

REGIME CHANGE, POLICY INCONSISTENCY AND EDUCATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Obasa, Stephen Oluwafemi

Lecturer, Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Redeemer's University, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Change is ubiquitous in every society irrespective of development or underdevelopment as long as it is meant to fulfil human needs. It takes a committed leadership to accomplish a propitious change in a society. In nations of the world, whether developed or developing, democratic or non-democratic, policy process tends to determine the functioning and success of every modern government. It is through policies that government translate its political vision into programmes and actions to deliver the desired change in the society. Whenever a policy fails to identify the problems encountering the society, the government may be compelled to change it by adopting new one. The responsibility of formulating new policy rests on either the existing government or newly elected political leader. The objective of this paper was to examine the implication of policy inconsistency, which is the function of regime change, on educational development. The findings showed that except if the government focuses on the gap that exists between policy formulation and its implementation, the persistent change in policy would be of futility.

Key words: Regime change, Policy inconsistency, Educational development, Nigeria

Introduction

In every society wherever government, government institutions and politics exist, there is bound to be regime change. Thus the phenomenon of regime change is not a new development in nations of the world. The level of development and underdevelopment has always been the factor of changes of leadership. It is also not predicated on the nature of ideology a nation adopts; rather, it evolves from certain natural or artificial events in a nation. In the literature, the political philosophers believed that monarchical system of government has the longest tenure and also the best (Banfield, 1958; Hadenius & Teorell, 2006). Recent development in Jordan, Bahrain, Morocco, Swaziland, Saudi Arabia showed that several monarchical governments had experienced regime change in spite of its structure and

organisation in those societies. The democratic and non-democratic nations are not spared for they also experience regime change.

Regime change may arise from peaceful demand by the society (where majority of the citizens are requesting through peaceful means that a leader should step down or when a vote of no confidence is passed at the parliament or by means of referendum or wilful resignation by a leader on the basis of allegations against him) or through a revolutionary means (that is violent removal of a ruler) or constitutional means (when election is carried out) or influence by super powers or foreign government against the government of a lesser power. For instance, the following Presidents such as Gloria Macapagal Arroyo of Philippine, 2005; Richard Nixon, 1974 following Watergate scandal; British Prime Minister John Mayor, 1995; Robert Mugabe of Zimbabwe, 2017 and the Nigerian Interim President Ernest Shonekan, 1993 were either forced to resign or resigned voluntarily due to one allegation or the other. Systematic transition from one regime to another usually emanates from massive societal change, economic development and redistribution of political power that sometimes culminates to revolution, civil war, or a negotiated replacement of one elite with another (Zoltan, 2002). Regime change can also be influenced by foreign governments, particularly by the super power. For instance, the United States, according to Stephen Kinzer's book *Overthrow: America's Century of Regime Change from Hawaii to Iraq*, had a hand in the governments in Iran, Guatemala, Congo, Dominican Republic, South Vietnam, Brazil, Chile, Hawaii in 1893, Cuba in 1898, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, Nicaragua, Honduras, Panama, Grenada, Afghanistan, and of course Iraq.

Again, regime change can also occur through violent revolution. For instance, the various revolution that swept through some European, Asian and American countries from the French Revolution of 1789, which led to the removal of Louis XVI; the English Revolution of 1640 which led to the assassination of King Charles; Russian Revolution of 1917, which dismantled the Tsarist autocracy and led to the eventual rise of the Soviet Union; the Chinese Revolution of 1911 led to the overthrowing of China's imperial dynasty; the Zanzibar Revolution which occurred in 1964 led to the overthrowing of the Sultan of Zanzibar and his mainly Arab government by local African revolutionaries.

Regime change has a direct link to policy change and policy inconsistency in any country where such trajectory exists. Thus policy inconsistency is often sine qua non to change of government. Perhaps, in every liberal democratic society where regime change occurs, it is often predicated on the demands of the citizens, the level of economic development, employment structure, educational and cultural advancement, level of political participation, public opinion, party affiliation, percentage of educated public, and pressure groups that exist in such society.

Policy change or policy inconsistency occurs in so many countries with change of governments. For instance, president Trump signed an executive order that takes aim at environmental rules and other measures. Trump ordered a rewriting of rules aimed at cutting greenhouse gas emissions from power stations, an act which is at variance to Obama's policy; Theresa May amended the controversial social care policy introduced by former British prime minister, David Cameron; Italian labour policy changed in 1990s; Akufo-Addo, a newly elected president of Ghana adopted new agri policy. In Nigeria, several economic, political and social policies have changed due to change in governments from one military government to another, military to democratic leader, and civilian government to another civilian.

Policy inconsistency resulting from changes in policy sometimes emerges from the attempt of leaders to reform the society not necessarily to create a setback for the citizenry. Where a leader has amended a policy not for national interests or development, but to tarnish the predecessors, such policy is likely to fail.

Conceptual Clarification

The term regime simply implies any form of government or set of rules that determine the operation of government or institution and its relationship with the society. Here, the focus is on rules and decision making procedure established by the government and how it affects the individuals in the society. Keohane and Nye, define regime as "sets of governing arrangements" that include networks of rules, norms, and procedures that regularize behaviour and control its effects" (Keohane & Nye, 1977; in Krasner, 2009). Similarly, Jervis (1978) argues that the concept of regime "implies not only norms and expectations that

facilitate cooperation, but a form of cooperation that is more than the following of short-run self-interest." Haas argues that regime encompasses a mutually coherent set of procedures, rules and norms (Haas, 1980). Uses of regime concept often involves an association with a specific individual (e.g. Nicolae Ceausescus's regime in Romania, Buhari's regime in Nigeria), Ideology (e.g. a Fascist, Totalitarian, Feudalist, Democratic, Monarchical, Theocratic regimes) or political project (e.g. a Neoliberal regime) (Ward, 2007).

A regime change simply means the replacement of administration or government either by election or military coup d'état. Regime change is often associated with a process that is connected to revolution. However, it can be used to explain a peaceful change of elected government or political leader by another person (Althusser, 1970; in Sharma & Gupta, 2005 ; Borneman, 2003, on line Etymology Dictionary). Regime change is typified in changes in rules, procedures, principles, norms, decision-making which can be done within the regime or experienced as a result of replacement of a leader. When those changes emanate from a new political leader, it's an indicator of inadequacies in the system; and weakened governance posed by the outgoing leader of the state. There may be many rules and decision-making procedures that are consistent with the same principles and norms. Changes in rules and decision-making procedures are changes within regimes, provided that principles and norms are unaltered. Changes in principles and norms are changes of the regime itself. When norms and principles are abandoned, there is either a change to a new regime or a disappearance of regimes from a given issue-area. Fundamental political arguments are more concerned with norms and principles than with rules and procedures (Waltz, 1957; Hirsch, 1976; Kaplan, 1957; Keohane & Nye, 1977; Krasner, 2009).

Regime change is the transition from one political regime to another, esp. through concerted political or military action (Collins English Dictionary, 2012). The fundamental institutions and practices of a political system, such as the basic belief of where power should reside, how power should be used, and the nature of citizens' relationship with their government is regarded as regime. While regime change is a change in the institutions or principles behind a government that reflects a major change in how power is held and exercised. For example, the recent switch of the Russian Duma to all proportionally elected houses, represents a regime change to some.

Rationale behind regime change

The fundamental political question that raises inquisitiveness in the mind of researchers is why do states sometimes experience regime change? The answer may be difficult because what is responsible for regime change in a particular society or state may not attract any change of government in another. Thus, it is important to say that transition from one particular democratic to non-democratic, popular to non-popular, autocratic to liberal, socialism to capitalism, parliamentarianism to presidentialism is a function of several factors such as:

Self-aggrandisement

This simply means the act of self-centredness. It occurs where a leader believes that the ideology he believes must hold or be recognised regardless of the opinion of others or circumstances challenging such belief. When a leader portrays this, he is considered as self-opinionated. Such political leader goes out in full force to protect his interests. Self-aggrandisement is also regarded as an important determinant of regimes by several other authors. Young (1982) argues that there are three paths to regime formation: spontaneous, in which regimes emerge from the converging expectations of many individual actions; negotiated, in which regimes are formed by explicit agreements; and imposed, in which regimes are initially forced upon actors by external imposition.

The nature of orientation towards political power

Regime change may evolve from the orientation political elites have toward the possession of power. Here, we are looking at why there should be transition in the system. Orientation in this sense may be viewed in terms whether a regime is changed because political leaders want to maximize certain opportunities to promote the general goal of the society (cosmopolitan and instrumental) or to secure personal goal or interests (particularistic and extremely consumatory orientation).

Rules, Norms, Procedures and Principles

Rules, norms, procedure and principles are considered as endogenous. According to Stephen Krasner, they are the critical defining characteristics of any given regime. However, norms and principles that influence regime in a particular issue-area but are not directly related to

that issue–area can also be regarded as explanation for the creation, persistence, and dissipation of regime.

Historical trends

Historical developments establish a set of conditions that permits some sort of political change. Some countries have shifted from socialism to capitalism, from communism to democracy, authoritarian to liberal politics, parliamentarian to presidentialism because of the fact that one particular ideology is gradually going into extinction while the other is gaining global recognition regularly. Again, where a leader decides to alter the existing political ideology arbitrarily, it may affect the support given to the party which he represented in future elections.

Economic change

Regime change can also be facilitated by economic change. There is a strong relationship between economic and politics. The economic transformation has a strong impact on political development or transformation in a country. In every country of the world, there is economic transformation moving from the crude level to an industrialised stage before technological changes and improvement of life can be affected.

Class Struggle and Conflict

Under group theory, individuals in the society try to protect the interests of their group. Hence, every group contends with one another in the course of their struggle to control the limited resources in the society. This struggle sometimes results to a group trying to dislodge the other in the race for power. This development is a reflection of Lasswell’s view of politics which says that “*Politics is who gets what, when, and how.*”

Military intervention

Military take-over in the political development of new nations has some ideological undertone ranging from strong Puritanism and emphasis on anti-corruption and anti decadence; the acceptance of collective public enterprise as the way to achieve social, political, and economic change; the attitude of anti-politics to corporate interests. Other factors responsible for military’s termination of democratically elected regime are: foreign

influence, characteristics of military establishment itself (Finer, 1988; Huntington, 1969, 1977; Putnam, 1967; Janowitz, 1960; Jenkins & Kposowa, 1992).

Globalization Impact

The influence of globalization impact on every nation is another factor enhancing regime change. Apart, from domestic factors, international factors emanating from outside the country determine the regime change in any society. Globalization in this context is the spread of political, social, and economic dynamisms beyond the border or territory of any country. Again, another direction that globalization can be viewed is when International actors force targeted states to change their governments, a process known as Foreign-Imposed Regime Change (FIRC).

A FIRC imposer may seek to remove the target's political leader without also seeking to change the target's institutions or it might seek to change the target's leader and institutions. Regime change can also be externally imposed through other, violent or less violent actions (Clausewitz, 1984; Allen, 2008; Reiter, 2009 & 2017; Iqbal, & Zorn, 2008; Escriba-Folce & Wright, 2005).

Education Policy and Policy Inconsistency

The word "policy" is a broad concept that embodies diverse meanings. The major difficulty encountered by scholars of policy science is how to establish a well articulated, comprehensible and cogent definition that will address all the salient elements associated with the concept. Webster's dictionary has a number of closely related definitions. They are:

- A definite course or method of action selected (by government, institution, group or individual) from among alternatives and in the light of given conditions to guide and, usually, to determine present and future decisions.
- A specific decision or set of decisions designed to carry out such a course of action.
- Such a specific decision or set of decisions together with the related actions designed to implement them.
- A projected programme consisting of desired objectives and the means to achieve them.

Policy can be broadly defined as a proposed course of action of an individual, a group, an institution or government, to realise a specific objective or purpose. It is the policy which lays down the framework upon which the organisational goals are accomplished (Basu, 2006). Thus “public policy” is whatever governments choose to do or not to do (Dye, 1981).

The actual formulation of policy involves the identification and analysis of a range of actions that respond to these concerns. Each possible solution is assessed against a number of factors such as probable effectiveness, potential cost; resources required for implementation, political context and community support. According to Torjam (2005), despite the variation in policy process, there are some general steps that are common to its development. These are: i/ selecting the desired objective ii/ identifying the target of the objective iii/ determining the pathway to reach that objective iv/ designing the specific program or measure in respect of that goal v/ implementing the measure and assessing its impact.

In line with Dye’s definition, Educational policy may be conceived as what government wants to do or not do as it relates to how education system in a state should be run in terms of programme and projects being put in place. The policy formulated determines the direction the education sector of a state will take. Education is the process of acquisition of knowledge through learning over time. This knowledge is embedded in the skills, values, beliefs and habits secure by learners.

The UNESCO considered education to be basic. According to its operational definition of the term ‘Basis Education’, it means a combination of ‘Elementary’ and ‘Fundamental education’ designed to meet basic learning needs. It is the ‘basis’ for lifelong (for children, youth or adults) (UNESCO, 2007). The World Declaration on Education for All (1990) was emphatic about the necessity of providing education for all children, youth and adults that is responsive to their needs and relevant to their lives. This paves the way for the concept of quality expressed in terms of needs. Drawing on Bunting (1993), he declares that, “Quality in education does have a bottom line and that line is defined by the goals and values which underpin the essentially human activity of education.” Quality education involves learning in active, collaborative and self-directed ways in order to enhance sustainable development; acquiring right attitudes, values and skills as well as information; curriculum should be designed in such a way that teachers, students, communities will respect human rights; and

proving relevant skills and competencies that will enhance accessibility to 21st century employment opportunities.

Beeby came up with three models of quality education. According to him, there must be first, class quality; second, it must serve the economic goals of the community where learners live; three, it is judged by broader social criteria (Beeby, 1966: 11). Hawes and Stephens model of quality education can be summarized in three ways: Efficiency in meeting goals; Relevance to human and environmental needs and conditions, ‘something more’ in relation to the pursuit of excellence and human betterment (Hawes & Stephens, 1990: 11; cited in Barrett et al, 2006).

The role of education is multifarious. It enables:

- People to choose their own direction, instead of having it chosen for them by dominant influences from outside.
- People to secure opportunities for their own self-advancement so that they will be able to participate actively in national" affairs.
- People to appreciate certain traditional values of their society

The long-term goal in education is nothing less than to ensure everyone completes a basic education of adequate quality, acquires foundation skills—literacy, numeracy, reasoning and social skills such as teamwork—and has further opportunities to learn advanced skills throughout life, in a range of post-basic education settings. (Human Development Network, 2002:431)

Since quality education is very germane to the growth of the society, formulating education policy in every society becomes very essential. Again, it is very important to say that education policy must be well formulated since the whole idea of education is investment in human capital. Burrup, (1977) supported this view with this assertion that:

“Human Capital has the fundamental characteristic of any form of economic capital. It is a source of future satisfaction or future earnings or both. It is human capital because it is part of the person possessing it. Such capital deteriorates with inactivity, but it does not disappear with the death or complete incapacity of the person possessing it. It often needs to be reactivated and updated to lessen the degree of obsolescence or extent of its inadequateness”

According to Mingat, Tan and Sosale (2003), Policy makers in education are responsible for developing a vision and strategy for educational development, and mobilizing support and cooperation for implementing the vision and strategy from wide constituencies. Policy makers face two main types in formulating policies in education: setting priorities in the placement of interventions, and choosing the right instrument for intervention.

In the light of international experience, the elaboration of education development policies and programmes face several difficulties in practice, which jeopardise the pertinence and applicability of the policy. Some of the most frequent are (Jallade, Radi & Cuenin, 2001):

- The recommended education policy is not based on sufficient knowledge and analysis of the education system and its social, economic and cultural environment;
- The policy framework for education comprises general orientations but the medium and long term goals are not sufficiently clear;
- The goals do not meet the development stakes of the country and do not fully satisfy its priorities;
- The elaboration of the programme is carried out according to a traditional technocratic approach, hence the options and priorities are not understood and accepted by the system's stakeholders or decision-makers;
- The education policy, although well explained, is not, or not sufficiently, put into application in an implementation strategy or action programme that specifies the means and deadlines to achieve each goal;
- The costs have not been evaluated and the financial feasibility of the plan or programme has not been studied in depth.

A policy is successful if it achieves the goals that proponents set out to achieve and attracts no criticisms of any significance and/or support is virtually universal (McConnell, 2010). In a situation whereby there is regime change, the political leader through the appointed ministers, commissioners, zonal education officers may deem it fit to reform the education policies, especially, where those policies are considered to have failed due to their inability to meet the nation's educational goals. The political regime and system of government of each country influence the approaches to the preparation of education policy and programmes to suit the

national interests. Hence, the idea of the term ‘policy inconsistency’ is common to every government experiencing regime change in every society, regardless of its level of development or underdevelopment.

Regime Change and Policy inconsistencies in Nigeria

In the sub-Saharan African countries, transiting from colonial administration to contemporary political system and regime change involving a transition from ruling party to the opposition was until recent the exception rather than the rule. In most of these nations, democratic transformation often evolves within the context of power changing hands between different factions of the same ruling party and between one generation of rulers and the other without the prospects of inter-party transition (Alamu, 2015). In most of these African nations such as Ghana, Nigeria, Togo, Cameroun, Malawi, Benin Republic, South Africa, Botswana, Guinea, Gambia, Mali, Ivory Cost; there have been consistent inter-party and intra-party transmission because power has shifted away from the military juntas following global opposition to military intervention and military government. The regime change is usually characterised by a shift of paradigm from traditional authoritarian model to some form of political modernity.

The change of regimes in Nigeria since independence spanned through the colonial periods to the present time. Here, a comparative study of the various leaders at national level and their efforts in educational development in Nigeria through the diverse reforms carried out at different stages of their administration will be examined. Between 1914-1960 , Nigeria had over six British Administrators: Sir Fredrick Luggard (1914- 1919), Sir Hugh Clifford (1919-1925), Sir Graeme Thomson (1925-1931), Sir Donald Cameron (1931-1935), Sir Bernard Bourdillon (1935-1943), Sir Arthur Richard (1943-1948), Sir John Macpherson (1948-1955), and Sir James (1955-1960).

The Nigerian educational development can be viewed from two dimensions. First, from the British dimension, this evolved from the colonial masters that administered the country between 1914- 1960. With the advent of the British administrators, several educational policies were introduced. The implementations of those policies at the various regions were uniform since they were formulated by the British authority prior to the British conquest. Although those education policies were the initiation of the British, however, it needs to be pointed out that those policies reflected the traditional environment where they were

implemented. It is also significant to say that with the coming of the British, direct and indirect rule policies were introduced by Lord Fredrick Lugard. This development made the British to formulate the educational policies that would reflect the Islamic model and cultural system of the Northern indigenes to suit the belief of the Hausas/Fulanis. On the other hand, direct rule system prevailed in the South, for the education policies reflected Christian model due to the influence of the Christian missionaries, who brought the western-type education to Nigeria with the arrival of the Wesleyan Christian Missionaries at Badagry in 1842. The introduction of education policies based on direct and indirect rules have actually resulted to a gap in the level of educational development in the Northern and Southern regions.

During the colonial era, the British government in Nigeria initiated the 6-5-4 as a unified system of education. At this particular period, Nigerian children were made to pass through 6 years primary, 5 years secondary and 4 years tertiary education system. (Fafunwa, 2004; Ozigi & Ocho, 1981; Fabumi, 2005; Ogunsola, 1982). The colonial administrators administered education through the use of certain education ordinances and education codes, such as the 1882, 1887, 1916, 1926, 1946 and 1926 Education codes, (Ijaduola, 1998 & Ogunu, 2000). These codes and ordinances were used as guidelines to administer education in the colony. They served as the basis for the modern day educational policies, education laws and techniques of educational administration in Nigeria (Fabunmi, 2005).

The 1882 education ordinance made the following provisions for African countries: first, that award of grants for organization and discipline, with special grants for schools, which obtained high percentage of passes, and thus attained high standard of general excellence. Second, that there should be a capitation grant for each subject. Third, that a capitation grant in proportion of the average attendance at school be made available. The 1887 education ordinance made provision for the establishment of education board; the conditions for giving grants; standard of education pattern; and the classification of teachers' certificates as well as how scholarship should be awarded. In 1916, Sir Luggard introduced an education policy which recommended that grant-in-aid be offered to school based on different conditions and percentages ranging from 30% for tone of the school, discipline, organization and moral instruction; 20% for adequacy and efficiency of the teaching staff; 10% for periodical examination and general progress and 40% for buildings, equipment, and sanitation.

Under the administration of Sir Graeme Thomson in 1925, a new education policy was formulated in 1926. This policy consisted mainly of the recommendations of the Phelps-Stoke Commission such as: The 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. In 1948, another education ordinance was instituted by the British administrator which recommended that educational administration be decentralised with the creation of Central Board of Education, Local Education Committees, and Local Education Authorities. By 1954, under the leadership of Sir Macpherson, the doctrine of federalism was already adopted as an administrative principle in Nigeria. With this development, Nigeria was balkanised into three regions with each given the power to formulate its education policies suitable for their regions. Towards the end of the administration, Ashby Commission was established to investigate the level of educational development in the country so that there could be reform. Having discovered the level of retrogression and imbalance in the Nigeria's education system, it recommended that there should be expansion and improvement at primary and secondary levels and upgrading of some universities. The first University was established following the recommendation of Ashby commission.

Since the departure of the British Colonial administrators following the 1960 independence, Nigeria has had over 16 regime change involving the constitutionally elected civilian leaders and illegally self-imposed military juntas. While some of the leaders did not introduce new education policy, due to some circumstances that beset their administration, some, however, introduced large scale education reforms. From Sir Tafawa Balewa (1960), Dr. Nnamdi Azikwe (1963), Gen. Aguiyi Ironsi (1963), Gen. Yakubu Gowon (1966), Gen. Murtala Mohammed (1975), Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo (1976), Alhaji Shehu Shagari (1979), Gen. Muhammadu Buhari (1983), Gen. Ibrahim Babangida (1985), Chief Ernest Shonekan (1993), Gen. Sanni Abacha (1993), Gen. Abdusalami Abubakar (1998), Chief Olusegun Obasanjo (1999), Umaru yar'adua (2007), Dr. Goodluck Ebele Jonathan (2010), to the present President, Ahaji Muhammadu Buhari (2015), Nigeria has witnessed different educational development with variation of education policies in form of reforms sweeping across the country. Thus, education policies have been inconsistent except in few instances where certain civilian or military leaders saw the policies as being pragmatic and considered it

necessary to retain and pursue it rigorously. For instance, between 1960 and early 1966, the Tafawa Balewa's, Dr. Nnamdi Azikew's, and Major General Aguiyi Ironsi's governments retained the British education policies simply because they were battling with sustaining political stability and political power as the country was beset with the cloud of intrigues, suspicion, distrust, and struggle between the elected civilian leaders and political opponents, the act which eventually led to the incursion of military elite in politics for the first time in Nigerian political history.

The intervention in politics which led to the displacement of the Prime Minister, Alhaji Tafawa Balewa, eventually culminated to successive military government in Nigeria. With the removal of Major General Aguiyi Ironsi as the Head of State in a coup d'état by General Yakubu Gowon, the education system of Nigeria took a new dimension. For instance, the Gowon's regime split the three regions into twelve states as contained in the decree No. 14 of 1967, gave the state administrators the power to promulgate education policies suitable for the growth of their states. This decision by General Yakubu Gowon was probably informed by the shift in paradigm from the unitary system to federal system of government. Thus, under his government, education system was decentralised in line with the principle of federalism.

During the administration of President Shehu Shagari, the 6-3-3-4 system was established in 1982 to replace the 6-5-4 system. This policy recommended 6 years for primary education, 3 years for junior secondary school, 3 years for senior secondary school and 4 years for university education. The history of 6-3-3-4 system of education dated back to 8th September 1969 under the federal commissioner for education, Mr. Weniuke Briggs, who inaugurated a conference which formulated the ideas leading to the 6-3-3-4 programme. The 6-3-3-4 educational system was put in place to enable the goals of National Policy on Education to be attained. Among which are: a/ Science, technology and vocational education; b/ Universalization of primary education; c/ Female education d/ Education of the nomads; e/ Mass literacy f/ Special education, for the gifted and the handicapped g/ Development of national languages h/ Quality improvement and maintenance in higher institution of learning; i/ a new school year. The National Education Policy is derived from five main national objectives contained in the 2nd National Development Plan which established a free and democratic society; a just and egalitarian society; a united, strong and self-reliant nation; a great and dynamic economy; a land of bright and full opportunities for all citizens.

Omolewa (1986) stated that the 6-3-3-4 system was conceived as an instrument of nationality, it was designed to inject functionality into the Nigeria school system. The 6-3-3-4 was fashioned to produce graduates who would be able to make use of their hands, the head and the heart (the 3tts of education). When it was finally introduced in 1982, there had been inputs by various sectors of Nigeria professional community. The 6-3-3-4 system was also created by the federal government to combine both the academic programme with vocational as it exposes graduates to entrepreneurialship. *According to the Policy Advisor, Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All (CSACEFA), Wale Samuel (Vanguard, 2012):*

“The problem of implementation of 6-3-3-4 is partly due to non-availability of personnel, materials, funds and administrative will. This programme has failed to achieve much not solely because of lack of human and material resources but largely due to poor implementation.”

Under the military successive governments of General Muhammadu Buhari, Gen. Badamosi Babangida, and Gen. Sanni Abacha which span between 1983-1999, several decrees were promulgated to guide and regulate the conduct of education in Nigeria. Among which was the Decree No. 16 of 1985, which was promulgated on Minimum Standards and Establishment of Institution’s Decree No. 20 of 1986 which changed the school calendar from January to December to October to September, Decree No. 26 of 1988, which proscribed and prohibited the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) for participating in trade union activities and Decree No. 36 of 1990, which revoked the proscription of ASUU, and many other decrees

Under the President Obasanjo’s administration, new education policies were introduced to enable Nigeria to flow with the global education trends among which was the Education For All (EFA), coordinated by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) with the supports of UNDP, UNFPA, UNICEF, and World Bank. To realise the six goals of Education For All (EFA), governments, development agencies, civil society and the private sector in every country were expected to work together with UNESCO. Consequently, the National Policy on Education (NPE, 2004), Universal Basic Education (UBE) Law (2004), National Policy on Gender in Basic Education (2007) and the National Policy for the Integrated Early Childhood Development (2007) were all established under the administration of President Olusegun Obasanjo to enable Nigeria to comply with

the global education demand which compelled every member nation to meet the learning needs of all children, youth and adults by 2015. Those policies were initiated by the Federal Ministry of Education (FME), education agencies, International Development Partners (IDPs) and Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) and approved by President Olusegun Obasanjo to enhance the educational growth of the nation.

The 6-3-3-4 policy was however changed under the President Olusegun Obasanjo through his minister of education, Dr. Obi Ezekwesili, who initiated the 9-3-4 system as a new education policy. The goal of this policy was to privatise the unity schools (i.e. the Federal Government Colleges). This new system was to make the primary education 9 years, while the secondary and higher education should not exceed 3 and 4 years respectively. The 3 years was meant for children to sit for WAEC or NECO examinations after which they were expected to enrol for JAMB entrance examination. Taking close look to the two systems, there is really no difference between the 6-3-3-4 and 9-3-4 because the 9-3-4, which is Basic 1-9 is the same thing as Primary 1-6 and JSS 1-3.

Following a regime change from President Obasanjo to President Goodluck Jonathan, the repealed 6-3-3-4 was restored with the appointment of Professor Ruqayyatu Ahmed Rufa'i but with modification that would include Early Childhood Education (ECE). In the manner of her predecessors, she also christened the system hence the name 1-6-3-3-4. Under the proposed 1-6-3-3-4 system, 1 year was set aside for early childhood education for five years old, 6 years for primary, 3 years for junior secondary school and 3 years for senior secondary school and 4 years to be spent in the higher education by children.

Policy Inconsistencies and Educational Development in Nigeria

Educational development can be conceptualised from different ways. According to the following scholars (as cited in POD Network, 2016), the term simply means:

“Helping colleges and universities function effectively as teaching and learning communities” (Felten, Kalish, Pingree, & Plank, 2007, p. 93)

Actions “aimed at enhancing teaching” (Amundsen & Wilson, 2012, p. 90)

A “key lever for ensuring institutional quality and supporting institutional change” (Sorcinelli, Austin, Eddy & Beach, 2005, p. xi).

The education development of any country can be determined by the Education for All Development Index such as:

- Goal 1: Expand early childhood care and education
- Goal 2: Provide free and compulsory primary education for all
- Goal 3: Promote learning and life skills for young people and adults
- Goal 4: Increase adult literacy by 50 percent
- Goal 5: Achieve gender parity by 2005, gender equality by 2015
- Goal 6: Improve the quality of education

To be able to attain these indexes, the government, whether in the developed or developing country is expected to craft education policy that will promote their realisation. Again, the need to also implement effectively such formulated policies is very crucial. Nigeria as a country has experienced series of policies on education evolving from different regimes before and after independence. The indiscriminate policy change has actually led to policy instability in the sector. Some of the policies have hindered the educational development of the country because they were formulated for personal goals rather than national goals. Policies of the past keep on somersaulting due to improper implementation, lack of political will, misapplication, poor infrastructure, lack of skilled manpower to monitor their execution, inadequate funding, poorly trained education personnel, corruption and financial embezzlement.

Policy inconsistencies following regime change have impeded the educational development in the following ways:

- It makes the most vital aspect of the past policies that would have been utilized for the educational advancement of Nigeria to be discarded.
- It makes it to be seen as a normative act rather than empirical thus creating gap between idealism and realism.
- It creates challenges for the executors of new policy due to confusion in the implementation created by the shift of paradigm.
- Improper and untimely formulation of policies by quack education minister without due consideration to their practicability even in the face of negative circumstances.

- It results to educational imbalances when such policies are made to satisfy a section of the indigenes where the Minister of education has come from. For instance, when policy changes favour particularly population groups, they also modify the composition of the student population
- Policy change makes education business to be extremely costly for those in the private sector since private school owners have to abandon the already laid down structure and have to start all over.
- On the part of the parents, policy change in education has made it difficult for some of the children to terminate their education untimely where the new policy prevents free education by compelling them to pay.
- According to Minget, Tan and Sosale, (2003), Policy inconsistencies in education typically alter at least one of the following features of the system: enrolment rates, unit costs, and the extent of public subsidization of the costs.

The state of education in Nigeria is aptly put in the *National Empowerment Development Strategy* in this way:

‘...the delivery of education in Nigeria has suffered from years of neglect, compounded by inadequate attention to policy frameworks within the sector. Findings from an ongoing educational sector analysis confirm the poor state of education in Nigeria. The national literacy rate is currently 57 percent. Some 49 percent of the teaching force is unqualified. There are acute shortages of infrastructure and facilities at all levels. Access to basic education is inhibited by gender issues and socio-cultural beliefs and practices, among other factors. Wide disparities persist in educational standards and learning achievements. The system emphasizes theoretical knowledge at the expense of technical, vocational, and entrepreneurial education. School curricula need urgent review to make them relevant and practice oriented’

The failure of past education policies to improve performance in the education sector in Nigeria is not limited to errors in their formulation, but, the challenges that are involved in the implementation of the policies by agencies established for that purpose. The failure on the part of the agencies to effectively monitor and evaluate those implementing the education policies is a fundamental factor affecting the realization of government goals in this area. Ejere (2011) attested to the above position that, over the years, successive governments in Nigeria have not been lacking in creating effective educational policies, programs and initiatives, but in implementing and translating those policies. The effect of policy

implementation and translation is to improve the quality and standards of services the government delivers to Nigerian people.

Again, bureaucracy has also affected the issue of implementation of education policies. Keiser (2011) acknowledged that bureaucratic alignment in policy realization positively or negatively affects policy decisions. Bureaucracies play a central role in implementing public policy by applying programme rules to individual cases. In so doing, they create the policy that the public actually experiences. Scholars have recently argued that policy analysts should refocus their attention on the central bureaucratic task of information processing to best understand why public bureaucracies implement policy the way they do (Workman, Jones & Jochim, 2010, cited in Boalji, Gray & Campbell-Evans, 2015). Okotoni (2001) summarised the role of the federal bureaucracy as coordinating federal ministries, advising political officials, formulating and implementing government policies, gathering and supplying data for policymakers, and ensuring continuity of public relations services (cited in Boalji, Gray & Campbell-Evans, 2015).

The public bureaucracy has evolved from corrupt nature of the society, bad leadership, lack of efficient manpower, poor and delay in education funds, self-centeredness on the part of education officials responsible for the implementation of education policies, pervasive political influence on public bureaucrats, overzealousness on the part of political leaders to reject, discontinue, and criticize past education policies through the public bureaucrats who did it successfully by sensitizing the public of such weaknesses even when the implementation had reached the level of fruition. Scholars like Nnamdi (2001), Amucheazi (1980), Makinde (2005), Aluko & Adesopo (2002), Anieze (2011), Nweke (2006), Ikelegbe (2006), and Okoli and Onah (2002), supported the above views that the trajectory of policy failure evolved from the illicit acts of the bureaucrats.

Financial challenges have also affected the proper implementation of education policy since there is relationship between finance and infrastructural development in schools. A comparative study carried out by scholars on some African countries showed that Nigeria has not committed enough fund on education. Oseni, (2012) cited in Adediran (2015) concluded in their studies that the Nigeria's spending on the whole education sector has been low, averaging 8.21% of the total budget between 2000 and 2011. This was well below those of Ghana, Cote d'Ivoire, South Africa, Kenya and Morocco which had 31%, 30%, 25.8%, 23%

and 17.7% respectively of their annual budget for education. In terms of Gross National Product's (GNP's) share to the education sector, Nigeria allocated only 3% compared to Ghana (26%), Namibia (22%), Kenya (20%), Tunisia (17%) and Egypt (13%).

Conclusion

The frequent change of regime and its seemingly effects on policy inconsistencies have brought untold tragedies to educational development in Nigeria. The inconsistencies in policies have created confusion in the education sector. There is no country without regime change, but there are few countries with consistency in policies, while there are some with only slight modification in policies, and large countries with consistent policy change. Apart from internal factors such as political and public pressures among others that are responsible for policy change, it could also be motivated or influenced by the international agents. For instance, the return to civil/democratic rule in Nigeria (1999) and decisions of the international community at the World Education Forum (2000) to achieve EFA goals and targets for every citizen and society were the main change agents that provided the momentum for tackling the challenges bedevilling the basic education sub-sector in Nigeria.

Given the number of policies that have been formulated by the various governments since Nigeria's independence, no nation in African continent should have been able to rival with her in view of the abundant resources available. However, the improper implementation of those education policies formulated by heads of government has led to slow educational development. The public bureaucracy whose major responsibility is to focus on making sure the country realises its education goals has failed in the course of implementing the education policies. The effect of this short-coming is the wide gap it has created between the development goals of a policy at the formulation stage and the realization of such goals on implementation. To enable the Nigerian society to witness educational development irrespective of the emergent regime change of political leaders, there must be the political will on the part of political leaders to ensure policy continuity (except where necessary should there be modifications), and also, put agencies in place that will monitor, regulate and evaluate the activities of public bureaucrats and private stakeholders in the education sector.

REFERENCES

Adediran, Sulleiman (2015). Forces of Educational Policy Since 2000 in Nigeria. Education for All Global Monitoring Report, 2015. *UNESCO*

- Alamu, Tatalo (2015). Regime Change and its Discontents. Sunday, may 3, *The Nation*.
- Allen, S. H. (2008). The Domestic Political Costs of Economic Sanctions. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52, 916–944.
- Althusser, L. (1970). Ideology and Ideological State Apparatus: Notes towards Investigation. in Sharma & Gupta (Eds.), *The Anthropology of the State*. Pp. 86-111). Malden, M.A: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Aluko, M.A and Adesopo, A. A. (2002). An Appraisal of the Two Faces of Bureaucracy in Relation to the Nigerian Society. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(1) 12 – 21.
- Amucheazi, E.C. (ed) (1980). *Readings in Social Sciences: Issues in National Development*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Amunden, C., & Wilson, M. (2012). Are Asking the Right Questions? A Conceptual Review of the Educational Development Literature in Higher Education. *Review of Educational Research*, 82(1): 90–126.
- Anikeze, N. (2011) *Fundamental Issues in Nigeria Politics, Government and Development Administration*. Enugu: Academic Publishers Company.
- Basu, R. (2006). *Public Administration Concepts and Theories*. 5th edition, New Delhi: Sterling Publishers Private Limited.
- Beeby, C.E. (1966). *The quality of education in developing countries*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Bolaji, S.O., Gray, J.R., & Campbell-Evans, G. (2015). Why Do Policies Fail in Nigeria? *Journal of Education and Social Policy*, Vol. 2 No. 5 November 2015.
- Borneman, J. (2003). Responsibility after Military Intervention: What is Regime Change? *Political and Legal Anthropology Review*, 26 (1), 29-42.
- Bunting, I. A. (1993). Rationalisation, Quality and Efficiency. *South African Journal of Higher Education*. 7(2), 17 – 27.
- Clausewitz, C. V. (1984). *On war* (M. Howard & P. Paret, Eds.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Dye, T.R. (1981). *Understanding Public Policy*. U.S.A. , Englewoods: Prentice-hall Inc.
- Ejere, E. I. (2011). An Examination of Critical Problems Associated with the Implementation of the Universal Basic Education Programme in Nigeria. *International Education Studies*,4 (1), 221–229.
- Escribá-Folch, A., & Wright, J. (2015). *Foreign Pressure and the Politics of Autocratic Survival*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fabunmi, M. (2005). Historical Analysis of Educational Policy Formulation in Nigeria: Implications for Educational Planning and policy. *International Journal of African and African American Studies*, 4(2), 1-7.

- Fafunwa, A. B. (2004). *History of Education in Nigeria*. Ibadan: NPC Educational Publishers Ltd.).
- Felten, P., Kalish, A., Pingree, A., & Plank, K. (2007). Toward a Scholarship of Teaching and Learning in Educational Development. In D. Robertson & L. Nilson (Eds.), *To Improve the Academy: Resources for Faculty, Instructional and Organizational Development*, 25 (pp. 93–108). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Finer, S.E. (1988). *The Man on Horseback*. 2nd edition, Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Hass, E. (1980). Technological Self-Reliance for Latin America: the OAs Contribution. *International Organization*, 34, 4 (Autumn, 1980). p. 553.
- Hirsch, The Social Limits to Growth, chap. 11. See also Michael Walzer, *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class*. New York Review of Books 27 (20 March 1980).
- Hawes, H. and D. Stephens. (1990). *Questions of Quality: Primary Education and Development*. Harlow: Longman.
- Human Development Network, T.W.B. (2002). World Bank strategy in the education sector: process, product and progress. *International Journal of Educational Development*. 22(5): p. 429-437, cited in Barrett, A.M., Chawla-Duggan, R., Lowe, J., Nikel, J., & Ukpo, E. (2006). *The Concept of Quality in education: a Review of the International Literature on the concept of Quality Education*. EdQual: A research Programme Consortium on Implementing Education Quality in Low Income Countries, UK
- Huntington, S.P. (1967). Reforming Civil Military Relations. *Journal of Democracy*, October 1967, 9-17.
- Huntington, S.P. (1977). *Political Order in Changing Societies*. 13th edition, London: Yale University Press.
- Iqbal, Z., & Zorn, C. (2008). The Political Consequences of Assassination. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 52, 385–400.
- Jallade, L., Radi, M. & Cuenin, S. (2001). National Education Policies and Programmes and International Cooperation: What role for UNESCO? *Education Policies Strategies 1. UNESCO*
- Janowitz, Morris (1960). *The Professional Soldier: A Social and Political Portrait*. The Free Press: New York.
- Jenkins, J.C. & Kposowa, A.S. (1992). The Political Origins of African Military Coups. *International Studies Quarterly*, 36, 271-292.
- Jervis, R. (1978). Cooperation under the security dilemma. *World Politics*, 40(1) (1978): 167 – 214.
- Kaplan, Morton (1957). *Systems and Process in International Politics*. New York: Wiley, p. 23

- Kaplan, Morton (1979). *Towards Professionalism in International Theory*. New York: Free Press. pp. 66-69, 73
- Keiser, L. R. (2011). The Impact of Bureaucratic Structure on Government Eligibility Decisions. Paper presented at the Public Management Research Association Conference.
- Keohane, R. & Nye, J. (1977). *Power and Independence*. Boston: Little, Brown. p.19.
- Kinzer, S. (2006). *Overthrow: America's Century of Regime Change from Hawaii to Iraq*. New York: Henry Holt Company.
- Krasner, S. (2009). Structural Causes and Regime Consequences: Regime as Intervening Variables. *International Organization*. Volume 36, Issue 02. Published online, 22 May 2009. www.ir.rochelleeterman.com
- Makinde, T. (2005) Problems of Policy Implementation in Developing Nations. *Journal of Social Sciences*. 11(1) Pp 63 – 69.
- Mingat, M., Tan, J. & Sosale, S. (2003). Tools for Education Policy Analysis. *The International Bank for Reconstruction and development/ The World Bank*.
- Nnamdi, H. (2001) *Comparative Public Administration*. Benin City: Trust Publications.
- Ogunsola, A.F. (1982). *Legislation and Education in Northern Nigeria*. Ibadan: University Press Ltd.
- Okoli, F.C. and Onah, F.O (2002) *Public Administration in Nigeria: Nature, Principles and Applications*. Enugu: John Jacobs Classic Publishers.
- Okotoni, O. (2001). Problems and prospects of Nigerian bureaucracy. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(3), 223–227.
- Oseni, M. (2012). Adequacy of Budgetary Allocation to Educational Institutions in Nigeria: *Pakistan Journal of Business and Economic Review* Vol. 3, Number 1 (2012).
- Ozigi, A. & Ocho, L. (1981). *Education in Northern Nigeria*. London: George Allen and Unwin Publishers Ltd.
- Professional and Organisational Development (POD) Network in Higher Education, (2016). What is Educational Development?*
- Putnam, D. (1967). Toward Explaining Military Intervention in Latin American Politics. *World Politics*. 20: 1. pp. 83-110.
- Quizlet, AP Comparative Government: Key Terms and Concepts*
- Regime Change*. Collins English Dictionary, 2012). William Collins Sons & Co. Ltd.
- Reiter, D. (2009). *How wars end*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Reiter, D. (2017). *Foreign-Imposed Regime Change*. Online publication: mar. 2017.

The World Declaration on Education for All (1990). Cited in World Education Forum 2015, 19-22 May 2015, Incheon, Republic of Korea.

Sharma, A. & Gupta, A. (2005). *The Anthropology of the State: A Reader*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Sorcinelli, M.D., Austin, A.E., Eddy, P.L., & Beach, A.L. (2005). *Creating the future of faculty development: Learning from the past, understanding the present*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.s

Torjam Sherri (2005). *What is Policy?* The Caledon Institute of Social Policy. Canada: Ontario, Ottawa.

UNESCO (2007). *Operational Definition of Basic Education: Thematic Framework*. December 2007.

Ward, K. (2007). *Regime*. Encyclopedia of Governance, Sage

Waltz, Kenneth (1979). *Theory of International Relations*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Young, O. (1982). Regime Dynamics: The Rise and Fall of International Regime. *International Organisation*, Volume 36, Issue 02, March 1982, pp.277-297.

Zoltan, B. (2002). *The East European Gypsies: Regime Change, Marginality and Ethno-politics*.