



Historical Analysis of Educational Policies in Nigeria from 1908–1977 and its Implication in Modern Nigeria

Morris Njokuⁱ

Department of Educational Management
Faculty of Education
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education
Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract

This paper surveyed the historical development of education and policy analysis from 1908 to 1977. The researcher in course of analysis looked at the basis of the educational policies and its development in the face of its success or failure having in mind that the colonial masters did not introduce policies that adequately address the aspiration of Nigeria, hence, the introduction of 6-3-3-4 system. The system sought to introduce a functional technological based education. This paper further evaluated the implications of issues like nepotism, favoritism, insecurity, poverty, political interference, traditional interference, funding and bureaucratic bottle necks in the face of educational policies and implementation in Nigeria, within the time vendor focus and apparently answers the question, if the education development and policies have adequately answered educational problems.

Keywords: Education, Policy, Analysis, Educational development, Issues, Ordinance, Code, Law, Commissions, Post-colonial Era.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Njoku, M. (2018). Historical Analysis of Educational Policies in Nigeria from 1908–1977 and its Implication in Modern Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 11(3), 420-436. Retrieved [DATE] from <http://www.ij sre.com>.

Copyright © 2018 IJSRE

INTRODUCTION

Like every other sector in human race, education policies are to proffer guideline and principles. The several attempts by many factors to undermine or frustrate the good intentions of educational policies have been resisted by astute researchers. Therefore, this paper x-rays some of the perceived problems of educational polices in Nigeria. To achieve that, this paper critically focused on the analysis of some issues like favoritism, nepotism, poverty, insecurity, bureaucratic principles, political interference and traditional interference.

Further, there have been no definite factor or factors conclusively defined to be responsible for ineffective implementation of educational policies, hence researchers are exposed to finding solution through identification of variables militating against educational policies. Even education itself has no definite or generally agreed definition. That is why Wali (2007) stated that education is difficult to state in precise terms. The reasons are education has the growing qualities of living organisms. Among its permanent attribute is that it is constantly changing in emphasis and at the same time, adapting itself to the new circumstances and demand, backed with policies to achieve its aim in the face of its dynamic circumstances and demands.

Policy literally connote to advice, to scheme, conceive something to be done, or to project in advance of action. It is a rationale assessment of what we wish to do, and how to do it. In order to reach necessary state (Okeke, 2006), Dior in Adiele, Obasi and Ohia (2017) defined planning (policy) as the process of preparing a set of decision or action in future which are directed at achieving goals by optimal means.

From the forgoing, one could define educational policy as a set of government principles, as well as the collection of laws and rules that governs the operation of educational systems. The variables or factors militating against these policies constitutes the major concerns of this research.

BACKGROUND

The development of educational policies has been in existence since the establishment of governments. Tailar (1997) in Ng-Ding (2016) defined policies analysis as the study of what governments do, why and with what effects, recognizing that institutions at all levels of the education system are effectively part of a public system, even if they are not formally in the public sector, in particular, Quah (2015) in Ng-Ding (2016) argues that policy formulation is always relatively easy, it is the implementation that is complex.

Decades of policy implementation studies have put to lie the notion that there can be a generalized theory of policy implementation Deleon and Deleon (2002) in Jimada (2009) Collectively, these studies illustrate that one size never fits all context matters, and that when policy makers and analysts face an extremely complex condition, they are better off if they try to understand particular issues, rather than proposing a generic met theory of why some policies fail or why some succeed. Indeed, policy analysis studies today focus on the unique social, cultural, economic and political contexts that bedevil specific policy or reform implementation.

Nigeria education as a reconstituted democracy has to address issues of a dual transformation. The country's education needs to re-examine its past and focus on developmental plans that will meet the political and economic sector. The new government has declared education as one of its priorities. The aim of this is to have reformed system of education that will provide access at all level of education and improve the quality and efficiency of the entire education system while the challenges that lie in the implementation programmes are monitored strictly.

According to Fafunwa (N.d) between 30 and 40 percent of the country's recurrent expenditure and 20 percent of the capital budget were spent on education during 1960s and 1970s. The reverse is the case where the country's budget cannot be measured with the former. Robert-Okah (2018) also has it that ironically, the Nigeria government and her agencies have refused to realize the strategic position of education in national development, hence the underfunding of the sector.

Azubuike (2013) show that government of all levels spent between 7 and 11 percent of their annual budget on education a distant embarrassing disgrace compared to UNESCO

recommendation of 26 percent. Politics in allocation of resources equitably, deviated as against the standard pointed out by Rowley and Henley who opined that politics is all about authoritative allocation of values.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to prepare educational planners and policy makers with a base and direction in their line of action. As well as trying to create ground breaking awareness to implementers of educational policies by highlighting some perceived factors or issues responsible for ineffective or partial implementation of educational policies.

The highlighted issues or challenges in line with trend of events, will enlarge the understanding of educational planner and implementers towards adequate preparation in confronting the slow pace of educational growth in Nigeria from the policies implementation perspective. The education policies and implementation reflect the national philosophy and national objectives as documented in 2nd National Development Plan (1970). The objectives as adopted by government in (1981) are: A free and democratic society, just and egalitarian society, a united and self-reliant nation, great and dynamic economy and a place of bright and full opportunities for all citizen.

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATION

There are certain concepts raised in this paper like educational ordinance of 1908, education code of 1916, education ordinance of 1926, Elliot commission 1940, Ashby commission of 1959, its report of 1960, minority report, nepotism, favoritism, insecurity, poverty, traditional interference, political interference, funding and bureaucratic bottle necks needs clarification. This is done for proper understanding of the users of this paper.

Education Development and Policies from 1908–1977

According to Fabunmi (2005) and Adiele, Obasi, and Ohia (2017) the account of educational development and policies are posited thus:

The 1908 Ordinance

Lagos and other southern part of Nigeria were governed separately as different colonies. Not until 1906, that the colony of Lagos and the Protectorate of Southern Nigeria were amalgamated to be known as the protectorate of Southern Nigeria. This amalgamation gave rise to the 1908 education ordinance for the protectorate of Southern Nigeria. The only significant change in the ordinance was the creation of the department of education which replaced the Education Board.

The 1916 Education Code

The Northern and southern protectorates were ruled as different entities. In 1914, the two protectorates were amalgamated together for administrative convenience and became known as Nigeria. Lord Lugard then, the Governor General of Nigeria, promulgated the 1916 education code for Nigeria. The major policy thrust of the code was to ensure:

- Increased government participation in educational provision;
- Equitable distribution of educational institutions and facilities;

- Increase in financial support for education;
- Secularism in educational provision;
- More relevant education;
- Higher standard and co-operation among the various educational agencies;
- Provision of diversified curriculum;
- Encouragement of communities and voluntary agencies in the building of schools; and
- Provision for quality teaching training.

The 1926 Education Ordinance

The British government in 1926 adopted a new education policy for its British West African colonies. The policy called for greater investment in education in order to raise the efficiency of Nigerians. The new policy was very significant in the sense that:

- It was the first policy document to be issued on African education by the colonial government since western education was introduced in Nigeria eighty three years earlier.
- It highlighted the indifference of colonial government to education and the inefficiency and short-sightedness of the Christian missions in the field of education;
- The memorandum guided Nigerian education policy and development between 1926 and 1945.

The 1926 education ordinance sought to address the following issues:

- The registration and accreditation of teachers for government grants;
- To check unbridled educational expansions by screening new schools;
- Monitoring and control of standards in existing schools;
- The establishment of Board of Education with representatives from various voluntary agencies and other interest groups.

The period also witnessed the setting up of different education schemes for the Northern protectorate. The North became divided into Islamic and Pagan North with four types of schools namely:

- Schools where Moslems should be taught the Roman Character;
- Schools where the sons of chiefs would be taught as boarders in a school or college;
- General primary schools for children on secular basis;
- Cantonment schools for children of native clerks who are mostly Christians (Adiele, et al., 2017).

According to Fabunmi (2005) in his account of 1926 ordinance posited that month of March 1925, a memorandum on Education Policy in British Tropical African was dispatched to the colonies as the basis for the British colonial education policy. The need to provide a modus operandi for this memorandum and the necessity to stop the mushroom primary schools from operating in Southern Nigeria provided the impetus for this ordinance. The ordinance was a landmark in the development of education in Nigeria and an outcome of the recommendations of the 1920 Phelps–Stoke Commission on education in Africa. Its terms of reference include:

- To inquire into existing educational work in each of the areas to be studied;
- To investigate the educational needs of the people in their religious, social, hygienic and economic conditions;
- To ascertain the extent to which these educational needs were being met; and
- To make available in full the result of the study.

The report of this commission geared the British Colonial Administration to demonstrate increased interest in African education. It issued its first educational policy in 1925 memorandum and outlined guidelines for operation in the colonial educational system. This policy consisted mainly of the recommendations of the Phelps-Stoke Commission. These include the following:

- Establishment of advisory boards of education that will assist in supervision of educational institutions;
- Adaptation of formal education to local conditions;
- Study of vernaculars in schools;
- Thorough supervision and inspection of schools;
- Education of women and girls;
- Emphasis on religious training and moral instructions (Osokoya, 2002).

While the recommendations of the 1926 Education Ordinance are:

- Making registration on teachers a pre-condition for teaching in any school in Southern Nigeria;
- Disallowing the opening of schools without the approval of the Director of Education and the Board of Education;
- Authorization the closure of any school, which was conducted in a way that was in conflict with the interest of the people or the host community;
- Specifying the functions and duties of supervisors or mission school inspectors;
- Expanding and strengthening the existing Board of Education by including the Director and the Deputy Director of Education, the Assistant Director, ten representatives of the mission and other educational agencies;
- Regulating the minimum pay for teachers who were employed in an assisted school. (Osokoya, 2002 and Fabunmi, 2003 Cited in Fabunmi, 2005).

Development of Nigerian Universities and Ashby Commission

Higher education in Nigeria really began more than a hundred years before the founding of its first college, when the first Nigerian enrolled in Fourah Bay College in 1327. From that moment on, increasing numbers of Nigerian were being educated in a variety of fields outside of Nigeria and, toward the end of the 19th century, these educated Africans began to demand the creation of opportunities for higher education and technical training in Nigeria. This movement coincided with a shortage of British personnel for the Civil Service, particularly during the depression beginning in 1928, and the colonial government was forced to establish courses of study for Nigerians who were needed to fill junior and intermediate posts in the administration of the Colony.

The first college of higher educational status to be established on Nigerian soil was the Government Yaba Higher College, in 1932. It offered post-secondary diploma courses in medicine, engineering, agriculture, education, arts and science. Its main objective was to train

intermediate cadre for the Civil Service on a more organized basis than earlier departmental courses. One of the peculiar features of the college was its stringent admissions policy which was largely dependent on the prospective vacancies for students' placement in the various government services at the completion of their studies. Its entrance requirements were considerably higher than those of most British universities and the College proudly proclaimed that the latter were accepting Yaba "rejects and dropout".

The establishment of the Yaba Higher College as an intermediate or junior college was vehemently attacked by the press and the public as an attempt on the part of the colonial government to fool the public into believing that it has met the aspirations of the people for higher education by providing an inferior institution whose graduates would not be recognized outside the boundaries of Nigeria. This was a valid criticism since the diplomas awarded were only valid for Nigerian employment and were not recognized by British universities. Graduates going abroad for further studies were not given credits for the work completed in Nigeria. Despite public opinion, the college continued for fifteen years. (Fafunwa, n.d).

The college suffered immeasurably during World War II. Its campus and the medical school, which was located at a different center in Lagos, were requisitioned for military purposes and the students were distributed to several centers: Lagos, Umuahia and Accra. The college later became the nucleus of the new university college, Ibadan in 1947. Emergence of the British model: The Yaba Higher College was still suffering the adverse effects of the war when, in 1943, the Secretary of State for the Colonies announced that he was setting up a Commission on Higher Education in West Africa with the following terms of reference:

The Elliot Commission 1943

To report on the organization and facilities of the existing centers of higher education in British West Africa, and to make recommendations regarding future university development in that area. The commission marked a new era in the history of higher education in British West Africa principally because it was the first of its kind and importance to include three Africans, Rev. I. O. Ransome-Kuti of Nigeria, Dr. K. A. Korsah of the then Gold Coast and Dr. E. H. Taylor-Cummings of Sierra Leone, in its fourteen – member panel, headed by Sir Walter Elliot. The commission visited Sierra Leone, Ghana, Nigeria and the United Kingdom, taking written and oral evidence from missionaries, students, government officials, groups and individuals, both African and British. The commission's reports of 1943 led to the establishment in 1948 of the university colleges Ibaaati the university college, Lagos, Ghana; and to reconstitute of the Fourah Bay College. Freetown, Sierra Leone. Both Ibadan and Lagos were securely tied to London University under a "Special Relationship" which meant that their curricular, the appointment and the promotion of staff were not only patterned after the London university system, but were also closely monitored by it and the inter-university council for the Colonies.

The first five years of the university college, Ibadan was a difficult period, the public and the press were critical of the institution because, among other things, Nigeria wanted a university, but was given a university College; the administration was almost entirely British; and the Colonial Secretary in London exercised control over the college, even though it was largely financed from Nigerian taxes. The college began by having forty-four expatriate staff and six Africans. The number of African staff remained at the same level until 1953, while expatriate staff nearly doubled during the same period. Partly due to Ibadan stringent admissions policy and partly for other reasons, the number of Nigerian students abroad has always been greater than those studying at home. For example, in 1948 there were 210

students in Ibadan as against 550 abroad; while in 1953 there were 400 students at Ibadan as compared with 2,000 abroad.

Nigeria attained internal self-government in 1952 which meant that the Nigerian people were responsible for their own internal self-rule via the secret ballot, choosing their own legislators and appointing their own ministers in charge of several portfolios including education; however, external affairs remained firmly in British hands. At this point, Nigerian leaders made education their first priority (Fafunwa, n.d). More primary and secondary schools were built and more children were enrolled at the two levels between 1952 and 1959 than during the previous one-hundred years of British rule. Between 30 and 40 percent of the country's recurrent expenditure and about 20 percent of the capital budget were spent on education. Both the Nigerian people and their leaders genuinely believed that through popular education the country could be transformed socialize, politically and economically. Thus, education was conceived as an indispensable tool for the development of human and natural resources.

With the expansion of primary and secondary, the enthusiasm for more higher education facilities peaked among both educated and illiterate Nigerians. Thus, Nigerian higher education reached another important landmark in its history when, in April 1959, the Federal Minister of Education appointed a commission "to conduct an investigation into Nigeria's need in the field of the post –secondary school certificate and higher education over the next twenty years (1960-1980)". The appointment of the Commission is of special important for two reason: (1) it was the first time in the history of education in Nigeria that the Nigerians themselves decided to examine the higher educational structure in term of the needs of the country not only for that material time but for a period of twenty years; (2) It was the first official comprehensive review of higher education in Nigeria to be undertaken by a team of experts comprising equal numbers of Nigerians and non-Nigerians – British and American. The team, which was headed by Sir Eric Ashby of Cambridge University, also included Professor Frederick Harbison, a noted American economist who was asked to estimate Nigeria's needs or high-level manpower between 1960 and 1970 and their educational implications for the future in terms of training.

The Ashby Commission of 1959

The Ashby commission, as it is commonly called reviewed the pre and the post- secondary educational facilities in Nigeria and noted that the country had made remarkable progress during the previous decade. Specifically it had 2 ½ million children in primary schools and 25,000 teachers in training in 1958 as compared to 626,000 and 5,000 respectively in 1948. The commission noted the lack of balance, however primary, secondary and post-secondary education and observed that most of the 80,000 teachers in service were "pitifully unprepared for their task". Some three-quarters of the teachers were untrained and from among those trained, two thirds had no more than a primary school education.

The commission singled out for special criticism the literary emphasizes of secondary and higher education. While agriculture was and is the mainstream of the Nigerian economy, agricultural schools like technical and commercial education, failed to attract the best graduates. The educational gulf between the north and the south was also noted with dismay, and a number of measures were proposed to correct the imbalance. Harbison on his part, pointed out that Nigeria, as an emerging state, was not only fated with the arduous task of maintaining its economic growth, but of accelerating it. He warned: Modern dams, power stations, textile factories or steel mills can be constructed within few years. But it takes between 10 to 15 years to develop the managers, the administrators and the engineers to

operate them. Schools and college buildings can be erected in a matter of months, but it requires decades to develop high-level teachers and professionals.

After describing what he meant by high-level manpower both by function and by educational qualification, he proceeded to divide high-level manpower into two broad categories – senior and intermediate. By Harbison's estimate, of the 31,200 personnel needed in the senior category, 20,000 should have university education or its equivalent; that is to say, some 10,000 individuals would rise, by dint of hard work, to the managerial and administrative positions without a university education, particularly in the commercial and industrial sectors. Based on this assumption Harbison estimated that Nigeria would need to produce 20,000 graduates over a period of ten years at the rate of 2,000 a year and that other post-secondary institutions at home and abroad should produce about 5,000 intermediate manpower for Nigeria annually. He also made a number of other recommendations including the establishment of a Manpower Development Board to coordinate inter-regional manpower development. The federal government later accepted Harbison's report as a minimum target.

The Report of Ashby Commission 1960

The Ashby commission issued its own report in October 1960 and based its recommendation on three premises:

- Its conception of Nigeria in 1980;
- Harbison's estimate of Nigeria's high-level manpower needs in 1970; and
- Its own estimate of the limited capacity of Nigeria's educational system.

The commission's two main objectives were (1) to upgrade Nigerians who were already employed, but who needed further education and (2) to design a system of post-secondary education which would first produce by 1970 the flow of high level manpower which Nigeria needed and design education in such a manner as to ensure expansion to meet the 1980 target without further re-planning. It then proceeded to make a number of recommendation directed to primary and secondary education, commercial, agricultural and veterinary education concerning expansion, recruitment and training. Finally it addressed itself to university education and proposed:

- That the federal government should give support to the development of the new university of Nigeria, Nsukka, planned in 1955 and opened a few weeks before the publication of the Ashby Report;
- That a university be established in the North using the old site of the Nigeria College as its base;
- That a university be established in Lagos with day and evening degree courses in business, commerce, economics, etc.
- That the university college, Ibadan should move away from its conservative position, widen its curriculum, and develop into a full university;
- That all universities in Nigeria should be national in outlook;
- That there should be wider diversity and greater flexibility in university education;
- That all the universities should offer B.A. (Education) degree courses;
- That courses in engineering, medicine, law, commerce, agriculture, etc. should be offered;
- That the new Nigerian universities should be independent of one another and with each offering its own degrees courses;

- That a national universities commission should be established to have undisputed control over the affairs of the universities particularly in areas of finance, staff and curriculum.

The commission believed that the academic enterprise proposed would cost between £15 and £20 million between 1960 and 1970 and that external aid might have to be sought by the Federal government to meet part of the cost.

The Minority Report of Ashby Commission

A minority report submitted by the then western Region's Minister of education, who was also a member of the commission, disagreed that four universities would meet needs and aspirations of Nigeria, he further hinted that the Western Region government was already planning its own university. The federal government enthusiastically accepted both the Ashby commission Report and the minority reports. However, federal government did not accept Harbison's estimates of future manpower needs, finding them conservative (Fafunwa, n.d).

Educational Development in Post-Colonial Nigeria (1960–1977)

In the account of Adiele et al. (2017) Immediately after independence, the Nigeria education system was characterized by the following features:

- Continued partnership between the government and voluntary agencies in education provision.
- Education imbalance between the North and South and between majority ethnic groups and the majority ethnic groups.
- Education provision was grossly inadequate for the teeming population, both in terms of the quality and quantity of education provided.

Based on the above background, the Nigeria Government earlier in 1959 had set up the Ashby Commission of 1960 to look into the country's manpower needs over a period of twenty years (1960-1980). Some significant highlights of the Commission's report bothered on:

- Incoherent Policies;
- Poor curriculum content;
- Inadequate facilities;
- Imbalance between levels and regions;
- Poor quality of the products of the school system

The report of the Ashby Commission had considerable influence on the direction of educational planning activities that came up in the subsequent years. In fact, the inclusion of educational planning into the first and 4th National Development plans were directly influenced by the Ashby Commission's recommendations.

The lapses observed by the Ashby Commission prompted the various regional government to set up series of commissions and committees in education. The west had the Banjo Commission and Taiwo Commission, the East, the Ikoku and Dike Committee and the North the Oldman commission (Aghenta cited in Ezekiel-Hart & Adiele, 2010). The report of these committees resulted in the 1969 National curriculum conference where matters of national education interest were highlighted and discussed, some of which bothered on objectives, contents, method and materials for the Nigerian education system. The 1969

National Curriculum Conference recommendations culminated in the adoption of a common philosophy for Nigerian education and the subsequent development of a common national policy on education for Nigeria as a country in 1977.

Analysis of Issues Responsible for Ineffective or Partial implementation of Educational Policies in Nigeria

Nepotism/Favoritism

The issue of nepotism/favoritism became prominent when people in authority started derailing from the standard and lay down policies, and ventured into defeating policies that were made for the interest of the nation (masses) to their private and personal interest. Nepotism was felt much on the area of awarding contracts. Common principles or policies that guides awarding of educational contract to allow the best qualified to obtain was not functional hence relatives and friend were given jobs.

In fact today, nepotism has stride to a point, that people in government adopts books from relatives that has nothing to do with curriculum and scheme of work in the educational system such books are the books supplied by Rivers State government to government owned secondary schools undermining the basic policies that established education.

Closely related is the definition given by Roy and Roy (2004) favoritism as an act of favouring an individual or group over others who have the same or similar rights. He further said that nepotism is referred to as “a dimension of favoritism given to family members for example hiring of nephew, nieces, in-law and other because of the family ties rather than competency.

Arasil and Tumer (2008) also agreed that nepotism and favoritism is a problem in education sector by sighting the scenario in Northern Cyprus: thus because people know each other and they tend to have strong or family ties, perhaps they depend on these relationships to get job and admission without required credentials.

Insecurity

The reoccurring cases of insurgence in Nigeria greatly has affected educational development and policies geared towards achieving certain educational goals. Proliferation of arms, as part of insecurity, had tailored the activities of educational heads towards unnecessary phobia, hence causing them to shelve disciplinary actions against defaulting educational personnel in the area of discipline, which is used to strengthen policies and educational programmes. It is also important to note, that insecurity and insurgency not only weaken the educational policies and development in some parts of Nigeria but had gone to the point of completely eliminated the presence of education (Schools) from certain villages and communities likely found in Northern Nigeria.

Jimada (2015) pointed out that the incessant bombing by Boko Haram insurgents no doubt impact negatively on lives, property and educational development in Nigeria. Though, there is the dearth of quantitative evaluation of the catastrophic attacks, available statistics has it that between July 25 and February 2011, through bombing and other means; 550 persons were killed in 135 attacks in 2011 alone. While in 2011, at least 500 people were killed in Boko Haram attacks (Amnesty International, 2012).

Apart from the loss of lives, there is also the wanton destruction of property worth several billions of naira through bombing. The above scenario has dire consequences particularly Nigeria (Oluwaseun in Jimada, 2015).

Fafunwa (n.d) in his support for insecurity as a problem of educational policies point out that by 1966, six years after commission reports, the five Nigeria universities had a total enrollment of 8,800. This exceeded the commissions target and would have reached the federal government target of 10,000 by 1968, if not for the Nigeria civil war.

This assertion by Fafunwa here simply means that the policy of Nigerian education was disrupted by the outbreak of civil war. Supporting the view that insecurity at any level contributes greatly to ineffective implementation of education policies.

Poverty

The concept of poverty in educational industry has contributed a lot in averting the fundamental policies formulated to guide the smooth running of educational sector towards achieving its desired goals.

Stakeholders in education industries, because of inability to fend for their immediate families had turned educational industries to a place of making illegal money to sustain their family. The stakeholders of education under focus in this paper ranges from the lecturers, secondary school teachers and students:

Lecturers: A lecturer who collects bribe or sorting as its generally called, is perceived from the angle of poverty, gratification certainly will make the lecturer to deviate from the policy guiding the evaluation of such students, hence partial implementation of educational policy.

Teachers (WAEC Supervisors): The scramble for WAEC supervision among teachers is not for the benefit of education and its policies but for self-aggrandizement posed by poverty. When students pay ₦2,000 to a supervisor in an examination that is meant to test the knowledge of a student who consequently will take over from the teacher in future in line with the educational policy. The supervisor for the value of ₦2,000 abandons the examination hall with the educational policies entrusted to him, hence causing slow pace of educational development.

Students and Untimely Death: The students have become the major victims of road accidents and money making ritualism. The students in many occasions abandoned their studies so as to travel to their respective homes in order to hustle some amount of money to shoulder some of their educational responsibilities. On the course of this trip they get involved in ghastly motor accidents or run into some unscrupulous individuals such as fraudsters and ritualist thereby reducing the number of potential educationist in Nigeria, who would have in turn formulate and implement effective policies for educational development.

Robbery and commercial sex; students in many occasions have been involved in the act of forcefully and physically collecting peoples' properties, an act which is capable of landing many of them into prisons, while others murdered through jungle justice. The girl suddenly turned into commercial sex workers as the only legitimate business to sustain and shoulder their academic responsibilities undermining the dreadful diseases such as gonorrhea, syphilis and AIDs.

In supporting the implications of poverty to the policy of education at school level, Agabi (2018) noted that over the years poverty has remained a persistent hindrance to the achievement of full participation of children of school age who are not challenged by ill-health. This is in terms of enrollment and policy implementation in regular attendance at school. Nations of the world have pursued various poverty alleviation strategies as mechanism for boosting the level of educational participations policies especially at the basic levels of education (primary and secondary). Believing that the girl child is worse off in terms of school enrollment and completion rate, free education programmes that were limited to primary education was expanded in many countries (including Nigeria) to include pre-

school education in the formal school system. This was to enhance the chances of the girl child enrolling in a regular school at the right age instead of staying home to serve as nanny for younger siblings (WEF, 2000; Agabi, 2017; UNESCO, 2015; FRN, 2014; in Agabi, 2018). In spite of these efforts, poverty remains a major challenge to school enrollment policy.

Poverty becomes a hindrance to the enrollment of children in schools when it is of such level that parents cannot afford regular meals and appropriate clothing for schooling (uniforms, sandals, etc); as well as the basic education resources for effective participation in schooling (exercise books, pencils, etc.) for their children. Even when these materials are provided as part of a free education programme, the cost of transportation to school becomes another challenge if the school is not within walking distance (Agabi, 2018).

Series of research reports abound to show that children from low income families are less likely to be enrolled in school at the appropriate age; and even when they get enrolled, they have higher tendency of not completing school due to inability of parents to cope with both the financial burden and the opportunity cost of keeping them in school. This is in spite of the current trend in free basic education programmes. In Nigeria, it is not uncommon to find children of school-age sitting in market stalls or hawking fruits and vegetables when schools are in session. According to Agabi (2015), the Nigerian government conveniently ignores the presence of these out-of-school child-hawkers in the streets because the burden of effectively funding the free and compulsory Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme has become too heavy.

This situation is not peculiar to Nigeria. It is a common feature of most developing countries. As observed by Hillman and Jenkner (2004) in Agabi (2018) governments in most developing countries lack the resources or the political will to meet the educational needs of their people; and the situation is worse in East Asia and sub-Saharan Africa. These are also the regions of the world that have a great majority of poor people and the highest frequency of internal, armed conflicts. The low level of school enrollment in these regions is therefore a reflection of their low economic status and the consequence of frequent conflicts.

In Rivers State for instance, parents are now expected to pay for sports wears, examination fees, school uniforms, environment maintenance fees, Parents-Teachers-Association fees and School Board Management Committees fees. The systematic re-introduction of fees into the UBE programme clearly portrays the ease with which government reneges on its own policies in education. It also reaffirms the declaration that the Nigeria government lacks the political will to fund and to ensure the full implementation of policies in education.

Most developing countries try to minimize the impact of poverty on education by seeking aids and international borrowing, all of which come with terms and conditions that may not be favourable for the economic growth of the dependent country. However, the treatise of economic justice and education justice, warns against external borrowing as a means of alleviating poverty and providing quality education, rather than alleviate poverty, external borrowing tightens the noose of perpetual dependence on the borrowing country with a heavier cloak of poverty and insufficient education that is also of poor quality. In Terres opinion, the rhetoric on poverty alleviation and on improving the quality of education in developing countries has come to a dead end because progress on both fronts is either non-existent or modest in spite of the education reforms that were based on international advice and loans. In the long run, problems increase and goals decrease while deadlines for loans repayment are extended, with the implication that in the course of eliminating poverty, developing countries get into higher levels of dependency and external borrowing in a vicious circle of poverty-loans-external debt – corruption – reduced social budget – degradation of public education (Terres & Ogbonnaya cited in Agabi, 2018).

Torres' position affirms the situation in Nigeria in which the free compulsory Universal Basic Education programme has been reduced to a state in which only children who have no better choice get enrolled and remain in school because of the poor state of educational infrastructure in public basic schools. The situation is further compounded by the systematic introduction of fees which also systematically makes the UBE programme open to only those who can afford the fees thereby widening the school enrollment gap between children of the rich and those of the poor.

Recognizing that education is an indispensable tool in the development of individuals and societies (WEF, 2000; cited in Agabi, 2018) as well as "the key to the realization of Nigeria's aspiration of becoming one of the top 20 developed nations by the year 2020, it is worrisome that the implementation of the free compulsory universal basic education policy is being treated with levity.

Traditional Interference: The deviation of traditional rulers from the main aim and objectives in which the institution was established has greatly affected social –education policies. It is of note that traditional rulers in their regalia influence some educational policies such as pleading for incompetent educational expert to man educational institutions. This act further covers the province of pleading for erring educational manager. The wives of traditional rulers are considered sacred in educational institutions, making them to neglect certain educational policies.

Political interference: Politics has turned to become prominent factor that influences all other sectors including education. It is worthy of note that no educational development and policies can thrive more than the political development of this nation. Political factor militating against educational development became more disastrous when the appointment of university head become sole business of the visitor (Governor). Hence, appointment is done on political basis instead of merit.

Amanchukwu (2018) in her opinion clearly stated that the presence of politician truncates the whole exercise in education sector. At times the Ministerial position are selected from people whose background are not in the areas they are fixed to man, thereby constituting difficulties to education planners. For example, if the Minister of Education has no expertise knowledge in that area, he will depend on advice from other people and his objectivity in taking decisions will be nothing to write home about. The scenario here is just putting a square peg in a round hole. This will constitute hindrances to education policies.

Rowley (1971) in his declaration saw politics as that which revolves the use and regulation of power, influence and authority, particularly in the allocation of those material goods that people want. Politics is therefore, the authoritative allocation of values which encompasses the various process through which government responds to pressure from the larger society, in particular by allocating benefits, rewards and penalties (Henley in Adiele et al., 2018).

The opinion of Henley and Rowley positioned politics at a very strategic point in educational industries. The problem posed by this authoritative allocation of values by the people at hems of affairs (politicians) is the bias nature of the allocation which ultra vises or summersaults the politics of education, the people want, hence, causing hindrance in the laid down policies of education industries, which is experienced in the slow pace of educational growth. The negative interference of politics in authoritative allocation of value is felt in the allocation of fund to educational industries for implementation of educational policies and programs.

Ukeje in Robert-Okah (2018) equally noted that education is for life and for living: an investment which pays untold dividends to the society. When the investment is made inadequately, the society suffers a loss. It is generally expected that Nigerian government

(politics) as a matter of urgency, should have a re-think on her attitude of funding education which incidentally is about the lowest in the African region.

Funding

Funding of education in Nigeria and virtually the world over is expensive. Its importance cannot be isolated because of the ease which its presence is felt from the period of planning to the implementation stage. Thus, funds can determine whether or not such plans will succeed. From the forgoing the chapter researcher therefore defined funding as an operational oil or lubricant which is used to sustain the life of an institution or organization, until the desired goals are achieved. Therefore, no matter how good and well painted an educational policy may be, the realization of its goals depends largely on the fund available to the implementation of its programmes.

Even other authorities uphold the importance of funding during implementation of policies. Robert-Okah (2018) posited that no education enterprise can flourish without adequate provision of funds. Educational plans, no matter how lofty and impeccable, cannot be effectively executed if they are not adequately funded. The needs of the university are numerous and diversified and unless they are met, the main aim of the university will be haphazardly achieved. Studies have consistently shown that increased public investments in education have been closely linked to improved economic performance of both citizen and societies. Ironically, the Nigerian government and her agencies have refused to realize the strategic position of education in national development hence the underfunding of this important sector. In making a case for education, the immediate past president of the United State of America, Barrack Obama stated that “the last thing a government should do is to cut back on spending on education.

Even Nelson Mandela, the iconic humanist once stated that education is the most powerful weapon, which you can use to change the world. Sir Eric Ashby in 1959 noted that “investment in education is the greatest asset any country can leave for posterity... equally noted that “education is for life and for living: an investment which pays untold dividends to the society. When the investment is not made or is made inadequately, the society suffers a loss.” It is generally expected that Nigeria, as a matter of urgency, should have a re-think on her attitude of funding education, which incidentally is about the lowest in the sub-sahara Africa (Adesina, 1981; Ukeje, 1980; in Robert-Okah, 2018).

Data on funding inadequacies in Nigeria according to Azubuike (2013) show that governments at all levels, spent only between 7 and 11 percent of their annual budgets on education- a distant embarrassing disgrace, compared to the UNESCO recommended 26 percent. This level of poor funding, with the attendant poor provision of teaching and learning resources, have made wealthy Nigerians to send their children to Ghana, South Africa and even Cameroon for higher education. It is rather unfortunate that while Nigeria spends less than 10 percent of her national budget on education, in the opinion of Fagge (2013) in Robert-Okah (2018) other sub-sahara Africa countries such as Ghana invest more than 28 to 30 percent.

Nigeria at every level elected to enter and uphold the provisions of all international agreements that have to do with education and human developmental. UNESCO is an agency of the United Nation which set up a benchmark for funding education by every member state to which Nigeria is a signatory. Nigeria is equally a signatory to the Universal Declaration of Human Right, which guarantees equal educational opportunities for all Nigeria was not equally left out of the 1990 World Conference on ‘education for all’ agreement held in Juntien Thailand as well as Dakar Framework for action held in Senegal in 2000 which adopted education as a key factor for development. All of these were compiled in a

compendium Christened the National Policy on Education initiated in 1977 by which has undergone six reviews up to 2014.

Education budgets according to Okeke (2007) is a fundamental ‘sticky’ issue since the recurrent expenditure cannot be readily reduced. Attempt at reduction in educational spending can be counterproductive. As a result, education which is regarded as a panacea to all socio-psychological and political ills attracts substantial proportion of the scarce public funds as well as political interests and attention. But behind this façade lies not only economic but socio-political and psychological forces that shape and influence budgetary practices and implementation. Officials were known to have channeled funds to schools of the governors and minister’s constituency to keep them in top order at the implementation phase. Gains of some communities were at the expense of others. Articulate and influential individuals and groups use formal channels to bend budgetary decisions in their favour. Inadequate funding, scarce national resources as well as politics of budgetary practices and implementation are the basic challenges confronting education policy makers and administrators.

Adesina (1977) noted that, in Nigeria the larger budget surplus, which the various governments usually announce during each plan period, was more apparent than real. He further identified two main sources serious financial challenges in educational development and policies implementation in Nigeria, which are “underestimation of educational programmes and overestimation of anticipated financial resources to fund the programmes. Secondly, there is also over reliance on, the over optimism about external assistance.

Bureaucratic Bottle Necks

Bureaucracy is associated with the works of Max Weber. It has become the most powerful and pervasive theory of educational management, and is the prepared model in many countries. Educational planning is an agent for both social and economic challenges that needs personal initiative and discretion during implementation stages, especially in the case of exigencies but bureaucracy does not have such principles, hence causing ineffective in implementation stages of educational principles.

The above is not in disagreement with Balkin (2002) who pointed out the pitfalls of policies as Extensive Bureaucratization when planning or policies becomes the province of specialist, there may be a tendency to generate paperwork and elaborate reports accompanied by fancy oral presentations. In some instances, policies become overly quantitative and formula driven. This simply means if the implementers are not given free hands in the cause of exigency, implementation becomes very difficult in an elaborate plan and implementation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this paper tried to highlight the negative effects of Nepotism, Favoritism, insecurity, inadequate funding, Bureaucratic bottle necks and poverty on the educational development and policies formation and implementation. However, it is the believe of the researcher that the little knowledge contributed here will add to the big bank of educational knowledge. Further, this paper will also serve as a guide to professionals in education policy formulation and policy implementation.

To the best of my ability and knowledge, this would seriously help in calling the attention of educational planners on exact areas of concern and where attention should be channeled to save the Nigeria education from backwardness in the league of world education.

Suggestion for Further Studies

This paper however did not exhaust the issues challenging educational policies and development in Nigeria, it is my opinion that future researchers should embark on finding other issues or factors responsible for ineffectiveness of educational policies and implementation, in line with contemporary challenges facing education. More preferably, it is also advised that future researchers should venture into another setting because this paper explored the issues within Nigeria context.

I further suggest that future researchers should investigate the challenges of government in combating insecurity in Nigeria. As well investigate into possible ways of harnessing a new approach into making policy implementation a pragmatic and functional system in order to realize its aims to the individual and society at large.

REFERENCES

- Adesina, S. (1977). *Planning and Educational Development in Nigeria*. Lagos: Educational Industries Publisher.
- Adiele, E. E., Obasi, R., & Ohia A. (2017). *Fundamental of Educational Planning*. Port Harcourt: Haray Publication.
- Agabi, C. O. (2015). Issues in funding of public education in Nigeria: A focus on free education programme. *Elixer international Journal of Educational Research, Technology*, 9(3), 36006-36012.
- Agabi, C. O. (2018). Student Population Flow in Basic Schools. In N. P. Ololube (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Planning and Policy Analysis* (pp. 114-137). Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.
- Amanchukwu, R. N. (2018). Problems and Issues in Nigeria. In N. P. Ololube (Ed.) *Handbook of Research on Educational Planning and Policy Analysis* (pp. 11-26). Port Harcourt: Pearl Publisher.
- Amnesty international (2012). *Effects of insecurity on the school children*. Retrieved from www.google.com.
- Arasil, H., & Tumer, M. (2008). *Nepotism, favoritism and cronyism: A study of their effects on job stress and job satisfaction in the banking industry of north Cyprus*. Retrieve from <https://www.sbp-journal.com/index.php/sbp/article/view/1797>.
- Azubuikwe, K. A. (2013). Challenges of financial education in Nigeria. In N. M. Mbajiorgu, E.M.K. Dawha & S. I. Efang (Eds.). *Financing Education in Nigeria*. (pp. 23-44). Lagos: West and Solomon Publishing.
- Balkin, D. (2002). *Managing Human Resources*. Retrieved from <https://www.colorado.edu>
- Fabunmi, M. (2005). *Historical Analysis of Educational Policy Formation in Nigeria. Implications for Education Planning and Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalacademicgroup.com/journal/2018/23>.
- Fafunwa, B. (n.d). *The development of university in Nigeria*. Retrieved from <http://www.archieve.com>.
- Jimada, M. (2015). *Insecurity and its effects on the school administration*. Retrieved from <http://www.onlineworksuit.com/june2017>.
- Ng-Ding, J. (2016). *Towards a Framework of Education Policy Analysis* Retrieved from <http://www.wikipedia.com>
- Okeke, B. S. (2006). *Educational planning in Nigeria: A social process approach*. Akwa: Doone Press.

- Okeke, B. S. (2007). *Politics of education: The Nigeria experience*. Akwa: Doone Printing and Publishing.
- Osokoya, I. O. (2002). *History and Policy of Nigerian Education in World Perspective*. Ibadan: AMD Publishers.
- Robert-Okah, I. (2018). Policy Somersaults in Nigeria Higher Education: An Unending Dilemma in University Governance. In N. P. Ololube (Ed.), *Handbook of Research on Educational Planning and Policy Analysis* (pp. 225-240). Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.
- Rowley, C. D. (1971). *The politics of educational planning in developing countries*. Paris: IIEP Santes.
- Roy, H. M., & Roy, F. C. (2004). *An empirical analysis of favoritism during business training*. Retrieved from <https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/00197850410556676>
- Wali, W. I. (2007). *A handbook of contemporary issues on education in Nigeria*. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers.

 © JSRE

ⁱ **Morris Njoku** is a postgraduate student in the Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria