



Influence of Globalization on National Education Policies in Nigeria

DR. PATRICK IBE;DR. ANGELA CHEKWUBE EKOH-NWEKE;DR. AUGUSTINE

OBELEAGU AGU

Abstract

Globalization is one of the most widely contested phenomena by scholars because of its complexity, elusive nature and attribution for its positive and negative outcomes. Historically, globalization and education are very inter-related. The process of globalization began as early as the fourteenth century or at least with emergence of capitalism in the sixteenth century which resulted in the creation in Europe and USA of national education systems. This process continued and resulted in the transfer of these national education systems by colonial powers on other nations, and eventually to the establishment of the globalization institutions and instruments (WB, IMF, UNESCO, UNICEF). This paper looks at the influence of globalization on National Education Policies in Nigeria. Our basic argument, is that Nigeria since the introduction of national system of education under colonialism, has always been a recipient of her education policies. The country has not been able to articulate an endogenous education policy. All opportunities (military to civilian, civilian to military) had always ended in the reproduction (expanding or contracting) of the existing policy. Nigerian education policy makers should try to domesticate globalization and related processes by purposefully interacting with globalization demands as policies are being formulated and implemented. The paper is presented according to the following themes/sections. One is conceptualizing globalization and coming up with explanations/definitions for a shared understanding of this concept. Two, is examination of the evolution of education policies under (a) colonial and (b) postcolonial settings. Three, is how to use education policies to make globalization more inclusive through indigenization of modern education policies.

Keyword: Key

Published Date: 8/1/2020

Page:807-819

Vol 8 No 08 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31686/ijer.vol8.iss8.2590>

Influence of Globalization on National Education Policies in Nigeria

DR. PATRICK IBE

E-MAIL: ibe@asurams.edu

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY, ALBANY,
USA

DR. ANGELA CHEKWUBE EKOH-NWEKE

E-MAIL: ekohangela@yahoo.com

SENIOR LECTURER DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT
(BUSINESS EDUCATION PROGRAMME)
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
MICHAEL OKPARA UNIVERSITY OF AGRICULTURE UMUDIKE
ABIA STATE

DR. AUGUSTINE OBELEAGU AGU

E-MAIL: augobele52@yahoo.com

EDUCATION SOCIAL POLICY ADVISER, GRAND PRAIRIE TEXAS

Abstract

*Globalization is one of the most widely contested phenomena by scholars because of its complexity, elusive nature and attribution for its positive and negative outcomes. Historically, globalization and education are very inter-related. The process of globalization began as early as the fourteenth century or at least with emergence of capitalism in the sixteenth century which resulted in the creation in Europe and USA of national education systems. This process continued and resulted in the transfer of these national education systems by colonial powers on other nations, and eventually to the establishment of the globalization institutions and instruments (WB, IMF, UNESCO, UNICEF). This paper looks at the influence of globalization on National Education Policies in Nigeria. Our basic argument, is that Nigeria since the introduction of national system of education under colonialism, has always been a recipient of her education policies. The country has not been able to articulate an endogenous education policy. All opportunities (military to civilian, civilian to military) had always ended in the reproduction (expanding or contracting) of the existing policy. Nigerian education policy makers should try to domesticate globalization and related processes by purposefully interacting with globalization demands as policies are being formulated and implemented. The paper is presented according to the following themes/sections. **One** is conceptualizing globalization and coming up with explanations/definitions for a shared understanding of this concept. **Two**, is examination of the evolution of education policies under (a) colonial and (b) postcolonial settings. **Three**, is how to use education policies to make globalization more inclusive through indigenization of modern education policies.*

Introduction:

Globalization can be defined from political, cultural, economic, and even environmental perspective. The political dimension of globalization discusses political interactions around the world which began immediately following the II World War. The formation of such entity like the United Nations brought most of the world's independent countries together and it triggered off the fight for independent for African, Asian and Latin American countries. The economic aspect of globalization relates to economic interaction around the world and the movement of goods from one country to another. The cultural perspective looks at the movement of human beings from one country to another, while the ecological dimension investigates the aspect of things like, climate change, population growth, world food supply, and environmental degradation. It is also very important to note that technology has played a very big role in globalization. In some quarters some scholars have noted that globalization is another form of colonialism in which colonial consumer values reign most. Rizvi and Lingard (2000) noted that the emerging global culture, many fears, imposes the same cultural images, taste, and attitudes on everyone, everywhere. This idea is encapsulated in the ironic phrase "McDonaldization of the World". Bauman (1998) noted that, it is this diversity of reference that makes it impossible to define globalization in any straightforward fashion. So, while the term "globalization" clearly refers to both the intensity and the extent of international interactions, it does not stipulate the ways in these interactions occur, or indeed how interaction acquires significance in some contexts but not in others. Further, there are multiple potential political readings and responses to the phenomena that these essays attempt to capture in relation to education. Theses seek to work against any "naturalization" of the directions the world is taking within globalization.

History of Globalization:

Globalization has always been associated with trade. The First phase of globalization might have started during the "Victoria Era" when the European started exploring the world for goods especially spices. One cannot talk about globalization without laying emphasis on trade. Karl Marx (1848) noted that "National differences and antagonism between peoples are daily more and more vanishing, owing to the development of the bourgeoisie, to freedom of commerce, to the world market, to uniformity in the mode of production and the conditions of life corresponding thereto---- the supremacy of the proletariat will cause them to vanish still faster.....In proportion as the antagonism between classes within the nation vanishes, the hostility of one nation to another will come to an end" Richard Cobden (1864) noted that "Free trade....., will act on the moral world as the principle of gravitation on the universe, drawing men together, thrusting aside antagonism of race, and creed, and language, and uniting us in the bonds of eternal peace"

The second phase of globalization which is always termed the "Keynesian era globalization" saw a rise in trade of manufactured goods between the industrialized economies of Western Europe, North America, and Japan Thomas (2017). The new trade involved an exchange between industrialized countries of manufactured goods for manufactured good. It is during this period that countries like Taiwan, South Korea, Hong Kong and Singapore joined the industrialized countries in exporting goods.

The third phase of globalization is called the Neoliberal globalization. Thomas (2017) noted that Neoliberal globalization makes “barge economics” a reality. The barge is built on a complex of organizational and technological change that rests on a legal and policy infrastructure which supports off-shoring and foreign out-sourcing of production. Trade he maintained remains central because goods must cross borders, and hence the need for trade agreement. However, barge economics is fundamentally different from conventional economics of trade. The latter is about cross-border exchange of goods and services with immobile production. The former is about creating flexible mobile international production networks configured on the principles of global cost arbitrage.

Globalization and Education

Education is the basic skill for promoting globalization. It should be seen as a widespread systemic change in education. It also calls for a shift in paradigm which involves attention to be paid in a mono-cultural to multi-cultural with emphasizes in school curriculum and its implications. Some of the early educational globalization is the spread of global religions, like Islam and Christianity, which throughout the nineteenth century displaced the indigenous forms of schooling. At this same time missionaries had brought what we call core Western ideas and practices to the world. With education the colonialist has penetrated the world in so many ways. Woodhouse (1987) claimed that people on the periphery are “mystified” by dominant ideologies, and willingly, even enthusiastically and without conscious awareness of implication, accept core Western learning thereby subordinate themselves to the world system. Carnoy (2005) stipulates that globalization increases the demand for education, especially university education, and this increases pressure on the whole system for higher quality schooling, often producing perverse educational consequences, particularly from the standpoint of equity.

What we have seen around the world today as education, mass schooling of children, could be regarded as a first instance of globalization’s impact on education, as many non-Western context traditional education had been conceived as small-scale, local community-based, and as vocational or apprenticeship education, and/or religious training (Reagan, 2000). What happened early on is that in most of the colonized countries we found formalized schools emerge for the first time for children of the elite and the children of the expatriates. Due to globalization there was a massive change in standardization which of course with its colonial characteristic has little relevance to the cultures of the communities. It was of course not intended for development as such but for foreign intervention and global empire maintenance or social control. (Babaci-Wilhite et al; 2006) is of the opinion that African education system is an example of curriculum that has been distributed from the top-down that is not helping students realize their potential and become empowered to change the future of their countries. In this system, he maintained rather than providing classes in the student’s native languages, instruction is given in French, English, Portuguese and Spain.

Jackson (2016) postulated that globalization as contemporary condition or process clearly shapes education around the globe, in terms of policies and values; curriculum and assessment; pedagogy; educational organization and leadership; conceptions of learner, the teacher, and the good of life; and more. Whereas, Besley (2012) maintained that other scholars argue that globalization major impact on education

has actually been the promotion of a thin layer of aspirational, cosmopolitan values among global cultural elites, who largely overlook the realities, problems, and challenges many faces.

Globalization and Education Policies Development

Globalization is the ongoing process of greater interdependence among countries and their citizens (Fischer, 2003). This inter-dependence materializes in increased international flows of goods and services, of financial funds, labour and ideas. The last aspect -increased international flows of ideas -is the most relevant one for human capital development. When it comes to education policies, it is important to consider the relevance of globalization for the international flow of ideas. Romer correctly emphasized that “globalization is driven by the gains from reuse of ideas” (Romer, 2010:94). In this sense, education policies take center stage because of their impact on individuals and societies capacity to adapt to the changes and to take advantage of the opportunities brought about by globalization. Rather than static comparative advantage aspects of globalization, the reuse of ideas that have been generated in other countries is what is most important for the process of development in a dynamic perspective.

The history of education policymaking in Nigeria is characterized by uncertainties, transitions due to changes in the global international relationships from colonial to post-colonial. In any of the contexts, the international flow of ideas remains paramount. We argue that colonialism was a manifestation of the first and second stages of globalization (Victorian era and Keynesian era). This has guided the examination of the colonial education policies in Nigeria. The Neoliberal stage of globalization dictated the education policies of Nigeria for the post-colonial era. In both phases of globalization (Victorian/Keynesian vs Neo-liberal), the Nigerian nation state had to acquiesce to the pressures exerted by the various church organizations, the influential nation states and much later by international organizations. This seriously impeded and still impeding the capacity of the Nigerian state to develop its policies independent of any external influence and in favor of its citizens. Consequently, colonialism and post-colonialism (with the civilian/military swing) is the conceptual framework for looking at the globalization of educational policy making in Nigeria.

Globalization and Colonial Education Policies

The education policies may fall under the Victorian and Keynesian era. The colonial government had a hands-off policy on education development. This was dictated by the ideology of laissez faire that was selectively practiced. The basic objective of colonial economic policy was to stimulate the production and export of cash crops and encourage the importation of European manufactured goods (Stiglitz, 2002). Investment in human capital development was not a priority. The various Christian Missionaries had a free hand in the education enterprise. British colonial policies on education were formulated and implemented in Nigeria between 1882 and 1926. Prior to 1882, the policy was to leave the delivery of education services to the Missionaries (Christian and Muslim) and the private sector (Fafunwa, 2004).

The educational policies of the colonial administrators were directed using education ordinances. These include: 1882; 1887; 1916; and 1926 Education Ordinances (Fafunwa, 2004). The 1882 and 1887 Ordinances were meant to address the imbalance in the education system and to establish a substantial

amount of control on education activities of the missionary bodies. The main takeaways of the Ordinances (1882, 1887) were the creation of Education Boards and establishment of the grants in aid formula. The 1916 Education Ordinance was a response to the amalgamation of the colony and the Protectorate of South with Northern Nigeria (1914).

The British colonial educational policy did not mature until the 1920s when the Advisory Committee for Education in Africa was established, and the famous Phelps-Stokes Commission issued its reports (Dike, 1980). Drawing from the American experience in Negro education, the Phelps-Stokes reported, *inter alia*, (a) that the education of the African should be adapted to the agricultural, vocational, and other utilitarian aspects of the African environment; (b) that African education should be different from that of Western societies, but similar to that of the African Americans; (c) that the education given should be such that it does not create political “poison centers;” (d) that education should stress character development and the religious life of pupils. Africans rejected Phelps-Stokes policy with the argument that educational adaptation, meaning vocationalism, agricultural training and the like was an inferior education.

The above notwithstanding, a Memorandum on Education Policy in British Tropical Africa was dispatched to the colonies in 1925 as a basis for the British Colonial Education Policy. The Report of this commission enabled the British colonial administration to demonstrate increased interest in African education, which led to the issuance of the first educational policy in 1925 (Dike, 1980; Fafunwa, 2004). The policy consisted mainly of the recommendations of Phelps Stokes Commissions. Based on the Phelps Stokes recommendations, the 1926 Education Ordinance was enacted. The 1948 and 1952 Education Ordinances were merely elaboration of the 1926 Education Ordinance. While the 1948 Education Ordinance decentralized education administration by creating a Central Board of Education and four Regional Boards for the East, West, Lagos and North; the 1952 Education Ordinance enabled each of the newly created regions -Eastern, Western and Northern -to develop its educational policies and systems. The 1948 Education Ordinance was a milestone in British colonial educational policy in Nigeria, because it was the first educational legislation that covered the whole country. The 1952 Ordinance became the education law for the country.

The clamor by Nigerians for self-government resulted in two constitutional conferences which brought together Nigerian political leaders and the British colonial government between 1951 and 1954. The deliberations of the conferences resulted in the drafting of a new federal constitution in 1954. The Constitution contained three lists: (i) Exclusive legislative list (which contained items only for the federal legislation); (ii) Concurrent legislative list (items upon which both federal and regions could legislate); (iii) Residual legislative list (comprise items which are within the exclusive legislative competence of the regions). The regions exploited this constitutional provision and made regional laws of education. Education happens to be in the concurrent list raising the issues of federal and regional tensions in educational policy making.

From the review of the dynamics of colonial education policies, two things stand out. One, is that that the colonial educational policymaking was delivered through ordinances. The peoples of Nigeria were not fully involved in the policy making of the ordinances. These were imposed on the people without going through the processes of discussion and negotiation. Two, the colonial policy architecture laid the foundation for the tension between the demands for greater national unity of purpose and the desire for regional and local

control in education policy. n. These principles -technocratic approach and the tensions between unity and regional authorities in education -spilled over into the post-colonial dynamics of education policy making as discussed below.

Globalization and Post-Colonial Education Policies

The policies made were dictated by Neo-liberal principles. Neo-Liberalism is a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedom and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free market and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. The state must guarantee, the quality and integrity of money, security, legal structures, education, healthcare and others (Harvey, 2005:2). Nigeria was granted full independence in October 1960, as a federation of three regions (Eastern, Western and Northern) under a constitution that provided for a parliamentary form of government. Under the constitution, each of the three regions retained a substantial measure of self-government. Despite seeking to assert political and social autonomy, the leadership at independence found they had little choice but to operate within the colonial policy architecture. The Nigerian state because of many reasons that is beyond the scope of this paper, was to say the least very weak. Six years after independence, the system gave way to successive military coups in 1966, followed by a three-year civil war and frequent military coups and changes of governments. The post-colonial educational policy making in Nigeria because of state weakness retained the colonial education principles and to a large extent influenced by Neo-liberal policies. This is examined under two categories -the civilian versus military regimes. Between 1960 and 2019, (59 years of independence), civilian regimes have effectively been in place for 29 years. Military regimes were in charge for 30 years. Neither the civilian nor the military had the capacity to transform the colonial policy making architecture

The First Democratic Republic (1960-1966)

As indicated earlier, the foundation of the Nigerian education policy making architecture was laid in the colonial era with Neo-liberalism principles guarding the education development. During the first republic, the policy of decentralization of education as stipulated in the 1954 constitution continued. The regions developed their educational policies as they saw fit. With the introduction of UPE, the south (eastern and western regions), expanded on the educational institutions initially introduced by the Christian Missionaries. In the north, Qur'anic education was the preferred mode of education in the largely Muslim north amongst the rural communities. The non-Muslim communities in the north struggled quite a bit in accessing education. Most merely depended on what the Christian Missionaries could provide.

The First Military Interregnum (1966-1979)

Six years after Independence and three years after being a Republic, the Military seized power in Nigeria on 15th January 1966. The taking over of political power by the Nigerian military marked the beginning of the erosion of the decentralized regional based federalism. The military government began a process that transformed the relatively loose regionalized federal arrangement of Nigeria into one with a strong center. It promulgated Decree No. 34 of May 1966, known as the Unification Decree, which

abolished the decentralized federalism and introduced a unitary form of government. Six months into the first coup, there was another coup and a change in government in June 1966 that reinstated decentralized federalism; but silent on regionalism. The military was incapable of transforming the colonial architecture of education policy making. Between 1967 and 1970, very little in terms of education policy making happened. The country was busy with the civil war. However, in 1969, the National Curriculum Conference was convened which reviewed the educational system and its goals and identified new national goals for the country which would determine the future and direction of education in the country. The conference was the first national attempt to change the colonial orientation of the Nigerian educational system and promote national consciousness and self-reliance through the education process. One crucial shortcoming of the conference was that most peoples from the Eastern part of the country (then Biafra) could not participate in the conference because of the civil war. As a follow-up to the 1969 curriculum conference, the Federal Government of Nigeria in 1973, organized a seminar of experts to deliberate on a truly Nigerian national education policy. The report of the seminar after considerations by the States of Federation and other stakeholders was presented as the draft National Policy on Education. This marked the beginning of the end of the reproduction of the colonial education policy and the participation of Nigerians in the policy formulation. The policy was not introduced until four years later

However, policies of education were made through education edicts; a reminder of the centralized education ordinances during the early period of colonial involvement in education. In 1976, the Federal Military Government increased the states from 12 to 19. Each state promulgated an edict for the regulation of education. One crucial observation was that all the edicts had common features, such as state takeover of schools from private and voluntary agencies, establishment of school management boards and a unified teaching service. The implementation of these edicts brought the educational policy making under a unified central control. Furthermore, under successive military regimes, revenue administration and collection became increasingly centralized, and state/regional allocation was engineered at the discretion of the military government. Simultaneously, expenditure responsibilities and government functions also became centralized, with the federal government assuming the role of the engine of social and economic development in which education is a subset.

In 1976, due to increased revenue brought about by oil boom, the Federal Government of Nigeria in line with the Neo-Liberal principles of mass primary education, introduced the national Universal Primary Education Program and expanded access into tertiary education and increased the number of unity secondary schools in the country. The UPE program provided six years of primary education starting from six years of age for all students and aimed for 100% primary enrollment by 1981. One of the main objectives of UPE was to provide all children free primary education, and hence bridge the educational gap between and within states and regions.

A national policy on education was introduced in 1977. The Policy among others was geared towards addressing the problems of educational relevance to the needs and aspirations of Nigerians as well as promoting Nigeria's unity and laying the foundation for national integration. In order to achieve the objectives, the policy made education in Nigeria the Federal Government's responsibility in terms of centralized control and funding of education. The centralization was a departure from the later colonial and

the first republic policy of having education on the concurrent list that allowed more stakeholder participation in financing and policy making.

Furthermore, the National Policy of 1977, introduced the 6-3-3-4 educational system modelled after the American system of 6 years of primary education, 3 years of junior secondary school, 3 years of senior secondary school, and 4 years of university education (FRN, 1977). The first military government reinforced the technocratic approach to policy making. The policy making institutions, such as the constitution, parliament and the bureaucracy inherited from the colonial administration were either abolished (constitution and parliament) or weakened (the bureaucracy and civil society, including missionaries). Most of the actors in the policy making were handpicked by the military government. Logically, these were more accountable to the military government that appointed them than to the Nigerian people. The policy making processes were weak on discussions, negotiations and exchanges; but strong on compliance

The Second Democratic Republic (1979-1983)

The first military interregnum (1966-1979) in Nigeria was followed by the second republic; this time a presidential system of civilian government. The 1979 constitution put education back on the concurrent legislative list. This marked a swing of the pendulum back to the regional/state-based federalism; but this time the states were weakened from the experiences of the immediate past military governance. The constitution shared the responsibility for education among the three tiers of government - federal, states and local governments; while it gave the federal government more powers than the states in the areas of post-primary, professional, technological and placed university education under federal control. Primary education was to be a joint venture between the states and local governments, with local governments responsible for teachers' salaries. The provision for education in the 1979 Constitution, culminated in the first revised National Policy on Education that resulted in the National Education Policy (revised 1981).

It is important historically to note that the National Policy of Education (1977) has been revised four times -1981, 1983, 1998, and 2004 (FRN, 2004). However, the principles inherited from colonial education policies to a large extent continued influencing the policy directives. While the 1981 and 1983 revisions were done under the Second Republic, the 1998 revision happened under Second Military interregnum, and the 2004 revision took place under the Third Republic. The revised National Policy on Education (1981) changed the responsibility to finance primary education from the federal government to the states and local government. The main reason for the change was that the federal government could not cope with the funding of the national UPE programme because of decreased national revenue due to the oil glut in the 1980's. The inability of the federal government to shoulder the financial burden of the implementation of national UPE policy stalled the process. Consequently, payment of teachers' salaries and provision of educational facilities became difficult to do. Quality of education suffered and primary enrollment stagnated. In 1983, the National Policy on Education was again revised. However, this revision did not take effect because the Second Republic Democratic government was overthrown the same year. One of the problems of the Second Republic was its inability to alter the centralizing tendencies of military

rule which it inherited. The current Third Republic Democratic government has not done better in changing the centralizing tendencies from the military.

The Second Military Interregnum (1983-1999)

In 1983, the Second Republic was overthrown by the military. The 1983 revised National Policy on Education was cancelled by the immediate military government. In its place, the Federal Military Government promulgated several decrees to guide and regulate the management of education. The decrees include: (i) Decree No.16 of 1985, which set the benchmark for national minimum standards and the establishment of institutions; (ii) Decree No. 26 of 1988, which proscribed and prohibited the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) from participating in trade union activities; and (iii) Decree No. 36 of 1990 which revoked the proscription of ASUU, and other decrees. The National Policy on Education was again revised in 1998 in line with the stipulations of the Jomtien directives under a military regime. The Jomtien conference of EFA marked the rise of consensus at international level that education is the sole important element in removal of poverty, protection of children from ruthless labor and advocating human rights and democracy (Haddad, 1990). The conference compelled the participating countries with weak states to endorse the aims and targets of the policy. The government hoped to use education as a tool for promoting national unity and for the total development of the individual. The revised policy prescribed a Universal Basic Education (UBE) program, which is compulsory for all children in the country, given in the form of nine years continued education (6 years' primary education and 3 years junior secondary schooling). The policy among others dealt with the followings: (i) It raised the minimum standard for entry into teaching profession from Teacher Grade II Certificate to the National Certificate of Education (NCE); (ii) It proposed the provision of UBE in a variety of forms, depending on the needs and possibilities for all citizens; (iii) it introduced various programs like the Nomadic education for the education of the migrant ethnic groups such as the nomadic cattle rearing Fulani and Ijaw fishermen were introduced.

The Third Democratic Republic (1999-Present)

The emergence of a democratically elected government in May 1999, ended more than a continuous decade of military rule. The implementation of the 1998 revised National Policy on education started in 1999. Between 1999 and now, successive Nigerian governments, influenced by the global goals and commitments, such as Education for All (EFA) and MDG have initiated series of policies and programs aimed at improving access and quality of education. 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 Integrated Early Childhood Development (2007) were all geared towards ensuring that Nigeria meets its commitments on the globally agreed objectives to meet the learning needs of all children, youth and adults by 2015. The policies were championed by the collaboration between the Federal Ministry of Education, and other line ministries, International Development Partners, Civil Society organizations in response to global education reforms.

The return to democratic rule in Nigeria (1999) and the decisions of the international community at the World Education Forum (2000) to achieve EFA goals and targets changed the dynamics of educational policy making in Nigeria in two ways. One, which is internal, is that there was pressure by the state

governments to decentralize the administration of education in the country. Under the 1999 Constitution, education is under the Concurrent Legislative List. The Federal Government was expected to develop policies that ensure equal and adequate educational opportunities at all levels. The state governments were responsible for providing primary, post-primary, vocational, technical and other forms of education in their respective areas. The Local Government Councils were expected to participate in the respective state governments programmes. The UBE (2004) Law reinforced the roles and responsibilities of the three tiers - federal, state and local council and added that the federal government's intervention under UBE Law shall only be assistance to the states and local government councils to ensure uniform and qualitative basic education throughout the country.

The second, which is external enabled international organizations such as the World Bank, UN agencies, and some bilateral organizations to be deeply involved in the policy dialogues to achieve educational targets and commitments. For example, the EFA movement in Nigeria was inspired by UNESCO/UNICEF/UNDP/WB efforts to support the country to achieve EFA and MDG education goals. Like most developing countries with the increasing impact of globalization, Nigeria started experiencing trans-nationalization of education policy making. The dynamics of educational policy making increasingly stopped being an exclusive affair of the nation state. Transnational institutions, to which the country and most nation states belong, are now the main contexts which define the major educational aims and targets such as EFA, MDG, and currently the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). It seems clear that for the most part, since the beginning of the 21st century, the Nigerian government like the states in most developing countries are largely pursuing common education policy agenda. The focus of educational policies by the Nigerian government was aligning its policies or approaches to the global policies.

Moreover, it is important to underscore that the trans-nationalization of educational policy making created space for the civil society in Nigeria to be increasingly involved in policy making. In the run-up to the World Education Summit in Dakar in April 2000, forty Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) with interest in education came together to form a national network named "Civil Society Action Coalition on Education for All (CSACEFA). One of the main objectives is to: contribute to the shaping of policies on education in Nigeria and provide a platform for dialogue. CSCEFA has forged partnerships with various national and international organizations in pursuance of its objectives. The civil society organizations have tended to work more closely with the International Development Partners because of funding; this has created some quiet tensions in the partnership arrangements.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have traced the development of education policy making in Nigeria over a period of several decades. It seems very clear that educational development in Nigeria was affected by globalization, specifically, by colonialism and Neo-Liberalism. Fifty-nine years after independence, Nigeria has not been able to transform its education system. The current education system is just an expansion of the colonial architecture. This is because the Nigeria State has historically been very weak. The state lacked the capacity to transform education; consequently, it had no option but to be responding more to globalizing processes rather than national needs. Through many twists and turns, the dynamics of educational policy making in

Nigeria has three main story lines. One, is that policy making in Nigeria has been mainly externally directed. The directive came initially through colonialism and secondly by trans-nationalization; both of which are phases of globalization. These happened because the Nigerian State was not in existence during colonialism and very weak during post-colonial era to deal with the demands of globalization in the 21st century. The second story line is that the dynamics of educational policy making since independence has been that policies have always emanated from the top down raising implementation issues. The processes of formulating these policies were not participatory and inclusive enough. Contributions by stakeholders at the local government and community levels were minimal.

We will like to conclude that for educational policy making in Nigeria to be meaningful and effective, should start the journey from the bottom (schools, communities, local and state level institutions). The top down and externally driven approach to policy making that have dominated educational development had minimal impacts. A new approach to educational policy making that goes beyond statement of intent by policy makers as has been hitherto practiced is needed. The policy making which is very process oriented could be directed by the following logic: (a) identification of the various organizational operations that will impact on the policy; (b) assessment of policy needs and the policy options available to meet them; (c) resources to be directed at the organizational units likely to have the most effect. This process will reduce reliance on abstract solutions, making way for local knowledge and skill at delivery level. This calls for decentralization of educational policy making and a return to a loose federal system in which local and state authorities are paramount.

Recommendations:

Based on the literature reviewed, the following recommendations were proffered;

1. The education policy makers at all level of education should determine the skills, abilities, competences and attitudes required by the young and lifelong learners.
2. The education policy makers and curriculum planners should construct an adequate and appropriate global curriculum to enable learners have a solid education foundation that will equip them with what it takes to acquire a global based knowledge.
3. The education policy makers should develop an appropriate and relevant technologically mediated pedagogy to enable the learners to be technologically grounded and as well fit in and function appropriately in the technological globe.
4. The education policy makers should specify an established universal standard by which learning/education performance can be evaluated to enable learners align globally without being underrated.
5. To enhance a nation's productivity and competitiveness in the global situation, decentralization and the creation of a market in education should be employed by the education policy makers to enable government increase labor flexibility and create more autonomous educational institutions while catering for the demand for more choice and diversity in education.
6. The education policy makers should strive to develop knowledge-producing institutions and industries to enhance skills and abilities that will improve human capital.

7. Government should provide a ready supply of skilled labor by increasing the overall level of education in the labor force to enable them attract foreign finance capital.
8. Educational systems should strive to produce individuals for global competition, individuals who can by themselves compete for their own positions in the global context and who can legitimate the country and strengthen its global competitiveness.
9. The government should put into consideration these important forces; the globalization of economy, the commodification of knowledge and the retrenchment of the welfare state for the changes in higher education.
10. The government should implement these trends in restructuring higher education in Nigeria; a shift from elite to mass higher education, the privatization of higher education, the practice of corporate managerialism and the spread of transnational education.

References

- Adediran, S. (2015). *Forces of educational policy change since 2000 in Nigeria*. Background Paper Prepared for the Education for All Global Monitoring Report. Abuja/Paris: UNESCO
- Agu, A. O. (2014). Nnamdi Azikiwe: A pragmatic progressivist Pan-Africanist philosopher of education. *Journal on African Philosophy* Issue 10, 39-58.
- Babaci-Wilhite, Z., Geo-Jaja, M., & Shizhou, L. (2012). Education and language: A human right for sustainable development in Africa. *International Review of Education* 1-29.
- Bauman, Z. (1998). The new poor and the rest of us. *Arena Journal* 12, 61
- Besley, T. (2012). Narratives of intercultural and international education: Aspirational values and economic imperatives.
- Carnoy M. (2005). Globalization, educational trends and open society. OSI Educational Conference - Education and Open Society: A critical look at new perspective and demands.
- Dike, K. O. (1980). 100 years of British rule in Nigeria (1851-1957). In I. Obaro (Ed.), *Groundwork of Nigerian History*. Ibadan: Heinemann
- 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.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National policy on education* (4th edition) Lagos: Nigeria Education Research and Development Council
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). *The constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria*, Abuja: Federal Ministry of Information
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1998). *National policy on education* (3rd edition). Lagos: Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC) Press

- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1981). *National policy on education (2nd edition)*. Lagos: Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1979). *Constitution of the federal republic of Nigeria*. Lagos: Federal Ministry of Information.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1977). *National Policy on Education*. Lagos: Government Printer.
- Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of Neo-Liberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Jackson, L. (2016). Globalization and education. *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*.
- Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC) (1972). *A philosophy for Nigerian education*. Ibadan: Heinemann Educational Books
- Reagan T. (nd); (2000) *Non-Western educational traditions: Alternative approaches to educational thought* (Mahwah) NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Rizvi, F.& Lingard, B. (2000). Globalization and education: Complexities and contingencies. *educational theory*. Urbana 50 (4). 419
- Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. London: Penguin Books
- Thomas, P. (2017). *Three globalizations, not two: Rethinking the history and economics of trade and globalization*. Berlin, Germany.
- Ukeje, B. O. (1986). *School and society in Nigeria*, Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Woodhouse, H.R. (1987). Knowledge, power and the university in a developing country: Nigeria and cultural dependency. *Compare* 17, 121.