly publications, and institutional reviews, the study examines the extent to which implementation challenges have affected the achievement of planned development outcomes. The findings reveal that although development plans in Nigeria are generally well-conceived and aligned with national aspirations, their implementation has been constrained by weak institutional capacity, inadequate funding, corruption, policy inconsistency, political interference, and ineffective monitoring and evaluation mechanisms. These challenges have contributed to recurring gaps between policy intentions and actual outcomes, thereby limiting socio-economic transformation and sustainable development. The paper concludes that the effectiveness of development planning in Nigeria depends largely on the establishment of robust implementation frameworks, institutional accountability, and policy continuity. It recommends strengthening monitoring and evaluation systems, enhancing stakeholder participation, promoting intergovernmental coordination, and ensuring sustained political commitment to development programmes.

Keywords: *Development planning; Policy implementation; Development programmes; Public administration; Governance; Institutional capacity; Monitoring and Evaluation*

Corresponding Author: Bassey Ekpenyong Anam

Background to the Study

The relationship between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes remains a critical concern in the country's pursuit of sustainable development, economic transformation, and improved public welfare. Development planning serves as a strategic instrument for identifying national priorities, allocating resources, and coordinating socio-economic activities towards desired outcomes. Since independence, Nigeria has adopted several development frameworks, including the First National Development Plan (1962–1968), the Second, Third and Fourth National Development Plans, the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP), the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS) (2004–2007), Vision 20:2020, the Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP) (2017–2020), and the National Development Plan (NDP) 2021–2025. These initiatives were designed to address challenges relating to economic diversification, employment generation, poverty reduction, industrialization, infrastructure development, and improved governance.

Despite the formulation of numerous development plans, Nigeria continues to experience persistent developmental challenges, including widespread poverty, unemployment, insecurity, inadequate infrastructure, and weak public service delivery. This reality suggests that the problem is not necessarily the absence of development plans but rather the persistent gap between policy formulation and effective implementation. Planning involves the identification of goals, determination of priorities, mobilization of resources, and formulation of strategies, while implementation entails translating policy intentions into concrete actions through execution, coordination, monitoring, and evaluation.

Scholars have consistently argued that implementation constitutes the most critical stage of the policy process because development outcomes are ultimately determined by the extent to which planned programmes are effectively executed. In the Nigerian context, implementation failures have been linked to weak institutional capacity, corruption, inadequate funding, policy discontinuity, poor coordination, and ineffective monitoring systems. These challenges have contributed significantly to the limited success of many national development programmes despite the quality of planning frameworks. Studies on Nigeria's development planning have shown that institutional weaknesses and governance deficits continue to constrain the achievement of development objectives.

Anam et al. (2024), in their evaluation of Nigeria's Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), Economic Sustainability Plan (ESP), and National Development Plan (2021–2025), observed that while these programmes provided strategic frameworks for economic recovery and sustainable development, their effectiveness depended largely on implementation capacity, institutional coordination, political commitment, and continuity of policy direction. The study further emphasized that development plans can only achieve their intended outcomes when supported by robust implementation mechanisms and effective governance structures. Furthermore, Anam (2016) argued that public policy effectiveness depends not merely on policy formulation but on the ability of institutions to implement decisions in ways that translate policy intentions into tangible societal benefits. Similarly, Anam's works on public administration and community development emphasize the importance of institutional accountability, stakeholder participation, and administrative competence in achieving sustainable development outcomes.

Another important issue affecting the planning-implementation relationship in Nigeria is the predominance of top-down approaches to development planning. Policies are often formulated by political elites, technocrats, and government officials with limited involvement of local communities and other stakeholders. Consequently, many development programmes fail to adequately reflect local realities and community priorities, thereby reducing public ownership and implementation effectiveness. Sustainable development increasingly requires participatory planning, collaborative governance, and stakeholder engagement to ensure that development interventions address actual societal needs. As Nigeria confronts increasing economic uncertainties, rising inflation, unemployment, insecurity, and fiscal pressures, strengthening the relationship between planning and implementation has become more imperative than ever. Effective implementation of development plans is essential for improving governance outcomes, promoting accountability, enhancing service delivery, and achieving sustainable socio-economic development.

Statement of the Problem

The persistent disconnect between planning and implementation remains one of the most significant obstacles to Nigeria's development efforts. Although successive governments have produced comprehensive development plans and policy frameworks, the translation of these plans into measurable developmental outcomes has remained largely inadequate. Consequently, many development programmes have failed to achieve their stated objectives despite substantial investments of public resources. One major challenge lies in weak institutional capacity and organizational effectiveness within public sector institutions responsible for implementing development programmes. Government agencies often face shortages of skilled personnel, inadequate technical expertise, bureaucratic inefficiencies, poor coordination mechanisms, and limited administrative capacity. These weaknesses undermine effective policy execution and contribute to delays, project abandonment, and poor service delivery. Evidence from studies on strategic management and organizational performance suggests that institutional effectiveness plays a crucial role in determining implementation success.

A second challenge relates to the weak integration of monitoring, evaluation, innovation, and evidence-based decision-making into the implementation process. Development programmes frequently suffer from inadequate performance measurement systems, weak data management structures, and limited use of technology for tracking project outcomes. As a result, policymakers are often unable to identify implementation bottlenecks, evaluate programme effectiveness, or make timely adjustments. The absence of robust monitoring and evaluation systems contributes significantly to inefficiencies, resource wastage, and poor developmental outcomes. Additionally, corruption, political interference, inadequate funding, and policy discontinuity continue to undermine implementation efforts. Changes in political leadership often result in the abandonment of ongoing projects and the introduction of new programmes without adequate consideration for continuity. This has weakened public confidence in government programmes and reduced the long-term impact of development interventions. Previous studies on policy implementation in Nigeria have consistently identified these factors as major impediments to successful development planning and execution.

Anam et al. (2024) similarly observed that the effectiveness of Nigeria's recent development frameworks depends not only on sound planning but also on sustained implementation, institutional commitment, and policy continuity across administrations. This study seeks to critically evaluate the relationship between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes. Specifically, it examines the institutional, administrative, and governance factors influencing implementation outcomes and explores how stronger coordination, accountability mechanisms, stakeholder participation, and evidence-based governance can establishment of robust implementation frameworks.

Research Objectives

The general objective of this study is to critically evaluate the relationship between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes using a qualitative assessment approach.

Specific Objectives

1. To examine the influence of planning processes on the implementation of development programmes in Nigeria.
2. To assess the institutional, systemic, and resource-related factors affecting the implementation of development programmes in Nigeria.

Research Questions

1. How do planning processes influence the implementation of development programmes in Nigeria?
2. What institutional, systemic, and resource-related factors affect the implementation of development programmes in Nigeria?

Literature Review

Conceptual Literature

Planning

Planning is a deliberate and systematic process through which governments and organizations identify goals, establish priorities, allocate resources, and design strategies for achieving desired outcomes within a specified period. It serves as a roadmap for action by providing direction, coordinating activities, and facilitating the efficient utilization of available resources. In public administration, planning is regarded as one of the fundamental functions of management because it enables governments to anticipate future challenges and develop appropriate responses. According to Anam (2016), planning is a strategic decision-making process that involves setting objectives and determining the most appropriate means of achieving them through rational policy choices. Similarly, Drucker (1974) views planning as a continuous process of making present decisions with future implications. Development planning therefore represents a conscious effort by governments to influence economic and social change through coordinated policies and programmes.

In Nigeria, development planning has historically been employed as a mechanism for promoting economic growth, social welfare, infrastructure development, poverty reduction, and national integration. The various National Development Plans, Vision 20:2020, Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), and the National Development Plan (2021–2025) exemplify the country's commitment to planned development. However, the effectiveness of these plans depends largely on their successful implementation.

Dimensions of Development Planning

Development planning generally encompasses:

1. Goal Setting – Defining national development priorities and objectives.
2. Resource Allocation – Mobilizing and distributing financial, human, and material resources.
3. Policy Formulation – Developing programmes and strategies for achieving goals.
4. Coordination – Harmonizing the activities of various institutions and stakeholders.
5. Monitoring and Evaluation – Tracking progress and assessing performance.

These dimensions collectively provide the framework through which governments pursue developmental objectives.

Implementation

Implementation refers to the process of translating policy decisions, plans, and programmes into practical actions and measurable outcomes. It is the stage at which policy intentions are operationalized through administrative, technical, financial, and managerial activities. Pressman and Wildavsky (1973), pioneers in implementation studies, describe implementation as the interaction between the setting of goals and the actions undertaken to achieve them. Similarly, Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) define implementation as the execution of policy decisions by public and private actors responsible for achieving stated objectives. Within the context of development planning, implementation involves project execution, resource utilization, stakeholder coordination, supervision, monitoring, and performance evaluation. It is often regarded as the most critical stage of the policy process because even the most well-designed plans can fail if implementation mechanisms are weak.

According to Anam et al. (2024), implementation effectiveness depends on institutional capacity, policy continuity, political commitment, stakeholder engagement, and accountability mechanisms. The authors argue that development plans achieve meaningful results only when implementation structures are adequately strengthened.

Determinants of Effective Implementation

Successful implementation is influenced by several factors, including:

1. Institutional capacity;
2. Availability of financial resources;
3. Administrative competence;

4. Political support and commitment;
5. Monitoring and evaluation systems;
6. Stakeholder participation;
7. Transparency and accountability;
8. Inter-agency coordination.

Where these factors are absent, implementation gaps emerge and policy outcomes become difficult to achieve.

Development Programmes

Development programmes refer to organized sets of policies, projects, and activities designed to achieve specific economic, social, political, or environmental objectives within a defined timeframe. They serve as instruments through which governments pursue national development goals. Todaro and Smith (2021) conceptualize development programmes as coordinated interventions aimed at improving living standards, reducing poverty, generating employment, enhancing infrastructure, and promoting sustainable growth. Such programmes often consist of multiple projects, policies, and institutional arrangements intended to address identified development challenges.

Nigeria has implemented numerous development programmes since independence. These include:

1. First National Development Plan (1962–1968);
2. Second National Development Plan (1970–1974);
3. Third National Development Plan (1975–1980);
4. Fourth National Development Plan (1981–1985);
5. Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP);
6. National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS);
7. Vision 20:2020;
8. Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP);
9. National Development Plan (2021–2025).

Despite the ambitious nature of these programmes, many have recorded mixed results due to implementation challenges.

The Planning–Implementation Nexus

The planning–implementation nexus refers to the interdependent relationship between policy formulation and policy execution. Planning provides the strategic framework and direction for development, while implementation transforms plans into practical outcomes. The two processes are complementary and mutually reinforcing. The Systems Theory perspective suggests that planning and implementation function as interconnected components within a larger governance system. A weakness in either component affects the effectiveness of the entire development process. Consequently, development success depends not merely on producing sound plans but on ensuring effective implementation.

Scholars have identified a persistent planning–implementation gap in many developing countries, particularly in Africa. This gap occurs when development plans are not adequately translated into action due to institutional weaknesses, poor governance, inadequate resources, corruption, or political instability. In Nigeria, the planning–implementation gap has remained a recurring challenge. Several development plans have contained ambitious objectives and comprehensive policy frameworks but failed to achieve intended outcomes because of deficiencies in execution. Anam et al. (2024) observed that while recent development frameworks such as the ERGP and National Development Plan were strategically designed, their effectiveness depended largely on implementation capacity and institutional coordination.

Causes of the Planning–Implementation Gap in Nigeria

The literature identifies several factors responsible for the disconnect between planning and implementation:

1. Weak institutional structures;
2. Corruption and financial mismanagement;
3. Inadequate funding;
4. Policy discontinuity;
5. Political interference;
6. Weak monitoring and evaluation systems;
7. Limited stakeholder participation;
8. Poor intergovernmental coordination;
9. Lack of reliable data for decision-making.

These factors often undermine the realization of development objectives and contribute to poor socio-economic outcomes.

Concept of Qualitative Assessment

A qualitative assessment is a research approach that seeks to understand phenomena through the analysis of non-numerical data such as documents, reports, policy records, and scholarly literature. It emphasizes interpretation, explanation, and contextual understanding rather than statistical measurement. In this study, qualitative assessment provides a framework for examining how planning and implementation interact within Nigeria's development programmes. Through documentary analysis and literature review, the study seeks to identify recurring patterns, institutional challenges, and governance factors that shape implementation outcomes. The approach is particularly suitable because it enables an in-depth understanding of the contextual realities influencing development planning and execution in Nigeria.

The effectiveness of development programmes depends on the degree of alignment between planning and implementation. Planning establishes objectives and strategies, while implementation operationalizes those objectives through action. When planning and implementation are effectively integrated, development programmes are more likely to achieve intended outcomes. Conversely, weak implementation undermines planning efforts regardless of the quality of policy design. Therefore, the central proposition of this study is that successful development outcomes in Nigeria depend on a strong and functional relationship between planning and implementation, supported by effective institutions, adequate resources, stakeholder participation, policy continuity, and robust monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.

Influence of Planning Processes on Implementation of Development Programmes

Empirical evidence consistently demonstrates that the quality of planning processes significantly influences the effectiveness of development programme implementation, particularly when planning is strategic, participatory, and evidence-based. Akinsulire et al. (2024), in a mixed-method study on strategic planning and investment analysis for affordable housing in Nigeria, found that well-structured planning frameworks enhance project viability, improve resource allocation efficiency, and increase the likelihood of successful implementation. Their findings further revealed that weak or poorly articulated planning systems often result in cost overruns, implementation delays, and suboptimal project outcomes. The study therefore underscores the importance of integrating feasibility analysis and long-term investment considerations into public sector development planning.

In a related qualitative study, Rijal (2023) examined community involvement in public management planning through literature synthesis and case analysis. The study established that participatory planning strengthens ownership, enhances accountability, and reduces resistance during implementation. It concluded that when stakeholders are actively engaged during the planning phase, development programmes are more likely to achieve smoother execution and sustained outcomes. These findings highlight the centrality of inclusive planning processes in bridging the gap between policy design and implementation.

Further empirical support is provided by Cordova-Pozo and Rouwette (2023), whose systematic review of scenario planning across multiple sectors revealed that scenario-based planning enhances decision-making quality and implementation preparedness by enabling policymakers to anticipate uncertainties and design adaptive strategies. Similarly, Soares, Domareski Ruiz, and Ivars Baidal (2022), in a conceptual and case-based analysis of smart tourism destinations in Europe, found that integrated planning systems supported by digital technologies improve coordination, monitoring, and implementation efficiency. They concluded that technologically enabled planning frameworks enhance adaptability and service delivery outcomes in complex development environments. Cachón-Rodríguez et al. (2022), through quantitative analysis of organisational data in European institutions, further demonstrated that structured planning combined with effective human resource management significantly improves programme execution, employee engagement, and sustainability outcomes. The study emphasized the need for aligning planning frameworks with institutional capacity to ensure effective implementation. Collectively, these studies suggest that robust, inclusive, and adaptive planning processes are critical determinants of successful development programme implementation.

Institutional and Systemic factors affecting Development Planning and Implementation

Empirical literature widely acknowledges that institutional and systemic factors play a decisive role in shaping the effectiveness of development planning and implementation across sectors. Ashraf (2024), in a comparative cross-country study on institutional determinants of sustainable development published in *Economic Change and Restructuring*, found that strong institutions characterized by accountability, transparency, and rule-based governance significantly enhance development outcomes. Conversely, weak institutions were associated with policy failure, inefficiency, and poor sustainability performance. The study underscores the centrality of institutional quality in determining the success of development interventions.

Similarly, Myronova (2025), in a mixed-method study on factors influencing the management of educational institutions, identified leadership quality, administrative efficiency, and resource availability as key institutional determinants of effective planning and implementation. The study concluded that weak managerial structures and inadequate institutional capacity significantly hinder programme effectiveness and limit development outcomes.

Additional empirical evidence highlights systemic constraints that undermine implementation effectiveness, particularly in relation to organisational readiness, technological adaptation, and coordination mechanisms. Gkrimpizi et al. (2023), in a systematic review of barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions, identified institutional resistance, infrastructural deficits, and inadequate digital competencies as major impediments to effective implementation of development initiatives. Similarly, Singun (2025) found that organisational inertia, limited funding, and resistance to technological change significantly reduce the success of digital transformation programmes, concluding that institutional adaptability is essential for effective implementation.

Van Cauwenbergh et al. (2022), in a case-based policy analysis on institutional readiness for nature-based solutions, demonstrated that even well-designed development interventions fail when institutions lack coordination capacity, preparedness, and enabling governance structures. In the same vein, Holst (2023), through a systematic review of Whole Institution Approaches to sustainability in education, concluded that coherent institutional systems, shared vision, and integrated governance structures are essential for translating development plans into effective action. The empirical literature indicates that beyond the quality of planning, the success of development programmes depends heavily on institutional strength, systemic readiness, and organisational coherence. Weak institutional frameworks and inadequate system integration remain major constraints to effective implementation, particularly in developing country contexts such as Nigeria.

Theoretical Framework and Linkage to Empirical Literature

This study is anchored on Systems Theory of Public Administration and Implementation Theory, which jointly provide a robust lens for understanding the relationship between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes.

Systems Theory and the Planning–Implementation Nexus

Systems Theory conceptualizes public policy and development administration as an interconnected system composed of interdependent subsystems, including planning, implementation, monitoring, and feedback mechanisms. According to this perspective, no single component operates in isolation; rather, the effectiveness of the entire system depends on the functional integration of its parts. Within this framework, planning represents the input subsystem where goals, strategies, and resource allocations are defined, while implementation represents the throughput subsystem where policies are transformed into tangible outcomes. Feedback mechanisms, such as monitoring and evaluation, serve as corrective loops that ensure system stability and adaptation.

The empirical literature reviewed strongly aligns with this theoretical position. For instance, Akinsulire et al. (2024) and Rijal (2023) demonstrate that effective planning processes enhance implementation outcomes through improved coordination, resource alignment, and stakeholder participation. These findings support the Systems Theory assumption that well-functioning inputs (planning processes) strengthen downstream system performance (implementation outcomes).

Similarly, Cordova-Pozo and Rouwette (2023) and Soares et al. (2022) show that adaptive and integrated planning systems improve decision-making and implementation readiness. This reflects the Systems Theory principle of interdependence and adaptability, where system components must respond dynamically to uncertainty and environmental changes in order to sustain effectiveness. Conversely, studies such as Gkrimpizi et al. (2023) and Van Cauwenbergh et al. (2022) highlight how systemic weaknesses—such as poor infrastructure, institutional resistance, and weak coordination structures—disrupt the flow between planning and implementation. These findings reinforce the Systems Theory argument that breakdown in any subsystem leads to overall system failure, which in this case manifests as the planning–implementation gap observed in Nigeria's development programmes.

Implementation Theory and Policy Execution Challenges

Implementation Theory, particularly the works of Pressman and Wildavsky (1973) and Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983), emphasizes that policy success depends on the complex interaction of institutional capacity, actor compliance, resources, and contextual conditions. It argues that even well-designed policies may fail if implementation structures are weak or fragmented. This theoretical position is strongly reflected in the empirical literature reviewed. Ashraf (2024) demonstrates that institutional quality—especially accountability, transparency, and rule-based governance—is a critical determinant of successful policy implementation. This aligns with Implementation Theory's emphasis on institutional capacity and governance structures as key mediating variables between policy design and outcomes.

Similarly, Myronova (2025) identifies leadership quality, administrative efficiency, and resource availability as determinants of implementation effectiveness, reinforcing the Implementation Theory argument that organisational capacity directly influences policy success. In the Nigerian context, these theoretical insights are particularly relevant. The findings of Anam et al. (2024) show that even well-designed national development frameworks such as the ERGP and NDP 2021–2025 experience implementation challenges due to weak institutional coordination and limited policy continuity. This directly supports Implementation Theory's assertion that execution environments often determine policy outcomes more than policy design itself. Furthermore, Singun (2025) and Holst (2023) highlight the importance of organisational adaptability, coordination, and system coherence in achieving successful implementation. These findings correspond with Implementation Theory's focus on multi-actor coordination and implementation environments, where success depends on aligning institutions, resources, and processes.

The Systems Theory and Implementation Theory provide a comprehensive explanation for the planning–implementation gap in Nigeria's development programmes. Systems Theory explains the structural interdependence between planning and implementation, while Implementation Theory explains the institutional, political, and administrative conditions that determine whether planned policies are successfully executed. The theoretical framework supports the central argument of this study: the effectiveness of Nigeria's development programmes is determined not only by the quality of planning but by the strength, coherence, and capacity of implementation systems within the broader governance structure.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative desk research design, relying exclusively on secondary sources of data. The study draws evidence from government policy documents, national development plans, institutional reports, and scholarly publications on development planning and implementation in Nigeria. Key institutional sources include the National Planning Commission, Federal Ministry of Finance, and relevant international development agencies such as the World Bank, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). In addition, empirical studies on development planning, public policy implementation, and governance in Nigeria were systematically reviewed to provide a broader analytical foundation for the study. The selected materials were critically examined to identify patterns, relationships, and contradictions in the planning–implementation process.

Data analysis was conducted using content analysis and thematic analysis techniques, which enabled the classification of recurring themes such as institutional capacity, resource allocation, monitoring and evaluation, stakeholder participation, and policy consistency. This approach facilitated an in-depth interpretation of how planning processes influence implementation outcomes in Nigeria's development programmes. The qualitative desk review approach is particularly appropriate for this study as it allows for triangulation of multiple secondary sources, enhances analytical depth, and supports a comprehensive evaluation of policy processes without the constraints of primary field data collection. It also ensures reliability through cross-verification of findings from diverse documentary sources.

Findings

Influence of Planning Processes on Development Implementation

The analysis reveals that effective planning processes play a critical role in shaping the success of development programme implementation in Nigeria. Table 1 indicates that key planning components such as clear objective setting, efficient resource allocation, risk identification, stakeholder engagement, monitoring and evaluation design, inter-agency coordination, long-term strategic planning, and implementation readiness assessment significantly enhance the likelihood of successful policy execution. These planning functions are strongly supported in official policy frameworks such as Nigeria's National Development Plans, as well as guidelines from the National Planning Commission and international development agencies including the World Bank and FAO. In principle, these frameworks provide a structured foundation for effective development management.

However, despite the presence of well-articulated planning structures, the findings reveal persistent implementation gaps. These include weak translation of policy objectives into measurable targets, delays in project execution, mismanagement of funds, inadequate risk forecasting, limited stakeholder participation, weak monitoring and evaluation systems, fragmented institutional coordination, policy inconsistency, and insufficient assessment of implementation readiness. Collectively, these weaknesses explain why many development plans in Nigeria fail to achieve their intended outcomes despite sound planning frameworks.

Institutional, Systemic, and Resource Constraints in Implementation

Table 2 further categorizes the challenges affecting development planning and implementation in Nigeria into institutional, systemic, and resource-related factors. At the institutional level, weak administrative capacity, bureaucratic inefficiencies, poor inter-agency coordination, and ineffective monitoring and evaluation systems significantly constrain implementation performance. These weaknesses reduce accountability and limit the ability of public institutions to translate plans into tangible outcomes.

At the systemic and political level, factors such as policy inconsistency, weak political commitment, corruption, and limited stakeholder participation undermine policy continuity and reduce the effectiveness of development programmes. These challenges often result in abandoned projects, duplication of efforts, and inefficient use of public resources. In addition, resource and data constraints further compound implementation difficulties. These include inadequate and unreliable statistical data, unstable funding mechanisms, and unrealistic planning assumptions that do not adequately reflect ground realities. As a result, many development programmes are designed on overly optimistic projections that are difficult to implement within Nigeria's socio-economic and institutional context.

Table1: Influence of Planning Processes on Implementation of Development Programmes in Nigeria

Planning Dimension	Description (Planning Function)	Influence on Implementation Outcomes	Supporting Institutional Sources	Identified Gap in Nigeria's Context
Clear Objective Setting	Definition of specific, measurable, and time-bound development goals in national plans	Guides implementation direction, reduces ambiguity, and prevents scope drift during execution	Nigerian National Development Plans (1962–1968; 1970–1985; NDP 2021–2025), National Planning Commission reports	Weak translation of broad goals into measurable operational targets at project level
Resource Allocation Planning	Budgeting, manpower planning, and resource distribution frameworks	Ensures availability of funds, materials, and personnel for smooth implementation	National Budget Frameworks, World Bank Development Reports, NPC fiscal guidelines	Delays in fund release, poor budget implementation, and resource mismanagement
Risk Identification and Mitigation	Early identification of political, environmental, and economic risks	Enhances preparedness and reduces disruptions during project execution	World Bank Group project appraisal documents; FAO planning frameworks	Limited integration of risk forecasting into national development planning
Stakeholder Engagement Planning	Inclusion of communities, civil society, and private sector in planning stages	Promotes ownership, acceptance, and cooperation during implementation	NPC participatory planning guidelines; World Bank community development frameworks	Weak grassroots participation and dominance of top-down planning approaches
Monitoring and Evaluation Design	Establishment of indicators, benchmarks, and performance tracking systems	Enables continuous assessment and adjustment during implementation	National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy frameworks; World Bank M&E systems	Weak M&E enforcement and poor data-driven decision-making culture
Inter-agency Coordination Planning	Alignment of ministries, departments, and agencies during planning	Reduces duplication, improves efficiency, and ensures coherent implementation	Federal Government policy coordination structures; NPC strategic plans	Poor inter-agency collaboration and bureaucratic fragmentation
Strategic Planning Frameworks (Long-term)	Long-range development visioning and scenario planning (e.g., Vision 20:2020, NDP 2021–2025)	Provides long-term direction and continuity in implementation efforts	Vision 20:2020, Economic Recovery and Growth Plan (ERGP), NDP 2021–2025	Policy discontinuity across administrations and weak implementation continuity
Implementation Readiness Assessment	Evaluation of institutional capacity before project execution	Ensures agencies are prepared for effective delivery of programmes	World Bank implementation readiness tools; FAO project design frameworks	Lack of structured readiness assessment before project rollout

Source: Researcher's compilation from National Planning Commission, Nigerian Policy Documents, and International Development Agencies, 2026.

Table 2: Institutional and Systemic Factors Affecting Development Planning and Implementation in Nigeria

Category	Factor	Description	Effect on Planning and Implementation	Key Identified Gap in Nigeria
Institutional and Administrative Factors	Weak institutional capacity	Limited technical expertise, managerial skills, and operational capacity in implementing agencies	Reduces efficiency in executing development plans and leads to poor project delivery	Inadequate training and low professional capacity in public institutions
Institutional and Administrative Factors	Bureaucratic red tape	Complex administrative procedures and slow approval processes	Causes delays in project execution and slows down policy implementation	Excessive paperwork and inefficient administrative structures
Institutional and Administrative Factors	Lack of inter-agency coordination	Poor communication and duplication of roles among MDAs and government levels	Leads to fragmented implementation and policy contradictions	Weak institutional collaboration and overlapping responsibilities
Institutional and Administrative Factors	Poor monitoring and evaluation	Weak or absent tracking systems for project performance	Results in project abandonment, inefficiency, and deviation from goals	Inadequate M&E frameworks and weak accountability systems
Systemic and Political Factors	Policy inconsistency and instability	Frequent changes in government policies and leadership priorities	Leads to abandonment of ongoing projects and disruption of development continuity	Lack of policy continuity across administrations
Systemic and Political Factors	Lack of political will	Limited commitment of leaders to long-term development goals	Weak enforcement of policies and poor implementation outcomes	Prioritization of short-term political interests over national development
Systemic and Political Factors	Systemic corruption	Misuse, diversion, and inflation of public funds	Reduces available resources and undermines project completion	Weak anti-corruption enforcement and accountability mechanisms
Systemic and Political Factors	Inadequate stakeholder participation	Limited involvement of communities, civil society, and private sector	Reduces ownership, acceptance, and sustainability of development programmes	Top-down planning with weak grassroots engagement
Resource and Data Constraints	Data deficits	Lack of reliable and accurate statistical information for planning	Leads to unrealistic planning and poor monitoring of outcomes	Weak national data systems and outdated statistics
Resource and Data Constraints	Financial constraints	Dependence on unstable revenue sources such as oil and external aid	Causes funding shortages and delays in project execution	Revenue volatility and poor financial planning
Resource and Data Constraints	Unrealistic objectives	Overambitious development targets not aligned with local realities	Results in failed or partially implemented development programmes	Poor feasibility analysis during planning stages

Source: Researcher's compilation from National Planning Commission, 2026.

Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study provide important insights into the persistent gap between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes. The discussion is organized around the two central themes of the study: the influence of planning processes on implementation, and the institutional, systemic, and resource-related constraints affecting implementation outcomes.

Influence of Planning Processes on Implementation Outcomes

The study found that planning processes significantly influence the effectiveness of development programme implementation in Nigeria. Specifically, elements such as clear objective setting, resource allocation, risk assessment, stakeholder engagement, and monitoring and evaluation frameworks were identified as critical determinants of implementation success. This finding aligns with Systems Theory, which emphasizes the interdependence of subsystems within the policy process. In this regard, planning serves as the input phase of the system, while implementation represents the transformation phase; weaknesses in planning inevitably affect downstream outcomes.

Empirical evidence reviewed in the study further supports this relationship. Well-structured and evidence-based planning enhances coordination, reduces uncertainty, and improves resource efficiency during implementation. However, the study also revealed that despite the presence of comprehensive planning frameworks in Nigeria's development programmes, there is often a weak translation of plans into actionable targets. This disconnect suggests that planning in Nigeria is frequently more normative than operational, with limited emphasis on implementation readiness and enforceability. The implication is that planning in itself is not the primary challenge; rather, the problem lies in the quality of integration between planning and execution. Where planning is inclusive, realistic, and supported by implementation mechanisms, development outcomes are more likely to be achieved. Conversely, where planning is top-down, overly ambitious, and weakly linked to implementation structures, development programmes tend to underperform.

Institutional, Systemic, and Resource Constraints

The second major finding of the study highlights the dominant role of institutional and systemic weaknesses in undermining implementation effectiveness. Bureaucratic inefficiency, weak coordination among agencies, policy inconsistency, corruption, inadequate funding, and weak monitoring systems were identified as key constraints. These factors collectively disrupt the implementation chain and weaken the capacity of government institutions to deliver development outcomes. This finding is consistent with Implementation Theory, which posits that policy success depends not only on the quality of formulation but also on the institutional environment within which implementation occurs. In the Nigerian context, the institutional environment is characterized by fragmentation, overlapping responsibilities, and weak accountability mechanisms. As a result, even well-designed development plans often fail to achieve their intended objectives.

Furthermore, the study revealed that inadequate data systems and weak evidence-based planning significantly hinder effective implementation. Without reliable data, planning assumptions become unrealistic, resource allocation becomes inefficient, and performance monitoring becomes difficult. This contributes to delays, cost overruns, and abandoned projects. The study also identified weak political commitment and policy discontinuity as major systemic challenges. Frequent changes in government priorities often lead to abandonment or modification of ongoing projects, thereby undermining continuity and long-term development outcomes. This finding reinforces the argument that development effectiveness requires stable governance structures and sustained political will.

Conclusion

This study critically examined the relationship between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes, with particular emphasis on how planning processes and institutional systems shape development outcomes. The study established that although Nigeria has consistently developed comprehensive national development plans, implementation outcomes have remained largely weak and inconsistent. Findings reveal that persistent implementation challenges are driven by factors such as weak institutional capacity, poor inter-agency coordination, corruption, ineffective monitoring and evaluation systems, and limited stakeholder participation. While planning processes, including clear objective setting, resource allocation, risk assessment, and strategic framework development, are well articulated in policy documents, they are often inadequately translated into practical action. This disconnect contributes significantly to the recurring gap between policy intentions and actual development results.

The study further identified that institutional and systemic constraints, including bureaucratic inefficiencies, policy inconsistency, weak political commitment, inadequate data systems, and financial limitations, continue to undermine effective implementation of development programmes in Nigeria. These challenges are compounded by top-down planning approaches and weak coordination among implementing agencies, thereby reducing the overall effectiveness of development interventions. On the basis of these findings, the study concludes that improving development outcomes in Nigeria requires stronger alignment between planning and implementation through enhanced institutional capacity, improved governance structures, strengthened data systems, and greater stakeholder participation in both policy formulation and execution.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made to improve the relationship between planning and implementation in Nigeria's development programmes:

1. Strengthening of Institutions: Government should strengthen the capacity of the National Planning Commission and related implementing agencies by providing adequate technical manpower, resources, and modern digital monitoring and evaluation systems to ensure real-time tracking of development projects.
2. Ensuring Policy Continuity: Legal and institutional frameworks should be established to safeguard the continuity of national development plans across political administrations. This will reduce policy discontinuity and ensure sustained implementation of long-term development objectives.
3. Enhancing Accountability and Transparency: Stronger anti-corruption measures should be enforced across all stages of project implementation. In addition, performance-based budgeting and well-regulated public–private partnerships should be adopted to improve transparency, efficiency, and value for money in public spending.
4. Promoting Inclusive and Evidence-Based Planning: Planning processes should be made more participatory by involving communities, civil society organizations, and key stakeholders. Furthermore, planners should adopt evidence-based approaches supported by reliable data systems, improved capacity development, and diversified funding mechanisms to enhance implementation effectiveness.

References

Abasilim, U. D., Adelusi, O., & Mudau, T. J. (2025). Evaluating Nigeria's national development plans: Addressing contemporary challenges and seizing strategic opportunities, *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (Public Administration Journal), 15*(1), 141–152.

Adedini, S. A., Mberu, B. U., Alex-Ojei, C. A., & Ntoimo, L. F. (2022). Exploring barriers and facilitators to integrated policy formulation and implementation of family planning and urban development programmes in Nigeria, *Health Research Policy and Systems, 20*(1), 115.

Akinsulire, A. A., Idemudia, C., Okwandu, A. C., & Iwuanyanwu, O. (2024). Strategic planning and investment analysis for affordable housing: Enhancing viability and growth, *Magna Scientia Advanced Research and Reviews, 11*(2), 119–131.

Alojail, M., & Khan, S. B. (2023). Impact of digital transformation toward sustainable development, *Sustainability, 15*(20), 14697.

Aliyu, M. A., Msughter, A. E., & Nneka, A. Q. (2023). Comparative study of national development plans in Nigeria and India: Media dimension. *SIASAT, 8*(4), 202–212.

Anam, B. E. (2014). *Framework of public administration*, Calabar: Ethereal Bliss Publishers.

Anam, B. E. (2014). *Understanding community and rural development*, Calabar: Ethereal Bliss Publishers.

Anam, B. E. (2016). *The study of public policy and decision making: A discourse*. Calabar: Ethereal Bliss Publishers.

Anam, B. E., Ijim, U. A., Ironbar, V. E., Otu, A. P., Duke, O. O., & Achuk-Eba, M. B. (2024). Economic Recovery and Growth Plan, Economic Sustainability Plan and National Development Plan (2021–2025): The Nigerian experience under President Muhammadu Buhari, *Cogent Social Sciences, 10*(1), 2289600.

Ashraf, J. (2024). How do institutional factors affect sustainable development? A comparative analysis. *Economic Change and Restructuring, 57*(2), 24.

Bukoye, O. T., & Abdulrahman, A. H. (2023). Organizational culture typologies and strategy implementation: Lessons from Nigerian local government. *Policy Studies, 44*(3), 316–335.

Cachón-Rodríguez, G., Blanco-González, A., Prado-Román, C., & Del-Castillo-Feito, C. (2022). How sustainable human resources management helps in the evaluation and planning of employee loyalty and retention: Can social capital make a difference? *Evaluation and Program Planning, 95*, 102171.

Chukwuka, E. J., & Imide, I. (2024). The role of competitive intelligence on Nigeria's economic development. *International Journal of Economics and Business Management, 10*(7), 154–170.

Cordova-Pozo, K., & Rouwette, E. A. (2023). Types of scenario planning and their effectiveness: A review of reviews. *Futures, 149*, 103153.

Gkrimpizi, T., Peristeras, V., & Magnisalis, I. (2023). Classification of barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Education Sciences, 13*(7), 746.

Holst, J. (2023). Towards coherence on sustainability in education: A systematic review of whole institution approaches. *Sustainability Science, 18*(2), 1015–1030.

Kineber, A. F., Oke, A. E., Alyanbaawi, A., Abubakar, A. S., & Hamed, M. M. (2022). Exploring the cloud computing implementation drivers for sustainable construction projects: A structural equation modeling approach. *Sustainability, 14*(22), 14789.

Myronova, O. (2025). *Factors influencing the effectiveness of the management of educational institutions' development.*

Obona, E. E., Effah, F. A., Obi, M. O., & Agube, G. C. (2024). Strategic planning and instructional supervision as determinants of quality assurance in public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Educational Research, 23*(1), 95–105.

Rijal, S. (2023). The importance of community involvement in public management planning and decision-making processes. *Journal of Contemporary Administration and Management (ADMAN), 1*(2), 84–92.

Singun, A. J. (2025). Unveiling the barriers to digital transformation in higher education institutions: A systematic literature review. *Discover Education, 4*(1), 37.

Soares, J. C., Domareski Ruiz, T. C., & Ivars Baidal, J. A. (2022). Smart destinations: A new planning and management approach? *Current Issues in Tourism, 25*(17), 2717–2732.

Unegbua, H., Yawasa, D. S., Dan-asabea, B., & Alabia, A. A. (2024). Sustainable urban planning and development: A systematic review of policies and practices in Nigeria, *Journal of Sustainable Development, 1*(1), 38–53.

Van Cauwenbergh, N., Dourojeanni, P. A., van der Zaag, P., Brugnach, M., Dartee, K., Giordano, R., & Lopez-Gunn, E. (2022). Beyond TRL–Understanding institutional readiness for implementation of nature-based solutions. *Environmental Science & Policy, 127*, 293–302.