THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN POWER AND POLICY PROCESS: A CRITICAL REVIEW

Ibrahim Adamu Maiyadi
Department of Public Administration
Federal Polytechnic Damaturu, Yobe State, Nigeria

Anas Abubakar
Department of Political Science
Federal University of Kashere, Gombe State, Nigeria

Addau Usman Sallau
Northwest University, Kano, Kano State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT
Power and the policy process are two intrinsically connected phenomena upon which societal rules are based. In non-democratic societies, the powers that shape decision/policy making process use to be that of the tyrant/monarch and his closest allies. However, in modern day democracies, policy processes are overseas by political authorities through direct citizens' participation in all the stages of the policy formulation - agenda setting, proposal, interest aggregation to the implementation and evaluation. In this sense therefore, power influences which issues are addressed, how policies are formulated, and how they are implemented. In other words, powerful individuals, media, civil society organizations and other state and non-state actors have always been an important element in shaping the nature and direction of policies in today's civilized social settings. Thus, power and policy processes are always along a single linear process. The specific aim of this research is to investigate the reciprocal impact of policies on power dynamics. Literature on power, policy, policy process and many other relevant issues were reviewed thematically with a view to having a rigorous understanding of the cases under study. Luke's three dimensions of power theory was used as the theoretical framework of the research. Having fully relied on secondary data, the research used content analysis method in analysing the existing relations between power and policy process. Based on this, the research revealed that, In the realm of policy making, various sources of power emerge, including political, economic, expertise, public opinion, media, and institutional structures. simply put, power plays in all the stages of policy making processes. The paper recommended that policy makers should seek out and include diverse perspectives in policy-making process and also promote inclusivity to avoid policies that inadvertently perpetuate existing social inequalities.
Keyword: *Power, Policy, Policy Process, Policy Distribution, Policymaker*

1. Introduction

The relationship between power and the policy process has long been a central focus of political science research. As modern societies face increasingly complex challenges and competing priorities, the exercise and distribution of power significantly influence the development and implementation of public policy (Iniade, 2022). Power, often described as the capacity to influence or control the actions of others (Bachrach & Baratz, 2021), manifests in diverse forms and operates across multiple stages of the policymaking process.

Policies, as instruments of governance, emerge from a formation where power dynamics are at their most fervent (Hill, 2013). The formulation stage, the crucible in question, becomes a battleground where diverse stakeholders, each wielding their unique forms of power, converge to shape the policy agenda (Parsons, 2023). Political elites, interest groups, and bureaucratic institutions engage in a dance of influence, each seeking to imprint their mark on the contours of policy. The outcome, therefore, is a manifestation not only of societal needs and values but also of the power structures that underpin and sometimes undermine the democratic process (Lasswell, 2016).

Moving beyond the inception of policies, the implementation phase unveils yet another facet of the power-policy nexus. Bureaucratic agencies, entrusted with the responsibility of translating policy into action, become wielders of significant power (Hupe, 2021). Their discretionary authority allows for the interpretation and adaptation of policies, introducing a layer of complexity influenced by organizational cultures and internal power dynamics. The impact of a policy, therefore, extends beyond its intended objectives, as the interpretation by implementing agencies becomes a crucial determinant of its real-world implications (O'Toole, 2020).

Moreover, the relationship between power and the policy process is not unidirectional. Policies, once enacted, serve as conduits through which power dynamics are reinforced or altered. They have the potential to empower certain societal groups while concurrently marginalizing others (Howlett, Ramesh, & Perl, 2020). This reciprocal relationship underscores the dynamism inherent in the interplay between power and policies, emphasizing the enduring ripple effects that extend well beyond the initial policy implementation (Cairney & Heikkila, 2022).

The aim of this paper, therefore, is to critically review the relationship between power and policy process while specific objectives are to:

i.   Examine the types of power and sources of power,
ii.   Analyse the stages of policy process and actors in policy process,
iii. Determine the power dynamics in policy making,
iv.   Examine the ethical issues and challenges in fair policy distribution, and
v.   Proffer recommendations on effective policy process.

2. Literature Review
2.1 Conceptual Clarification
Power

Power is a multifaceted and complex concept that has been widely explored across diverse disciplines, including political science, sociology, and organizational studies. Its definitions and interpretations often vary depending on the specific context and framework within which it is examined. A foundational perspective is offered by Max Weber, who defined power as the ability of an individual or group to achieve their objectives, even in the face of resistance from others. This definition underscores the inherently dynamic and relational nature of power, emphasizing its role as a key determinant in social interactions and decision-making processes (Weber, 2015).

Contemporary scholars have further built on Weber's framework, exploring power as a construct that operates at multiple levels—individual, organizational, and systemic. For instance, Lukes (2015) expanded on Weber's view, introducing the concept of the "three dimensions of power," which considers not only overt conflicts but also subtle forms of influence, such as agenda-setting and ideological manipulation. Additionally, Foucault (2015) highlighted the pervasive and decentralized nature of power, illustrating how it is embedded in societal structures and practices. These recent perspectives enrich Weber's original definition, providing a more comprehensive understanding of how power functions in shaping relationships and maintaining social order.

In political science, Steven Lukes (2015) introduced the concept of "three faces of power," offering a nuanced perspective. Lukes argued that power is not only about overt decision-making but also involves shaping the preferences and perceptions of individuals, often influencing their interests and desires without their awareness. This dimension of power, termed "third-dimensional power," highlights the subtleties and covert mechanisms through which power operates in society. Furthermore, Foucault's (2015) influential work on power emphasizes its dispersion throughout society, challenging traditional hierarchical views. Foucault's concept of "disciplinary power" underscores the role of institutions and societal norms in shaping individuals' behaviours and thoughts. This approach moves beyond the conventional focus on political power and highlights the pervasive nature of power in shaping social structures.

The concept of power manifests in various forms, each influencing social dynamics in distinct ways. Scholars and researchers have identified and categorized different types of power to provide a nuanced understanding of how influence operates within societies.

Formal Power

Formal power is often institutionalized and associated with hierarchical structures within organizations or political systems. It emanates from designated roles, titles, or positions that grant individuals authority over others. French and Raven's (2015) classification identifies legitimate power as a formal type, emphasizing the acceptance of authority by subordinates based on established norms and rules (Müller, 2018). For instance, a CEO's authority within a corporation is a manifestation of formal power, as it is derived from their position in the organizational hierarchy. This formal authority is further reinforced through organizational policies, job descriptions, and legal frameworks, which ensure compliance and maintain order (Jackson, 2020). In this way, formal power not only organizes relationships but also defines the scope of influence individuals have within institutional structures (Johnson, 2023).

Coercive Power

Coercive power is rooted in the ability to administer punishment or negative consequences. Those who wield coercive power can influence others through fear of retribution or punishment. French and Raven's taxonomy identify coercive power as a key base of influence (French & Raven, 2015). For instance, a government's ability to enforce laws and regulations through legal penalties represents coercive power, as individuals comply to avoid negative consequences (Raven, 2018).

Expert Power

Expert power, derived from an individual's specialized knowledge, skills, or expertise, is a key source of influence that fosters credibility and respect in decision-making and advisory roles. This form of power is evident when experts like scientists or industry leaders sway opinions or drive changes, leveraging their domain-specific proficiency. For instance, a climate scientist's authority to shape public and policy discourse on global warming stems from their in-depth understanding of the issue, supported by empirical evidence and research (French & Raven, 2015; Raven, 2018). Expert power is particularly impactful in contexts where trust in knowledge and accuracy is paramount, such as in public health or environmental advocacy (Cialdini, 2021).

Referent Power

Referent power stems from the influence an individual wields due to their charisma, likeability, or the respect and admiration they command. It is closely tied to the personal qualities that make others aspire to emulate or associate with them. This form of power is commonly seen in charismatic leaders or influential public figures who inspire loyalty and trust. For example, when a beloved celebrity endorses a product, their referent power can drive consumer behaviour, as fans are often

motivated by their admiration and identification with the celebrity (French & Raven, 2015; Northouse, 2021). Such influence highlights the emotional connection and aspirational qualities that underpin referent power's effectiveness.

Informational Power

Informational power arises from the control and management of critical or exclusive information, enabling individuals to influence others by deciding how, when, or to whom the information is disseminated. This power is particularly significant in contexts where timely and accurate information is a valuable resource. For example, a journalist with exclusive access to sensitive information can shape public discourse by choosing how to present it, thereby influencing opinions and decisions (French & Raven, 2015). Informational power is often transient, as its effectiveness diminishes once the information becomes widely available or obsolete.

Relational Power

Relational power highlights the role of social connections and interpersonal relationships in shaping influence and decision-making dynamics. This form of power is derived from an individual's ability to leverage their network and the trust and reciprocity embedded within it. For example, within a social or professional group, an individual who is well-connected and maintains strong relationships can influence group decisions by mobilizing support, building consensus, or navigating conflicts (Dahl, 2016; Emerson, 2016). Relational power underscores the value of social capital in fostering influence and collaboration within interconnected systems.

Policy

According to Adesanya and Popie (2020), policy refers to a set of principles, guidelines, and rules formulated and implemented by individuals, organizations, or governments to achieve specific goals or address particular issues. Policies serve as a framework for decision-making and guide actions within a given context. They can be found in various domains, including government, business, education, and healthcare, among others (Hinte, 2023).

In government, policies are essential for the smooth operation of society, as they are designed to tackle various challenges such as social, economic, and environmental issues. For instance, environmental policies play a pivotal role in regulating pollution and promoting sustainable practices, thus ensuring a balance between economic growth and environmental protection (Adeyanju, 2023). Similarly, in the business sector, organizations implement policies that guide their operations while ensuring adherence to legal and ethical standards. These include human resources policies to manage workplace behaviour, anti-discrimination policies that foster inclusivity, and cybersecurity policies that protect sensitive data (Okoro &

Aluko, 2020). Collectively, such policies not only enhance the functionality of the organization but also create a positive work environment that is conducive to productivity and compliance with regulations (Eze & Obi, 2022).

Policy Process

The several phases involved in creating and carrying out policies within governmental or organizational bodies are included in the policy process, which is frequently defined as a cyclical and dynamic set of actions (Dye, 2017). According to Sabatier and Weible (2014), this complex process is not a straight line but rather a recurrent and iterative cycle that adjusts to the changing demands of society and tackles new problems. After challenges have been identified and prioritized, possible solutions are developed as the first step in the policy-making process. This step, called agenda setting, is crucial because it establishes which issues receive attention and move on to the next stages of the policy-making process, according to academics. Following the inclusion of a policy issue on the agenda, the process moves on to the formulation stage, where stakeholders, experts, and policymakers work together to create and develop alternative policies or ideas (Bardach & Patashnik, 2015).

The adoption stage, which comes after policy formation, denotes the formal acceptance and endorsement of a policy proposal by pertinent decision-making entities, such as executive or legislative organizations (Sabatier & Weible, 2014). Negotiation, discussion, and compromise are all part of the adoption stage as legislators try to reach an agreement on the suggested policies. The implementation phase follows, during which time resources are allotted, agencies are organized to carry out the policy, and theoretical frameworks are transformed into tangible actions (Pressman, 2020).

The evaluation step of the policy-making process, which entails determining the impact and efficacy of the policies, comes after implementation. Researchers and policymakers examine whether the desired outcomes were met, what unexpected repercussions emerged, and whether changes or revisions are required for upcoming policy cycles (Bardach & Patashnik, 2015). The policy process is adaptive in part because of this evaluative feedback loop, which informs later policy cycles.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

The theory which serves as a basis for this study is Lukes three Dimensions of power theory, developed by Steven Lukes (2015) this framework analyses power in three dimensions

i.   Decision making power: Focuses on the visible, measurable and observable exercise of power in decision making processes

ii.   Agenda setting power: This dimension addresses control over the political agenda deciding what issues are consider or exclude from public debate

iii.   Ideological power: This dimension goes beyond observable conflict to examine how power influences people's beliefs, desires and values making them accept the status quo as natural or Beneficial.

Lukes theory to the study highlights how visible and invisible forms of power influence the policy process, useful for analysing not only overt power struggles (e.g. lobbying) but also the agenda or how citizens choices are shaped and also offers insight into why certain groups dominate policy making and why some voices are excluded.

2.3 Empirical Literature
Sources of Power in Policy Making

According to Ayilara (2019), policymaking is a process shaped by diverse sources of power, including institutional, structural, and individual influences, which collectively impact decisions and outcomes. Institutional power, derived from formal structures such as government agencies and legislative bodies, plays a critical role in setting the agenda and implementing policies (Hill, 2013). Structural power, often linked to socio-economic systems and power imbalances, determines the extent to which different groups can influence policy (Lukes, 2015). Additionally, individual power, rooted in the leadership, expertise, and charisma of policymakers or interest groups, can significantly sway policy direction. These sources of power interact within a broader context of political, economic, and cultural factors, highlighting the complex and dynamic nature of policymaking.

One of the most prominent sources of power in policy making is political power. Political leaders, elected officials, and government institutions play a crucial role in shaping and implementing policies. As Okunnu and Anuye (2018) argues, political power is often concentrated in the hands of a few, and decision-making authority is exercised through formal political processes. The ability of political actors to influence policy outcomes is a central aspect of the policy-making landscape (Dye, 2017).

Economic power is another influential factor in policy making. Economic elites, corporations, and interest groups can wield significant influence over policy decisions through financial contributions, lobbying, and economic leverage. Aguniye (2014) highlight the impact of economic elites on policy outcomes, emphasizing the unequal distribution of influence based on economic resources.

According to Nwadabi and Osadebe (2021), the role of expertise and knowledge is crucial in shaping policy decisions. Policymakers often rely on advice from experts, researchers, and think tanks to inform their choices. The authority of knowledge and expertise in policy making is evident in the emphasis on evidence-based decision-making (Weiss, 1979). Experts can shape the policy agenda and contribute to the framing of issues, influencing the direction of policy development.

Public opinion is a key source of power, particularly in democratic systems where the support of the electorate is vital for political legitimacy. The relationship between public opinion and policy making is complex, with policymakers considering public preferences in their decision-making process (Burstein, 2017). Public support can act as both a constraint and an enabling factor in policy development.

The media plays a significant role in shaping public perceptions and influencing policy making. Agenda-setting theory posits that media coverage can determine the salience of issues in the public mind, thereby influencing policy priorities (McCombs & Shaw, 2017). Policymakers often seek to manage their public image through media interactions, recognizing the media's power to shape public discourse.

Institutional structures, such as the legal framework, bureaucratic organizations, and international institutions, also contribute to the distribution of power in policy making. The institutional context shapes the rules and procedures through which policies are formulated and implemented (March & Olsen, 2015). Understanding the role of institutions is essential for analysing how power operates within the policy-making process.

Stages of the Policy Process
The following are the stages of policy process:

Agenda setting marks the initial phase of the policy process. During this stage, issues gain attention and prominence among policymakers and the public. The media, interest groups, and political actors play pivotal roles in influencing the policy agenda by framing and emphasizing specific problems or concerns (Kingdon, 2015). The agenda-setting process determines which issues move forward for further consideration in the policy process.

Policy formulation involves the development of proposed solutions or courses of action to address the issues identified during agenda setting. Policymakers, experts, and stakeholders collaborate to craft policies that align with the established goals. This stage requires thorough analysis, research, and consideration of potential consequences. The outcome is often a policy proposal or a set of alternatives that undergo further scrutiny before potential adoption.

Policy adoption refers to the official approval and endorsement of a policy proposal by a legislative body, executive authority, or relevant decision-making body. The adoption stage involves debates, negotiations, and compromises to garner support for the proposed policy. The approved policy may undergo modifications during this phase based on political considerations, feedback, and the legislative process (Sabatier & Weible, 2014).

After adoption, the focus shifts to policy implementation, where the proposed measures are put into practice. This stage involves translating policy objectives into concrete actions, allocating resources, and coordinating activities among different government agencies or organizations. Implementation may encounter challenges such as resource constraints, bureaucratic resistance, or unforeseen issues that require adjustments to achieve the intended outcomes (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973).

Policy evaluation is the final stage of the policy process, where the impact and effectiveness of the implemented policy are assessed. Evaluation involves measuring outcomes, determining whether the policy achieved its goals, and analysing the unintended consequences. Evaluation findings can inform future policy decisions, contribute to accountability, and guide adjustments or revisions to existing policies (Bardach & Patashnik, 2015).

The policy process encompasses the stages of agenda setting, policy formulation, policy adoption, policy implementation, and policy evaluation. Each stage involves distinct activities and considerations, and the process is often iterative, with feedback loops influencing subsequent policy cycles. Understanding these stages is essential for policymakers, scholars, and citizens alike to engage meaningfully in the development and assessment of public policies.

Actors in the Policy Process
The policy process involves a diverse array of actors who play distinct roles in shaping, influencing, and implementing policies. Mazmanian and Sabatier (2014) noted that These actors, drawn from various sectors of society, contribute to the dynamic and complex nature of policy development and execution.

Government agencies are key actors in the policy process, playing crucial roles at multiple stages. They contribute to policy formulation by providing expertise, conducting research, and offering recommendations to policymakers. Additionally, government agencies are responsible for implementing policies, allocating resources, and ensuring compliance with established regulations. The interactions between different agencies often require coordination to achieve policy goals effectively (Mazmanian & Sabatier, 2014).

Interest groups, also known as advocacy groups or pressure groups, represent specific constituencies or advocate for particular issues. These groups actively participate in the policy process by influencing decision-makers, shaping public opinion, and engaging in advocacy efforts. Through lobbying, campaigning, and public relations activities, interest groups aim to promote policies that align with their members' interests or causes (Lowi, 2017). Their influence can be significant, particularly in agenda setting and policy adoption stages.

Media plays a crucial role in the policy process by influencing public opinion and agenda setting. Through news coverage, editorials, and other forms of

communication, the media can shape how issues are perceived and which topics gain prominence. The media also serves as a platform for disseminating information about policies, influencing public understanding and reactions. Policymakers often engage with the media strategically to communicate their positions and garner public support (Entman, 2018).

Public opinion represents the collective views and attitudes of the general population on various issues. While the public may not directly participate in the intricacies of policy formulation, their opinions can significantly impact the political landscape. Policymakers often consider public sentiment when making decisions, especially in democratic systems where public support is crucial for political legitimacy. Public opinion can shape the agenda, influence policy adoption, and impact the political feasibility of certain policy proposals (Page & Shapiro, 2014).

In addition to these actors, there are other influential participants in the policy process, including elected officials, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), international organizations, and academic experts. The interactions and relationships among these diverse actors contribute to the complexity of the policy-making environment.

Power Dynamics in Policy Making

Power dynamics in policy making constitute a complex interplay of interactions, relationships, and struggles among diverse actors engaged in the formulation, adoption, and implementation of policies. As Dahl (2016) contends, power dynamics in this context involve the ability of actors to influence decision-making processes and outcomes. These dynamics are crucial for comprehending the intricate mechanisms by which influence is wielded, and policies are shaped within the multifaceted landscape of political and societal forces (Dye, 2017). Scholars emphasize that power operates not only through formal political structures but also within informal networks and relationships, underscoring the nuanced nature of power dynamics in policy making (Lowi, 2017). Analyzing these power dynamics is essential for grasping how certain actors or interest groups can disproportionately influence policy outcomes, potentially leading to the prioritization of specific interests over broader societal considerations (Schattschneider, 1960).

Interest groups exert significant influence on policy making by leveraging resources, advocacy strategies, and political connections. They represent specific constituencies or industries and often engage in lobbying, campaign contributions, and grassroots mobilization to advance their agendas. The power of interest groups lies in their ability to shape the policy agenda, influence lawmakers, and contribute to the framing of issues. The extent of their influence can vary, but well-organized interest groups can play a decisive role in shaping policy outcomes (Schattschneider, 1960).

Bureaucracies, comprising government agencies and civil servants, wield power in the policy process through their expertise, institutional knowledge, and implementation capabilities. Bureaucrats play a role in policy formulation by providing technical advice and drafting proposals. Moreover, during policy implementation, they are responsible for executing and administering policies. The bureaucracy's influence can be subtle but pervasive, as bureaucrats possess specialized knowledge that can shape the decision-making process (Wilson, 1887).

Political parties play a central role in the power dynamics of policy making, especially in representative democracies. Elected officials affiliated with political parties participate in policy formulation and decision-making processes. The party in power often determines the policy agenda, and party discipline can influence the voting behaviour of members. Political parties shape the legislative landscape, impacting the passage or rejection of policies. Additionally, partisan politics can contribute to polarization and affect the willingness to collaborate on policy issues (Aldrich, 2023).

The media plays a pivotal role in shaping power dynamics by influencing public opinion, framing issues, and setting the agenda. Through news coverage, editorials, and other forms of communication, the media can amplify or diminish the importance of specific policy issues. Policymakers often seek to manage their public image through strategic media interactions. The media's power lies in its ability to highlight certain aspects of policies, shaping public perceptions and influencing political discourse. However, media influence is not unidirectional, as media outlets can also be influenced by political actors and interest groups (McCombs & Shaw, 2017).

Power dynamics in policy making involve the intricate interplay of various actors, each with its own set of interests, resources, and strategies. Interest groups, bureaucracies, political parties, and the media contribute to the complexity of the policy process, and their interactions shape the landscape of decision-making in political and governance systems. Analysing these power dynamics is essential for understanding how policies are formulated, adopted, and implemented in different contexts.

Ethical Issues in Policy Making

Ethical considerations are integral to the policy-making process, as policies have far-reaching consequences for individuals and communities. Arnstein (2016) noted that addressing ethical issues is essential to ensure that policies are just, equitable, and aligned with societal values. Some key ethical considerations in policy making include:

Policies should aim to promote fairness and justice, treating all individuals and groups equitably. Ethical concerns arise when policies disproportionately benefit

or harm certain populations, contributing to social inequalities. Policymakers must consider the potential distributional impacts of policies and strive to minimize disparities.

Transparency is a fundamental ethical principle in policy making. Citizens have the right to be informed about the decision-making process, the factors influencing policy choices, and the potential consequences of implemented policies. Ensuring transparency fosters accountability, allowing for scrutiny of decision-makers and holding them responsible for their actions (Behn, 2018).

Ethical policy making involves the inclusion of diverse perspectives and the participation of affected stakeholders. Policies that are developed without considering the input of those impacted may lack legitimacy and fail to address the nuanced needs of different communities. Inclusiveness in the decision-making process enhances the democratic nature of policy development (Arnstein, 2016).

Policies should adhere to fundamental human rights principles. Ethical concerns arise when policies infringe upon individuals' rights to privacy, freedom of expression, or other basic human rights. Policymakers must conduct thorough human rights impact assessments to identify and mitigate potential violations (Donnelly, 2017).

3. Methodology

This paper is a theoretical review of existing literature on power and policy process. To achieve the research objective, the study relies on secondary sources of data. These sources include journals, textbooks, seminar papers, magazines, bulletins, newspapers and periodicals.

4. Challenges to Fair Power Distribution

Unequal Access to Resources: One of the primary challenges to fair power distribution in policy making is the unequal access to resources. Certain groups, such as well-funded interest groups or powerful corporations, may have greater influence due to their financial resources. This can result in policies that prioritize the interests of powerful actors over those of marginalized or less affluent groups (Schlozman et al., 2012).

Bureaucratic Power and Insularity: Bureaucracies, while essential for policy implementation, can wield disproportionate power due to their specialized knowledge and institutional influence. The challenge lies in ensuring that bureaucratic power is exercised transparently and in the public interest, rather than becoming a source of insular decision-making that may not adequately represent the broader population (Moe, 1989).

Lack of Public Engagement: A challenge to fair power distribution is the limited engagement of the public in the policy-making process. If certain groups have more access to decision-makers or if there are barriers to public participation, policies may not reflect the diverse needs and preferences of the entire population. Encouraging and facilitating meaningful public participation is crucial for fair and inclusive policy development (Arnstein, 2016).

Regulatory Capture: Regulatory capture occurs when regulatory agencies, tasked with safeguarding the public interest, become influenced or dominated by the industries they are meant to regulate. This can result in policies that prioritize industry interests over broader societal concerns, undermining fair power distribution and eroding public trust in the regulatory process (Stigler, 1971).

Addressing ethical considerations and challenges to fair power distribution is essential for fostering a policy-making environment that upholds democratic values, social justice, and the wellbeing of all members of society. Policymakers, stakeholders, and citizens must actively work to navigate these challenges and promote ethical practices in the development and implementation of policies.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations
5.1 Conclusion
The policy-making process is a complex and dynamic endeavour influenced by a multitude of factors, actors, and power dynamics. As policies have far-reaching implications for societies, it is crucial to navigate the challenges and ethical considerations inherent in the process. Understanding the stages of the policy process, the actors involved, and the sources of power provides a foundation for comprehending the intricacies of policy development.

The interplay of political, economic, and social forces, along with the influence of interest groups, the media, and public opinion, shapes the policy landscape. Power dynamics play a pivotal role, and ethical considerations are essential for ensuring that policies are just, transparent, and accountable. Challenges to fair power distribution, such as unequal access to resources and regulatory capture, underscore the need for vigilant efforts to promote equity and inclusivity in policy making.

5.2 Recommendations
i.   The government should tackle the unequal distribution of resources that can contribute to disparities in power. Implement measures to reduce the influence of well-funded interest groups and ensure that financial resources do not unduly determine policy outcomes.

ii.   The government should promote evidence-based decision-making by encouraging rigorous research and data collection. Policymakers should rely on reliable data and research findings to formulate policies, helping to ensure that interventions are effective and achieve their intended outcomes.

iii. Policy maker should foster transparency in the policy-making process by providing accessible information about decision-making, considerations, and potential consequences. Actively engage the public in meaningful ways, ensuring diverse voices are heard and considered in the policy development process.

iv.   The government should Prioritize the integration of ethical considerations throughout the policy process. Implement ethical impact assessments to evaluate the potential consequences of policies on equity, justice, and human rights. This proactive approach can help identify and address ethical challenges before policies are implemented.

v.   Policy makers should seek out and include diverse perspectives in the policy-making process. This includes involving marginalized communities, minorities, and those directly affected by policies. Promote inclusivity to avoid policies that inadvertently perpetuate existing social inequalities.

REFERENCES

Adesanya, O., & Popie, D. (2020). Policy formulation and implementation in governance: A comprehensive approach. *Public Administration Review, 52*(3), 211–224.

Adeyanju, A. (2023). Environmental policies and sustainable practices: A framework for policy implementation. *Journal of Environmental Policy, 35*(2), 134–148.

Aguniye, M. (2014). The impact of economic elites on policy decisions in developing economies. *Journal of Political Economy, 12*(1), 76–92.

Aldrich, J. H. (2023). *Why parties? The origin and transformation of political parties in America*. University of Chicago Press.

Arnstein, S. R. (2016). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35*(4), 216–224.

Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (2021). *Power and poverty: Theory and practice*. Oxford University Press.

Bardach, E., & Patashnik, E. (2015). *A practical guide for policy analysis: The eightfold path to more effective problem solving* (4th ed.). CQ Press.

Behn, R. D. (2018). *Rethinking democratic accountability*. Brookings Institution Press.

Burstein, P. (2017). The impact of public opinion on public policy: A review of the literature. *Political Science Quarterly, 118*(4), 595–614.

Cairney, P., & Heikkila, T. (2022). *Theories of the policy process*. Westview Press.

Cialdini, R. B. (2021). *Influence: The psychology of persuasion* (7th ed.). Harper Business.

Dahl, R. A. (2016). The concept of power. *Behavioral Science, 2*(3), 201–215.

Donnelly, J. (2017). *Universal human rights in theory and practice* (2nd ed.). Cornell University Press.

Dye, T. R. (2017). *Understanding public policy* (15th ed.). Pearson.

Emerson, R. M. (2016). Power-dependence relations. *American Sociological Review, 27*(1), 31–41.

Entman, R. M. (2018). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication, 43*(4), 51–58.

Foucault, M. (2015). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Pantheon Books.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (2015). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), *Studies in social power* (pp. 150–167). Institute for Social Research.

Hill, M. (2013). *The public policy process* (6th ed.). Routledge.

Hinte, S. (2023). Policy and governance in a changing world: Approaches to decision-making in contemporary societies. *Governance Review, 38*(1), 45–58.

Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2020). *Public policy: A new introduction*. Routledge.

Hupe, P. (2021). *Street-level bureaucracy and the policy process: A study of public administration*. Sage Publications.

Iniade, S. (2022). Power dynamics and public policy: An empirical analysis. *Journal of Political Science Research, 29*(3), 34–50.

Jackson, T. (2020). *Leadership and management: Theory and practice*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Johnson, D. (2023). *Organizational behavior: Understanding and managing human behavior in organizations* (9th ed.). Pearson.

Kingdon, J. W. (2015). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies*. Little, Brown and Company.

Lasswell, H. D. (2016). The policy orientation. *The American Political Science Review, 45*(3), 451–465.

Lowi, T. J. (2017). *The end of liberalism: The second republic of the United States*. Norton.

Lukes, S. (2015). *Power: A radical view* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (2015). The new institutionalism: Organizational factors in political life. *American Political Science Review, 78*(3), 734–749.

Mazmanian, D. A., & Sabatier, P. A. (2014). *Implementation and public policy*. Scott, Foresman, and Company.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (2017). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly, 36*(2), 176–187.

Moe, T. M. (1989). The politics of bureaucratic discretion. *Public Administration Review, 49*(2), 142–152.

Müller, J. (2018). Theories of power and influence in organizations: A critical approach. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39*(2), 178–197.

Northouse, P. G. (2021). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (8th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Nwadabi, C. U., & Osadebe, P. A. (2021). The role of expertise and knowledge in shaping public policy. *Journal of Policy Studies, 43*(2), 127–142.

Okoro, F., & Aluko, A. (2020). Corporate governance policies in businesses: Ensuring regulatory compliance and ethical standards. *Journal of Business Ethics, 33*(4), 405–419.

Okunnu, A., & Anuye, M. (2018). Political power and policy implementation in Africa: The Nigerian perspective. *African Journal of Political Science, 45*(2), 101–115.

O'Toole, L. J. (2020). Interorganizational coordination and policy implementation. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 30*(2), 143–160.

Page, B. I., & Shapiro, R. Y. (2014). Effects of public opinion on policy. *American Political Science Review, 77*(1), 175–190.

Parsons, W. (2023). *Public policy: An introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Pressman, J. L. (2020). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland*. University of California Press.

Pressman, J. L., & Wildavsky, A. B. (1973). *Implementation: How great expectations in Washington are dashed in Oakland*. University of California Press.

Raven, B. (2018). The bases of power and the power/interaction model of interpersonal influence. *Journal of Social Influence, 37*(1), 13–24.

Sabatier, P. A., & Weible, C. M. (2014). *Theories of the policy process* (3rd ed.). Westview Press.

Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). *The semisovereign people: A realist's view of democracy in America*. Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Schlozman, K. L., Verba, S., & Brady, H. E. (2012). *The unheavenly chorus: Unequal political voice and the broken promise of American democracy*. Princeton University Press.

Stigler, G. J. (1971). The theory of economic regulation. *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science, 2*(1), 3–21.

Weber, M. (2015). *Economy and society: An outline of interpretive sociology*. University of California Press.

Weiss, C. H. (1979). The many meanings of research utilization. *Public Administration Review, 39*(5), 426–431.

Wilson, J. Q. (1887). The politics of regulation. *Public Interest, 58*, 98–110.