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Governance in many countries is increasingly a complex process. Public affairs and society in the modern world are increasingly complex phenomena. More importantly, this increasing complexity of public affairs and society translates into the function of managing public affairs also becoming an increasingly complex function. In order to effectively manage public affairs, in a complex society, a strong link has long been forged between the academia and the profession of public management. The need to create new knowledge; collect, precise, analyze, and interpret huge amounts of information; and to be able to use this knowledge and information to improve the function of formulating, implementing and evaluating public policy has helped to expand, and sustain, this link between the academia and the profession of public management. The development and growth of public administration, and more recently public policy analysis, as academic disciplines and professions, attest to the strength of this link.

Schools mainly engage in creating knowledge (through their research function) and imparting knowledge to their students (through their teaching function). The task of applying knowledge to solve problems in society often fall on both schools and applied research organizations. In relation to public policy milieus, public affairs and policy studies organizations are the relevant applied research bodies. They may be affiliated to schools, or owned and/or operated by governments or private organizations.

In the developed countries, the functions, impacts, and constraints of public affairs and policy studies organizations are well known and appreciated. This is not quite the case in many developing countries. Cognizant of the fact that many of these countries are also increasingly facing complex problems, the nature of public affairs and policy studies organizations, and the role that these organizations play, fail to play, or should play in the public policy milieus of these countries need also to be understood and analyzed. The fact that many of these countries face numerous and complex societal problems, with very scarce material and managerial resources, makes the need to relate public affairs and policy studies organizations to public policy, in these countries, even more acute. Here we will specifically probe the Nigerian situation.

Some work has been done on some aspects of this subject. Banjo (1986) has chronicled the growth and development of one of the premier public affairs and policy studies organizations, the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA). Banjo's contribution is mainly a history of NIIA's growth, and not, specifically, a study of NIIA's role in the foreign policy milieu. It is Akinyemi (ca. 1983a) who provides some information on NIIA's functioning and impact in the foreign policy milieu; but, however, he primarily covers only a portion of NIIA's existence (from 1975 to 1983). A study of the organization and financing of scientific research institutes in Nigeria, by Akindele (see Essien-Udom 1984, 15), though specifically focused on research institutes that are concerned with applied natural sciences and technology, is also very relevant. Information on the organization and financing of these institutes provides some knowledge that gives some glimpse on the dynamics of the organization and financing of all research bodies.
The social sciences, as academic disciplines, form the core academic foundations from which public affairs and policy studies organizations mostly tap their basic information from. The state of the social sciences much relate to the state of public affairs and policy studies organizations. The adequate strength of social sciences academic departments in many Nigerian universities is an indicator of the progress in these disciplines. This viability of the social sciences further translate into public affairs and policy studies organizations being significant elements in the Nigerian public policy milieu. Professor E. U. Essien-Udom (1984, 12) has noted that the Nigerian Government has continuously "shown increasing interest in vital importance of social science research for public policy." He (Essien-Udom 1984, 12-13) cites the significant resources the Nigerian Government has invested in think-tanks, like NISER, NIPSS and NIIA, as bearing "testimony to the recognition of the contributions which the social sciences can make to public policy." The existence of numerous public policy think-tanks, as noted earlier, in turn, deepens their roles in the public policy process.

The General Profile of Public Affairs and Policy Studies Organizations

Public affairs and policy studies organizations, in Nigeria, can be broadly differentiated in terms of the issue areas that they focus on.

Most of these organizations (in terms of the policy areas that they focus on) fall under about five categories, namely (a) socio-economic arena, (b) judicial affairs, (c) area studies, (d) international affairs and security studies, and (e) public policy and management. Public affairs and policy studies organizations that focus on the socio-economic arena are Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER); Center for Development Studies at the University of Cross River (CDS/UNICROSS); Center for Development Studies at the University of Jos (CDS/UNIJOS); Institute of Development Studies (IDS) at University of Nigeria, Enugu Campus; Center for Demographic Research (CEDER) at University of Nigeria; Center for Social and Economic Research (CESER) at Ahmadu Bello University; and the Center for Social, Cultural and Environmental Research (CESCER) at the University of Benin (Commonwealth Universities Yearbook 1988 (Volume 3) 1988, 2253-2394). The public affairs and policy studies organizations in the area of judicial affairs are the Center for Islamic Legal Studies (CILS) at Ahmadu Bello University and the Nigerian Institute of Advanced Legal Studies (NIALS) at the University of Lagos. In the area of international affairs and security studies, the think-tanks are the Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA) and the National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS). Hansberry Institute of African Studies (HIAS) at the University of Nigeria and the Institute of African Studies (IAS) at the University of Ibadan are the area studies think-tanks. There are also think-tanks that focus on public policy studies and management studies. NIPSS, noted above as a think-tank in the area of international and security studies, also has a prominent focus on public policy studies and management studies. Apart from NIPSS, other think-tanks in the area of public policy studies and management studies are the Institute of Public Policy and Administration (IPPA) at University of Calabar, the Institute of Administration (INAD) at Ahmadu Bello University, Institute of Public Administration and Extension Services (IPAES) at University of Benin and the Center for Management Development (CMD).

As shown above, there are numerous think-tanks that are active in the public policy milieu in Nigeria. An adequate analysis of the roles and the impacts of all of these think-tanks can not be adequately achieved in just one article (such as this). Thus this study will mostly focus on the three most prominent think-tanks in the public policy milieu. These three major think-tanks are NISER, NIIA and NIPSS.
Nigerian Institute of Social and Economic Research (NISER): This is the premier think tank in the socio-economic arena. In fact it is the 'national' organization in this area (since it is financed by the Federal Government, and serves as the main socio-economic policy studies body for the federal and state governments).

Founded in 1950, NISER adopted its present name in 1960. Though directly financed by the Federal Government, NISER is also affiliated with the University of Ibadan (UI). This dual connection helps to ensure that NISER is fairly autonomous in its relationship with both the Federal Government and University of Ibadan. The dual connection provides NISER with an ability to use each of the two affiliations to mutually counterbalance the two of them.

NISER mainly engages in applied research and public service functions. Its applied research activities cover research on economic planning and development, industrial development, agriculture, international trade, public finance, and social policy and planning (The World of Learning (1987) 1987, 952). Its public service activities include consultancy work for federal and state governments and private organizations, and training programs for personnel of organizations which engage in activities related to the above applied research areas (The World of Learning (1987) 1987, 952). As indicated by the above applied research and public service functions, NISER broadly covers the socio-economic sphere.

Apart from being funded by the Federal Government, as noted earlier, NISER is also perceived, by both the public and private sectors, as the premier policy studies organization in the area of socio-economic affairs. NISER's formal links with federal and state governments ensures that some of the issues and subjects that it focuses on (in the above mentioned areas which engage its applied research attention) are those that are of significant interest to these governments. However, NISER, as a fairly autonomous body, also do initiate many of its research agenda. Through such thrusts, it steers policy-makers to pay attention to issues and research findings which the latter had no prior interest. Thus, in some cases, NISER leads policy-makers to new knowledge, while at other times, policy-makers encourages NISER to lead them to some particular new knowledge.

NISER's links with the federal and state governments also enable NISER to have access to significant points of public policy formulation, implementation and/or evaluation in these governments. This also translates into some NISER's applied research outputs more easily seeping into the policy process and affecting policy outcomes. Federal and State Cabinet Offices (especially their Economic Divisions) and the Federal and State Ministries of Economic Planning, Finance, Industries, Trade, Social Welfare and Agriculture are the main government units that NISER often relates to. Ministries of Transport, Labor and Health are further examples of other government units that NISER also relates to.

Apart from specific applied research for government units, NISER also influences policy issues and outcomes through its publications. Its Monograph Series publications are very important in this respect. Social Science Research Abstracts, and Research for Development series are some of its additional significant publications.

Seminars and conferences are other avenues that NISER uses in facilitating the articulation and collation of emerging intellectual views on socio-economic matters. Such avenues are also used to coalesce the intellectual community to focus on particular socio-economic problems. NISER's staff also use press releases and public pronouncements to influence policy outcomes. As a clear indicator of its adequate autonomy, some NISER's staff do sometimes strongly oppose certain proposed, or
enacted, government policies which their studies show to be deficient. For example, in 1987, NISER's head, who is also a renown professor of economics, opposed the Federal Government's proposed oil subsidy removal policy. In order to help mobilize the general public against the proposed policy, he presented the mass media with not-too-technical facts and figures. According to him, the policy will greatly increase the production cost of manufactured goods and the cost of transportation, housing and agricultural products. He also saw the proposed policy as being capable of inducing alarming reductions in personal income, personal savings, and government revenue and expenditure (Newswatch November 30, 1987, 17). Such direct public predictions, by a luminary in economic science who heads the premier socio-economic policy studies organization, much impact on the policy process and outcome. However, it is prudent not to overstate the influence of the head of NISER. Governments can, and do, sometimes ignore the views of such individuals.

On the whole, NISER, as shown above, through applied research, public service, and, to some extent, general public information, much provides the intellectual base for the generation of social or economic policy options in a manner that befits a 'national' institute.

Nigerian Institute for International Affairs (NIIA): In terms of national visibility, think-tanks which focus on international affairs and security studies are very prominent. The weighty and sustained involvement which national leaderships often give to international affairs and national security matters partly account for this prominence. The fact that the think-tanks, which are concerned with this policy area, are strongly linked to the Federal Government also account for their having a high national visibility. NIIA, as shown above, is one of the think-tanks that focuses on international and security studies.

NIIA is owned by the Federal Government. Research and public service activities, in the areas of general international affairs and foreign policy analysis, are its main activities (Akinyemi 1984, V).

NIIA has a Governing Council with a Chairman. The council serves as a board of trustees. The head of NIIA is referred to as the Director General. The organizational structure of this body appears to be adequately designed to enhance its functions. It is divided into Administration, Research and Library Departments; which are headed by Director of Administration, Director of Research and Director of Library and Documentation Services, respectively. Each department is further split into various divisions. For example the Research Department has three divisions, namely: International Politics and Strategic Studies; International Economic Relations; and International Law and Organizations (Banjo 1986, 21). The key officials in this department are the Research Fellows. Each of them has a primary project within the above divisions "as well as a geographic area of specialization which is generally aimed at reflecting the foreign policy priorities of Nigeria" (Banjo 1986, 21). It is through the Research Department that NIIA primarily carries out its research and public service functions.

National Institute for Policy and Strategic Studies (NIPSS): NIPSS is also owned by the Federal Government. Though it does deal with strategic issues, it is mainly identified with national policy issues in a broad sense. It conducts research and public service activities that focus on national political and socio-economic issues. The fact that it is also, particularly, concerned with national directions and guidelines, that ensures national growth and strength, readily feeds into its concern with adequate national security parameters and ingredients.
On the whole, and more importantly, NIPSS serves as a body that focuses on broad national public policy issues. Its public service activities are significant. It conducts seminars and classes for high-level individuals who are directly, or indirectly, involved with public policy making. It seems that one of NIPSS's goals is the provision of adequate awareness and broad national interest articulation capacity among high-level public policy makers and opinion leaders (and thus sensitizing them to the cardinal national goals and issues). It also organizes conferences. NIPSS also conducts applied research in order to seek for adequate knowledge and information that will enhance policy formulation, implementation and/or evaluation on urgent national issues.

As noted earlier, the Federal Government of Nigeria owns NIPSS, and the former also serves as the latter's main client.

As shown above, an effort has been to provide a profile of major public affairs and policy studies organizations. It is also necessary to relate these think-tanks to the policy-making and administrative dynamics.

Public Affairs and Policy Studies Organizations and Policy-Making and Administrative Dynamics

The impact and visibility of the above public affairs and policy studies organizations, in the policy-making and administrative milieu, significantly vary.

Of all the think-tanks in the socio-economic arena, only NISER's activities cover the whole country. As noted earlier, NISER is perceived as the 'national' and premier socio-economic policy studies organization. This national visibility, and the close formal links to the Federal Government, translate into it being able to have a significant amount of its research outputs and public service activities being utilized by federal and state governments. Apart from making intellectual inputs into various specific policy formulations, implementations and/or evaluations dynamics, NISER figures prominently in helping the Federal Ministries of Finance, National Planning, Industries, Trade and Agriculture, and the Federal Cabinet Office (its Economic Division), in the preparation of long-term development plans (which often form the centerpiece of national economic policy-making).

On the whole, the relative large number of socio-economic policy studies organizations, and the significant magnitude and intensity of research and public service activities of some these bodies, like NISER, have helped to make these organizations to have significant impacts on the economic and social policy making processes. The intense national desire to obtain adequate economic growth and modernization, as has been manifested in various industrial and agricultural undertakings, further enhances the importance of socio-economic policy studies organizations in providing intellectual inputs that will ensure sound economic and social policies.

NIPSS, as a policy studies organization, is in a class of its own. In fact some perceive it as "Nigeria's topmost center of training and research on matters of national policy and strategy" (Newswatch November 30, 1987, 18).

The fact that it is formally directly linked to the Federal Government ensures its research, public service and teaching functions having significant impacts on the policy process. The level and the nature of its formal links with the Federal Government specifically accounts for its impact on major national policies. It has formal access to the government at a high level. A government gazette entrusts the
Federal Government's relation with NIPSS to the Chief of General Staff (who was later designated Vice President in the Babangida Government) (Thisweek October 20, 1986, 18). With such an access, its research outputs and public service activities are easily utilized by the Federal Government. Since the number two position in the government has always been entrusted with many very important functions (for example, according to the government gazette, issued by Babangida Government, an individual occupying that position is in charge of the administration of the country's twenty-one states; appointments to the Boards of Federal Government-owned companies and parastatals; inter-state governments cooperation; administration of the focal point of national administration (the General Staff Headquarters); the administration of National Emergency Relief Agency; relations with NIPSS, NIIA and Public Complaints Commission; and the formulation of national policy guidelines on the administration of local governments (Thisweek October 20, 1988, 18) the occupant of the position is very much disposed to utilize NIPSS. The above tasks and functions constitute a complex and heavy responsibility on any political and administrative leader. Since the Vice President is in charge of the Federal Government's relation with NIPSS, he is in a vantage position to utilize the intellectual outputs of NIPSS in the formulation, implementation and evaluation of public policies.

Apart from the formal links to the Federal Government, the caliber of people who have attended NIPSS's training programs also results in NIPSS having much impact on the public policy process. Apart from its research activities, NIPSS also runs training programs for high-level public officials who are at the threshold of becoming, or are already, important political, military, administrative or economic leaders. For example, the President, the Vice President, the Minister of Defense, the Chief of Naval Staff, the Inspector General of Police, most members of the Armed Forces Ruling Council (the supreme national policy-making body), most members of Council of Ministers and Council of States, all General Officers commanding the Nigerian Army Divisions, and many high-level federal and state career civil servants are alumni of NIPSS (Newswatch November 30, 1987, 18). In fact, the Alumni Association of NIPSS membership list almost coincides with the list of all the nation's high ranking political, military, administrative and economic leaders. There seem to be a general tendency to perceive NIPSS's educational programs as prerequisites for national leadership roles, since these NIPSS's programs provide rigorous orientation to major national policy issues and acquaints the students with guidelines on matters of national policy and strategy. The policy papers and discussions that feature during the annual dinners of Alumni Association of NIPSS also often receive wide national media coverage. The attendance of these annual dinners also appear to be a roll call of the country's political, military, administrative and economic leaders (Newswatch November 30, 1987, 18-19; Newswatch December 7, 1987, 46; Newswatch December 14, 1987, 22). A paper presented by Professor Ukwu I. Ukwu (an alumnus of NIPSS), at the 1987 Annual Dinner of Alumni Association of NIPSS (held in Abeokuta, Ogun State), and entitled "The Nigerian Approach to Development: A Dispassionate Appraisal," was responded to by the Vice President, Admiral A. Aikhomu (Newswatch November 30, 1987, 18-19, and Newswatch December 14, 1987, 22). The paper was of such a very high intellectual quality, and also pertinent to pressing economic issues, that S. Adebo (the pioneer Chairman of the Board of NIPSS) requested Major-General C. Ndiomu (the Director-General of NIPSS) to make the paper a subject of regular seminar at NIPSS premises in Kuru (Newswatch November 30, 1987, 18-19). Though he disagreed with some of the points made in Ukwu's paper, Admiral Alkhomu was impressed by the brilliance of the paper. Aikhomu supported Adebo's suggestion and directed the paper to be a subject of a regular seminar at NIPSS (Newswatch November 30, 1987, 19). Thus, even an annual dinner of the Alumni Association of NIPSS was able to produce an event that will influence the thinking and perspectives of a generation of policy-makers. This itself is a powerful testimony of NIPSS's crucial role in the public policy process.
Additionally, NIPSS's prominent role in the policy process also manifests itself in the form of it helping to build bridges to other public affairs and policy studies organizations. For example, Professor Ukwu I. Ukwu (an alumnus of NIPSS) is an acting Director of IDS (a development policy studies organization), an Associate Research Fellow at NSER (a major economic and social policy studies organization), and a Senior Research Fellow at NIPSS (Newswatch December 14, 1987, 22). Additionally, between 1984 and 1985, the Director-General of NIPSS was a member of NIIA's Governing Council (Banjo 1986, 31). Through this sort of links, among public affairs and policy studies organizations, NIPSS helps them to have increasing impacts in the policy milieu, through the sharing of ideas (and thus enhancing synergism in the process of generating public policy options).

As noted earlier, NIPSS do also touch on issues that relate to the country's foreign relations. However, this occurs only tangentially. NIPSS touches on issues that have international ramifications mainly when they are strongly linked to matters of broad national policy.

NIIA is the main policy studies organization that focuses on international affairs. As mentioned earlier, NIIA and NIPSS are the only public affairs and policy studies organizations that are formally linked to the Federal Government at a very high level. The Vice President is charged with managing the Federal Government relations with the two organizations, as also noted earlier (Thisweek October 20, 1986, 18).

This NIIA's access to the Federal Government, through the second most ranking person in the country (the Vice President), enables its research outputs and public service activities to be well utilized by the Federal Government.

NIIA's access to the Federal Government, at a high level, predates this formal link to the Vice President during the Babangida Government. In terms of the nature of formal access to the Federal Government at a high level, NIIA has a rich history. The year 1981 was the last time that the Ministry of External Affairs served as NIIA's supervising Ministry. In that year, NIIA's formal link with the Federal Government was moved to the Executive Office of the President (this was during the Second Republic) (Banjo 1986, 21). During the Buhari Government era, NIIA's links to the Federal Government was through the Cabinet Office and, later, through the Supreme Military Headquarters (Banjo 1986, 21). Thus it can be posited that, from 1981 to the present, NIIA has enjoyed a high-level access to the Federal Government. This has enabled NIIA to make significant intellectual inputs into the foreign policy decision-making process.

This sustained access to high levels of government has also translated into significant national visibility for NIIA. Two of its recent Director-Generals have used NIIA's leadership as a springboard for External Affairs Ministership. Professors Ibrahim Agboola Gambari and Bolaji Akinyemi, who, at separate periods, were Director-Generals of NIIA, later were also Ministers of External Affairs at separate periods. These two vertical foreign affairs career movements are further indicators of NIIA's crucial role in the foreign policy process.

The nature and range of the research and the related activities that NIIA engages in also greatly contribute to the organization's importance in the foreign policy process. Generally, seasoned experts have always been appointed to head NIIA's Research Department. For example, U. J. Ogwu, A. Ajala, Dr. Dike Nworah, Dr. O. S. Kamanu and Professor R. A. Akindele, at separate periods, were substantive or acting Directors of Research (Banjo 1986, 19 and 21). Professor E. Bello also served as the Director of Research (Newswatch May 9, 1988, 38). Under such able leaderships the Research Department has been able to engage in a lot of activities.
Apart from research activities per se, the Research Department also engages in other related programs and activities. These research related activities are Public Enlightenment Lecture Program; Seminars and Conferences; Round Table Meetings; Special Briefings; Enlightenment and Training Program; Dialogue Sessions and the Patron of NIIA Hosting Event (Banjo 1986, 21-24).

As noted earlier, the Research Department is divided into International Politics and Strategic Studies, International Law and Organizations, and International Economic Relations Divisions. Within these Divisions, Research Fellows (who also have geographic specializations) conduct research into foreign policy issues that reflects the country's national priorities. It is within these dynamics that NIIA's main research functions are performed. Research Fellows, upon request, also "prepare policy papers for the government" (Banjo 1986, 21). Within this context, NIIA directly provides intellectual inputs into the foreign-policy decision-making process. The fact that the Research Fellows "are now increasingly consulted by various newspapers, radio and television stations for views and commentaries on current international issues" (Banjo 1986, 21 and Newswatch May 9, 1988, 38) further deepens NIIA's impacts on the general foreign policy process.

Public Enlightenment Lecture Program is one of the research related activities carried out by NIIA. Subjects covered by this program, and the list of speakers invited to give the lectures, indicate the importance of this program. The South African problem (Banjo 1986, 21); the issue of technological capacity acquisition (Eze 1986); China's foreign policy and its modernization strategy (Xiang 1986); the individual, the state and the economy, and the 1979 Constitution (Nwabueze 1979) are examples of the subjects covered by this program. The speakers who have given lectures under the auspices of this program include the following; Emeka Anyaoku, who is currently the Secretary-General of the Commonwealth of Nations; Momodu Munu, a former Executive Secretary of ECOWAS; Olaf Palme, late Swedish Prime Minister; President Jimmy Carter, former President of the United States; Dr. Anatoly Gromyko (Soviet African Studies expert and the son of late Andrei Gromyko); Helmut Schmidt, former Chancellor of the Federal Republic of Germany; Jesse Jackson, an American political leader; Edward Heath, former British Prime Minister; Professor Ali Mazuri; David Rockefeller; and Javier Perez de Cuellar, the United Nations' Secretary General (Banjo 1986, 22). Others include Professors B. F. Nwabueze (1979) and Osita C. Eze (1986). Through this sort of range of subjects and speakers, the program helps NIIA to get the public involved in pertinent international issues.

Another research related activity of NIIA is Seminars and Conferences program. In terms of organization, intensity, and tone, this program has more academic flavor than the above Public Enlightenment Lecture program. A series of academic papers and discussions, that concentrate on one particular topic, often characterize the format of the Seminars and Conferences program. The nature of Nigeria's relations with African and non-African countries; federalism; nonalignment; peace keeping efforts; Nigeria's international boundaries; Organization of African Unity Peace Keeping Force in Chad (Banjo 1986, 22); and the nature of economic cooperation between Nigeria and Eastern European countries (Akinyemi 1984) are some of the topics which the Seminar and Conference program has covered. Thus, this program helps to shape foreign policy agenda and further increases the role of NIIA in the foreign policy process.

Round Table Meetings is another research related activity. It is often "held in an atmosphere of confidentiality and the audience consist of carefully selected invitees" (Banjo 1986, 23). Examples of those who have presented papers in this program are A. Ayida, a former top civil servant (who lectured on a new world monetary order); P. C. Asiodu, another former senior civil servant (he lectured on some aspects of the economy and the oil industry); and President George Bush of United
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States, then the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations (who spoke on the United Nations, Africa and the United States) (Banjo 1986, 23). Through these Round Table Meetings, NIIA helps a selected group of those involved with foreign policy issues to get more knowledge about particular subjects.

Special Briefings program is another research related activity of NIIA. It is somehow similar to Round Table Meetings program. The only major difference being that the Special Briefings program's audience is restricted to NIIA's staff. The subject of the briefings often fall into two categories. One category of briefings is on events or crises in the international scene or in the domestic arena, while the other category of briefings has the objective of simply providing "information about the social, economic or foreign affairs of" particular countries (Banjo 1986, 23). Speakers in the Special Briefings sessions are often Ministers, visiting scholars, high government officials and members of the diplomatic corps. Examples of briefings that fall into the first category are the briefing sessions in which the Envoys of Argentina and Britain, on two different days, gave their respective perspectives on the Falkland crisis in 1982; the 1984 presentations made by United States' and Soviet Union's Ambassadors on the United States deployment of cruise and pershing missiles in Europe; and the 1985 briefing on the Iran-Iraq War, given by Iraqi and Iranian Ambassadors, on two different days (Banjo 1986, 23). The second category often involves Envoys simply giving presentation on the social, political, economic and/or foreign affairs features of their countries. Almost all Heads of Foreign Missions, based in Lagos, have, at separate periods, given such presentations on their respective countries (Banjo 1986, 23). The Special Briefings sessions are very popular and frequent. In 1985, twenty briefings were given. These sessions enable NIIA's staff to get adequate and current information about international issues and foreign countries. Such adequate information, in turn, enhances NIIA's capacity to provide high-quality intellectual inputs into the country's foreign policy process.

Another NIIA's research related activity is the Enlightenment and Training program. Through this program, NIIA offers tailored training programs to specific groups. This is often done at the request of the groups. Groups and organizations that utilize this program are mostly those that have functions that have some international ramifications. For example, senior officials of Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation (NNPC), the Nigerian Army, the Nigerian Air Force, the Nigerian Navy, the Department of Immigration, the Nigerian Police Force, the National Assembly staff, the National Insurance Corporation of Nigeria, and the Federal Radio Corporation of Nigeria have benefitted from this program (Banjo 1986, 23).

Another important research related program is the Dialogue Sessions. This takes the form of bilateral "discussions over a range of subjects" between a Nigerian delegation and a delegation of another country (Banjo 1986, 23). The discussions often cover the political, security, economic and cultural aspects of Nigeria's relation with that country (thus, it is very comprehensive). It also takes the form of a two part series. The dialogue takes place in NIIA and also at a similar institution in the counterpart country. The Nigerian delegation is often composed of experts from NIIA, professional communities, the academia, the business sector, and the media. Brazil, the United States, the Soviet Union, the Nordic countries, the Federal Republic of Germany, Canada, China and Cuba are some of the countries which NIIA has held Dialogue Sessions with (Banjo 1986, 23). The accomplishments and the proceedings of the Dialogue Sessions are often made available to the general public in the form of publications (for example, see Nigerian Institute of International Affairs 1980 and Nigerian Institute of International Affairs 1984).
The final, and a very important, research related program is the Patron of NIIA Hosting Event. The President of Nigeria is the Patron of NIIA. This event, which is commonly referred to as the "Patron's Dinner," has a rather very serious tone. It "has become a forum for the President to give an address reviewing the state of the world and stating Nigeria's views on key world issues" (Banjo 1986, 24).

NIIA do also collaborate with other bodies to organize seminars and workshops. Such seminars and workshops often focus on policy issues NIIA and the collaborating bodies perceive as having significant potential for synergistic tendencies, in terms of the generation, dissemination and application of ideas for policy-making purposes. For example, the Nigerian Navy (NN) and NIIA have a rich history of such collaborations. Security issues in Nigerian coastal areas is one issue area that necessitated the NN and NIIA co-sponsoring a workshop (see Akindele and Vogt 1983). The NN and NIIA has also jointly organized a seminar on "The Law of the Sea" (Akinyemi 1983 b, 8).

Through research, and the numerous research related activities (examined above), NIIA makes a tremendous impact on the foreign policy decision-making process. The research related programs, particularly, due to the wide media coverage which most of them receive, have also given NIIA a lot of national visibility. This further deepens NIIA's influence in the foreign policy process.

The importance and success of these wide-ranging research related programs has made these programs to compose themselves into a NIIA tradition, according to Banjo (1986, 21).

NIIA also has a vigorous publishing program. Many of the above research and research related programs provide materials for numerous publications.

Despite this excellent series of activities on the part of NIIA, its energy, sometimes, appears to make some Ministry of External Affairs officials to perceive NIIA as a threat. Some of the Ministry's staff appear to sometimes feel that NIIA, apart from its proper role in the area of research and public service activities, treads in a grey area that brings it into the policy-making arena (which is perceived as properly belonging to government ministries and agencies [Akinyemi ca 1983a]).

On the whole, NIIA seems to be relating adequately to the foreign policy decision-making milieu. Okoi Arikpo, a former Minister of External Affairs, had warned NIIA not to "indulge in idle pursuits unrelated to our national policies and pre-occupation" (quoted in Banjo 1986, 17). NIIA seems to be obeying Arikpo's instruction very well. It has performed adequately as a foreign policy studies organization. In this sense, it seems NIIA also agrees with Arikpo's view that NIIA "is an instrument of public policy" (quoted in Banjo 1986, 17).

The Muhammed/Obasanjo Government era, which was associated with assertive foreign policy behavior, was one of the brightest periods in NIIA's history. NIIA provided much intellectual inputs into foreign policy-making process during that era. It was also much identified with the foreign policy successes of that period (Aluko 1976 and 1981; Akinyemi 1979).

NIIA, and the other public affairs and policy studies organizations, have found various ways to achieve their missions, as shown above. Their achievements, however, have also been shown as significantly varying.
The amount of available resources, the nature of affiliation, the nature of access to policy-making points, the organizational structure, leadership capacity, organizational goals and socio-political dynamics are some of the factors that seem to impact on the performance of the public affairs and policy studies organizations.

The above profile of the public affairs and policy studies organizations, and their performance in the policy milieu, do indicate the effect of the amount of resources available to these organizations. NIPSS, NIIA, and NISER are the organizations that have larger amounts of material and human resources at their disposal, due to their prominent and visible links to the Federal Government. The above analyses of the performance of public affairs and policy studies organizations, in the policy milieu, show the three bodies to be those with greater impacts and national visibility.

The nature of affiliations of the various think-tanks, as shown earlier, also vary. Some are research, public service and/or teaching units of universities, while others are fairly autonomous bodies that are formally linked to the Federal Government. NIPSS and NIIA are the bodies that are formally linked to the Federal Government. NISER has an affiliation profile that are a combination of the above two types of affiliations. NISER is a fairly autonomous organization which is located in a university campus; but it is also formally linked to the Government. (NISER is located at University of Ibadan but is formally linked to the Federal Government.)

The fact that bodies like NIPSS and NIIA have formal direct links to the Federal Government, at a very high level, obviously enable them to make more inputs into the policy process. The universities' affiliated bodies do not have much formal direct links to the Government, and, thus, cannot make the same amount of intellectual inputs into the policy process.

The very fact that public affairs and policy studies organizations are affiliated to universities make them to have orientations that are different from those that are not linked to such academic institutions. According to Dunn and Whorton (1987, 118), "all universities deem instruction and research to be their central focus," and, accordingly, universities often "design reward structures to recognize performance in these areas." Dunn and Whorton (1987, 118) also note that academicians often "experience discomfort when attempting to appraise the performance of their colleagues' work in" areas other than research and instructions, and that "some faculty may evince hostility toward these units whose programs they view, at best, as a secondary university function and, at worst, as an illegitimate university activity." The sort of activities that often make public affairs and policy studies centers to have significant impacts in the policy-making milieu are applied research activities. Applied research often does not comply to the same standards as those research which most academicians consider to be scholarly research. By its very nature, applied research in the area of public affairs and policy studies seeks to discover, examine, understand and/or provide solutions to public policy issues and problems. Thus, applied research is more practical world focused and problem solving oriented. These practical world and problem solving orientations do not often allow applied research to engage in the luxury of dense, non-problem solving oriented, unhurried, and rigorous search for intellectual knowledge (which is associated with scholarly and basic research). This is a rather contentious issue. Some scholars will not share the view of some of their peers that, intrinsically, applied research is not scholarly research.

Though many university affiliated public affairs and policy studies organizations do have research, teaching and public service functions, they appear to be more able to discharge the teaching function. Additionally, according to some stud-
studies (Dunn and Whorton 1987, 118), while also having "comparative advantage over other institutions in research," university-related public affairs and policy studies organizations do not have such advantage in the area of public service activities, which involve things like technical assistance to public and private agencies, problem-solving studies and continuing education (see also Szanton 1981, 19).

Obviously, in order to conform to the university culture that emphasizes teaching and scholarly research, university-related public affairs and policy studies centers do well in these two areas and not very well in public service programs. Public affairs and policy studies organizations that are not affiliated to universities are thus more able to perform applied research (which feeds more into public service programs), and thus become more relevant in the policy-making milieu (since there is no university culture forcing them to emphasize scholarly research and instruction functions more than public service functions).

Thus, the nature of affiliations is one of the factors that enable some public affairs and policy studies bodies, like NIPSS and NIIA, to have significant impact in the policy-making milieu, while some (like those that are affiliated to universities) make lesser impacts in the policy-making process.

Another factor that accounts for the performance of public affairs and policy studies bodies is the nature of access to policy-making agencies. As shown earlier, higher and greater access to policy-making agencies translates into greater impacts in the policy-making milieu and into greater national visibility. Of all the public affairs and policy studies organizations, NIPSS and NIIA have the highest and greatest access to policy-making agencies. As also noted earlier, NIPSS and NIIA are the only public affairs and policy studies organizations that are linked to the Federal Government, through the Chief of General Staff (who is now designated Vice President) (Thisweek October 20, 1986, 18). NIPSS's and NIIA's links with the Vice President also imply that these organizations also have significant contacts with other machineries of national policy and administration, for example the Federal Government Cabinet Office. The Cabinet Office is one of the most important policy structures within the Presidency (which is the hub and fulcrum of national leadership). The Political and the Economic Divisions are the more visible units of the Cabinet Office. Specifically, the Cabinet Office serves as the hub for the erection of foundations for major national policies. It is also entrusted with some specific matters. For examples, it is often much involved with constitutional issues, census affairs, and creation of states policies (Newswatch June 6, 1988, 29). Its significance is also demonstrated by the fact that Sanda Ndayado, the head of the Political Division of the Cabinet Office during the Gowon Government, influenced Yakubu Gowon, the Head of State, to postpone the plan to replace military rule with civilian rule in 1976 (Newswatch June 6, 1988, 29). At the eve of Angola's independence, it was the Cabinet Office, rather than the Ministry of External Affairs, that helped Murtala Muhammed, the Head of State, to fashion Nigeria's policy towards Angola (Newswatch June 6, 1988, 31). A high-powered team, sent by the Babangida Government to resolve a major foreign policy problem with the neighboring Republic of Equatorial Guinea, included Modupe Okunnu, the Director-General of the Political Division of the Cabinet Office (Newswatch May 23, 1988, 14). These sort of policy influence and involvements clearly indicate the public policy importance of the Cabinet Office.

Thus, NIPSS and NIIA, by having access to policy structures like the Cabinet Office, have the ability to have very significant impacts on the policy milieu. The highly intellectual bent and backgrounds of many of those who work in the Cabinet Office, and the additional intellectual nature of the functioning of this structure (Newswatch June 6, 1988, 29), also make the Cabinet Office to be predisposed to
relate positively to intellectually oriented organizations like NIPSS and NIIA. Such a reality further expands NIPSS's and NIIA's impacts in the policy milieu.

Affiliation to the Federal Government is not a sufficient factor to ensure adequate impacts of these think-tanks. Affiliations combined with adequate access ensures such impacts. Thus, though NIPSS, NIIA, and NISER are all affiliated to the Federal Government, due to their higher and greater access to the Federal Government, NIPSS and NIIA have greater impacts in the policy-making milieu and more national visibility.

The organizational structure of public affairs and policy studies organizations is another factor that affect their performance. The discipline of administration stress the importance of adequate organizational structural arrangement in ensuring efficiency in organizations. More appropriate organizational structural arrangements of NIIA, NIPSS, and NISER have likewise translated into their being able to perform better than other public affairs and policy studies bodies.

Another factor that affects these bodies is the nature of their leadership capacity. Many of them, that have been able to perform very well, have, at various times, been blessed with able leaders. For example, during their various tenures as NIIA's Director-General, Dr. Fabunmi and Professors Akinyemi, Gambari and Olusanya did a lot to build NIIA into what it is today.

The sort of organizational goals that public affairs and policy studies organizations pursue also partially accounts for the performance of these organizations in the policy-making milieu. Those with goals that fit into policy areas which governments deem as being more important, and governments do deal with on a regular basis, are likely going to have more impact in the policy-making milieu. International affairs; economic and social policy; and the good performance and general stability of the political system (which NIIA, NISER and NIPSS are, respectively, concerned with) are issues that governments consider to be the more important policy areas and deal with on a regular basis. This reality is one of the factors that make NIIA, NISER and NIPSS to be important in the policy-making milieu.

Though NIIA, NIPSS and NISER are very influential think-tanks in the national policy milieu, they are acutely aware that, technically, they do not have the formal legal power to formulate policy. Rather, the three bodies are, technically, seen as only existing to generate ideas and policy options for the government ministries and agencies that have the legal power to formulate policy. Since knowledge is synonymous with power, the function of providing ideas and policy options and the function of formulating policy do get blurred (and thus NIIA, NIPSS and NISER do get informally involved in the latter function also, either inadvertently or as a result of the momentum of the policy process). However, these think-tanks, in order to minimize conflicts with government ministries and agencies (which are formally charged with the functions of policy formulation, implementation and evaluation) much prefer to be publicly perceived as having only the function of generating ideas and policy options for the policy-makers, rather than being perceived as being interested or involved in policy formulation. Thus, the think-tanks often emphasize their intellectual orientation. For example, Professor Akinyemi notes that the think-tanks "have built up channels of communications with the thinkers in our Universities and in the private sector" and that "[T]hrough these channels, ideas can be gathered and collated and made available for use" (Akinyemi 1983b, 8). He thus urges the "use of think-tanks such as NISER, NIIA and NIPSS, etc. in generating ideas," while also being quick in positing that the think-tanks "do not ask to formulate policies" (Akinyemi 1983b, 8).
At particular periods, due to socio-political dynamics, certain policy areas become more prominent than are normally the case with them. Public affairs and policy studies bodies, that are concerned with these particular policy areas, will enjoy more prominence in the policy-making process, during such periods, than is normally accorded to them. For example, during periods of administrative reforms, like the Udoji Public Service Review Commission era, organizations like INAD and CMD were more prominent, in the policy-making process, than is normally the case for these two bodies. Also, during periods of constitutional changes or reforms, NTALS and CILS also become more prominent than is normally the case for the two of them.

On the whole, the effectiveness of the public affairs and policy studies organizations cannot be attributed to a single factor, but to a certain combination of the factors analyzed above. Thus, the effectiveness of these think-tanks in the policy-making milieus can be explained or predicted on the basis of a certain combination of the factors of the amount of resources available to them, the nature of their affiliation, the nature of their access to policy-making agencies, their organizational structure, their leadership capacity, their organizational goals and the nature of socio-political dynamics.

Conclusion

The above examination and analysis of the nature of the relation between public affairs and policy studies organizations and the public policy-making milieu have revealed certain patterns and dynamics.

The profiles of the public affairs and policy studies organizations show that they can, comfortably, be classified according to their main policy concerns. Thus, these bodies fall into the following categories, namely (a) socio-economic arena, (b) judicial affairs, (c) area studies, (d) international affairs and security studies and (e) public policy and management.

Many of these bodies are affiliated to universities, while others are fairly autonomous bodies that are formally linked to the Federal Government.

While some of these bodies have national orientation and focus, in terms of their missions and functions, many of these bodies have regional orientations and foci. Many of the bodies that are linked to universities are those that tend to have regional orientations and foci, while many of those that are linked to the Federal Government are those that have national orientations and foci.

The bodies that are more identified with national orientation and focus are NIPSS, NIWA and NISER (which are linked to the Federal Government). Due to their prominence in the policy-making process and their pronounced national visibility, as shown earlier, these three bodies can truly be referred to as the 'national institutes'.

A series of factors, in various possible combinations, rather than a single factor, are also seen as determining whether the public affairs and policy studies organizations are effective in the policy-making milieu. These factors are the amount of available resources, the nature of affiliations, the nature of access to policy-making agencies, organizational structure, leadership capacity, organizational goals and the nature of socio-political dynamics. Thus, in order to improve the performance of the public affairs and policy studies organizations that are not performing adequately, it may be necessary to increase the amount of human and material resources that are available to them, improve the nature of their affiliations, provide them with more access to policy-making agencies, improve their
organizational structures, enhance their leadership capacity, ensure relevant organizational goals and/or also ensure that these bodies are more able to relate to changing socio-political dynamics.

The establishment of a national coordinating unit for all the public affairs and policy studies organizations may help to implement the above stated recommendations, and also help to coordinate, monitor, guide, and enhance these bodies. The research institutes in the areas of physical and biological sciences, engineering and technology have a machinery (the Federal Ministry of Science and Technology) (West Africa April 11, 1988, 661) that performs such roles. Thus, a similar agency for public affairs and policy studies organizations may be a good idea. The Federal Ministry of Science and Technology's responsibilities being expanded to cover public affairs and policy studies organizations may even be more appropriate.

As a former Head of State emphasized, effectively harnessing the country's talents and intellectual resources for development is the best way for the country to develop (Obasanjo 1987, 31). Proper and effective harnessing of public affairs and policy studies organizations' resources will help this sort of strategy for national growth. By enhancing the quantity and quality of public policy options available to the policy-makers, the think-tanks have the capacity to act as significant catalysts for political, social and economic progress and for the enhancement of the efficiency of the system of governance.
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