

**MANAGEMENT OF POLICY IMPLEMENTATION  
PROCESS ON UNIVERSAL BASIC EDUCATION (UBE)  
IN ENUGU EDUCATION ZONE**

**OBIAKOR, Mariagoretti Ijeoma**

Educational Management and Policy Department

Faculty of Education

Nnamdi Azikiwe University Awka

**mi.obiakor@unizik.edu.ng,**

07063842753

**Abstract**

*The main purpose of this study was to investigate the management of policy implementation process on Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Enugu Education Zone, the evidence from practices. Two research questions corresponding to the purpose of the study was raised for the study. Descriptive survey research design was adopted for the study. Population of the study was 5104 comprising all the teachers in the 31 public secondary schools in Enugu education zone. The sample size for the study was 180. The researcher sampled 15 teachers from each of the 12 selected schools. The instrument used for data collection was a 6-items questionnaire titled Policy Implementation Universal Basic Education Questionnaire (PIUBEQ). The questionnaire was structured based on the research questions which were set out to guide the study. The instrument used was validated by experts. The researchers distributed 180 copies of the questionnaire to the respondents and all were collected back on the spot after they had been filled to ensure optimum return of the instrument. The feedback from the questionnaires that were distributed formed the basis for analysis using mean, while Cronbach Alpha was used to determine the reliability of the instruments, which was 0.68. The findings of the study reveals that school authorities has in-depth knowledge of implementation policy of Ube, School authorities could interpret and execute the policy as stated in the policy blueprint and that School authorities also have sufficient knowledge of their specific roles in the UBE implementation. In policy implementation, the leadership commitment, and interpersonal relationships among the implementing officials largely determined the overall outcome of any government policy. That study recommends that there should be adequate monitoring and supervision of the UBE policy for proper implementation in secondary schools.*

**Keywords: Universal Basic Education, management and policy implementation**

**INTRODUCTION**

Since colonial dispensation, education in Nigeria has played a unique role in the development of the nation. Adesina (2013) acknowledged that much has happened to

the country's educational system — there have been changes, innovations, and reforms all aiming to make education accessible to citizens. The policy initiatives by the Nigerian government have focused on education as an instrument par excellence for effective national development (Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN), 2014). The research reported in this paper investigated the bureaucratic mechanism system level of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) policy implementation in Nigeria towards achieving 'Education for All' by 2015. The purpose of this research was to assess the impact of the bureaucratic implementation process and its effect on access in terms of the enrollment, attendance, and progression of Nigerian children in the UBE program. This study was premised on the resolve of the federal government to eradicate illiteracy and improve education access in order for children to acquire basic literacy and numeracy skills, before proceeding to higher education. Despite the interest placed on education, there remain some challenging and contentious issues dominating the education sector — one of which, according to Omoyale (1998); Bolaji and Illo (2007); and Bolaji, Olufowobi, and Oluwole (2013), is the lack of success in achieving education policy objectives in Nigeria since 1842. This informed the decision of the federal government of Nigeria to revamp and reinvigorate the agencies responsible for the implementation of the UBE policy. UBE in this study was the new education initiative of the government introduced in 1999, a response to the global UN Millennium Development Goals (MDGs, 2006) and the Jomtien Declaration on Education for All (EFA), of which Nigeria is a signatory (Okiy, 2004). The reform program aimed to remove distortions and inconsistencies in basic education delivery; reinforce the implementation of the policy; and provide greater access to, and ensure the quality of, basic education throughout Nigeria (National Population Commission [NPC], 2011). An understanding of the geo-political background of Nigeria is integral to appreciating the challenges of the policy implementation in this country. The government's 1842 goal of reforming basic education in Nigeria has not been achieved. The lack of success has been attributed to the inept approach of the bureaucratic mechanism towards implementing educational policies (Adesina, 1986; Omoyale, 1998). Attesting to this was the launch of the Universal Primary Education (UPE) program in 1955 and 1976. The 1955 policy initiative was to provide free and compulsory education. It operated according to peculiar regional circumstances. In the north, education was free, but neither universal nor compulsory. In the east, it was bandied as a vote-catching slogan, but quickly abandoned, apparently due to lack of 'resources,' since the term was interpreted narrowly to mean financial resources. In the western region, it laid the foundation for an educational road map for the other two regions established by the 1950 MacPherson Constitution (Bolaji & Illo, 2007; Obayan, 2011). The premium placed on education resulted in the citizens of this region being the most educated. An overarching assessment of the policy a few years after implementation revealed that it had failed due to the lack of a structural mechanism for implementation to address the issues of overcrowded classrooms, inadequate infrastructure and dearth of

qualified teachers. The resultant effect was that school-age children did not have facilities to accommodate them. The UPE policy of 1976 was launched across all the states of the federation and sought to address the inconsistencies in the 1955 educational policy. The 1976 policy was designed to expand access to education and increase the number of schools in the country. It also aimed to provide free education to all school-age children to bridge the education gap and reduce the rising levels of illiteracy in the country. The implementation was launched with much promise, yet failed to achieve its goal of eradicating illiteracy because of inadequate planning and lack of an implementing mechanism, as identified in the previous policy. For example, Fafunwa (2004) reported that when the schools were opened to register students, instead of the 2,300,000 children expected, 3,000,000 arrived. Other contributing factors identified by Fafunwa were the lack of qualified teachers and lack of consultation with local communities regarding providing education suited to children's particular circumstances.

Aluede (2006) affirmed that the intent of the 1976 UPE was to make education free, compulsory and accessible to the citizenry. However, within a short period, the program was aborted due to poor implementation at its inception. Thus, the policies failed largely due to the challenge of implementation strategy and the bureaucracy's inability to turn policy into practice. Over a decade has passed since the implementation of the UBE initiative, yet there has been little demonstrated success or achievement. Despite a significant increase in terms of funding, financing, time and energy invested in this program, coupled with international intervention to ensure effective and efficient implementation, the challenges have been great. Access to basic education among Nigerian school-age children remains at the low level of 60%; more than eight million children of school age (6-15 years) are still not in school. The hope of meeting the UN MDGs, remains an issue yet to be met (United States Agency for International Development [USAID]/ FGN, 2015).

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

With a history of lack of success in improving educational outcomes, the desire of the government to see to the implementation of the UBE led to the revamping and re-invigorating of the three agencies responsible for implementation: at the federal level, the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC); the State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB); and the Local Government Education Authority (LGEA; UBEC, 2004). The constitutional responsibility given to the three tiers of the government in implementing the UBE policy were similar, but all geared towards achieving the UBE objectives. In agreement with this, the federal government's role in implementing the UBE was to ensure quality control, maintenance of uniform standards and general coordination of program implementation. The UBEC is the federal arm of the bureaucratic implementation of the UBE, and operates as an intervention to coordinate and monitor agencies to progressively improve the capacity

of the states, local government agencies and communities to provide unfettered access to high quality basic education in Nigeria (UBEC, 2010). However, it has been over a decade since the Nigerian government's reform of basic education occurred. The modest performance of basic education in Nigeria in terms of access — retention, completion, and achievement — in the past decade is cause for concern. The World Bank appraisal of the basic education reforms in Nigeria reached an overall unsatisfactory outcome, with risk to development outcomes significant and bank performance unsatisfactory because the performance of the borrower (Nigeria) was also rated as unsatisfactory (World Bank, 2008, 2015). Nigerian education's stagnation over recent years posed a challenge to the country's ability to fulfil the 2015 goal as stated in the UBE policy. The current exclusion of a large majority of young people from the system represents a waste of national resources, and constitutes an imminent threat to the stability of the country's already volatile political landscape (USAID/FNG, 2009). The overall appraisals of other international agencies also point to problems in the implementation strategy of UBE. The ratings in terms of relevance, efficiency, and effectiveness were unsatisfactory and negligible. The work therefore is geared towards determining management of policy implementation process in universal Basic Education (UBE) in Nigeria, the evidence from practice.

### **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

The general purpose of the study is management of policy implementation process in Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Nigeria, the evidence from practice. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Know the extent the secondary school authorities responsible for UBE implementation hold a shared understanding of the policy intent
2. How the actions of the secondary school authorities shape implementation of the UBE policy

### **SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY**

This study is going to be of great importance to the school administrators, primary school teachers, secondary school teachers and students, government, and the society at large.

### **RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

1. What is the extent to which the secondary school authorities responsible for UBE implementation hold a shared understanding of the policy intent?
2. To what extent do the actions of the secondary school authorities shape implementation of the UBE policy?

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **The Universal Basic Education in Nigeria**

In 1999, the Nigerian government introduced Universal Basic Education, a programme to provide free primary and secondary education for all. This programme was created after several unsuccessful attempts at improving education in the country. Unfortunately, although there has been some improvements in enrolment in recent years, its results have been limited and Nigeria's educational system still rates very poorly in most international rankings.

### **THE INITIATIVE**

The Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme in Nigeria was launched in 1999, with the goal of providing "free, universal and compulsory basic education for every Nigerian child aged 6-15 years". The programme, however, was not able to take off immediately after its launch as it did not have legal backing. Therefore, initial UBE-related activities were carried out only in areas of social mobilization, infrastructural development, provision of instructional materials, etc. The UBE programme only took off effectively with the signing of the UBE Act in April 2004.

#### **The main beneficiaries of the programme are:**

- Children aged 3-5 years, for Early Children Care and Development Education (ECCDE);
- Children aged 6-11+ years for primary school education;
- Children aged 12-14+ years for junior secondary school education.
- Its scope included the following expansion of activities in basic education: "Programmes and initiatives for [ECCDE];

**"Programmes and initiatives for the acquisition of functional literacy, numeracy and life skills, especially for adults (persons aged 15 and above);**

"Out-of-school, non-formal programmes for the updating of knowledge and skills for persons who left school before acquiring the basics needed for lifelong learning;

"Special programmes of encouragement to all marginalised groups: girls and women, nomadic populations, out-of-school youth and the almajiris (Qur'anic student);

"Non-formal skills and apprenticeship training for adolescents and youth, who have not had the benefit of formal education."

### **THE CHALLENGE**

Nigeria gained its independence from British rule in 1960, but it took time to develop its own educational system. "Prior to 1977 Nigeria operated an educational policy inherited from Britain at independence. The inability of this policy to satisfy the national aspirations of the country rendered it unpopular." During the 1970s, the foundations were laid for a new policy, and in 1976 the Universal Primary Education (UPE) programme was launched, but it was widely considered to be unsuccessful. "A

National Seminar was organised by the National Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC) in 1973. This gave rise to the National Policy on Education in 1977.”. The policy was then revised in 1981 and 1990 to try to ensure that the education sector was supportive of government development goals.

School enrolment was still low at the beginning of 1990s - as of 1990, gross enrolment ratio in primary school was at 86%, but it had dropped to a mere 25% by the time children reached secondary school. The education sector infrastructure also deteriorated and was neglected. In 1997, the federal minister of education - while on a nationwide tour of the country's schools - allegedly stated that “the basic infrastructure in schools such as classrooms, laboratories, workshops, sporting facilities, equipment, libraries were in a state of total decay. The physical condition of most schools was reported to be pathetic.”

### **THE PUBLIC IMPACT**

There has been some improvement to education in Nigeria since the programme started, but it has been marginal considering its span of almost two decades:

- As of 2015, Nigeria ranked 103 out of 118 countries in UNESCO's Education for All (EFA) Development Index, which takes into account universal primary education, adult literacy, quality of education, and gender parity.
- UNESCO's 2015 review of education in Nigeria found that enrolment at primary and junior secondary levels had greatly increased since 2000. However, transition and completion rates remained below 70%.
- Enrolment rates increased by 130% for secondary education in the period from 2000 to 2013 (based on the latest available statistics from the World Bank), but decreased by 4% for primary level.
- In its latest review of Nigeria's educational standing in 2015, UNESCO has concluded that although progress has been made in basic education, much more remains to be done, both in quantity and quality:
- Participation in primary education is still low in comparison with primary school age population;

The quality of the national school curriculum is undermined by the generally low quality of teachers who implement it, which translates into low levels of learning achievement;

- Infrastructure, toilets and furniture are inadequate and in a dilapidated state;
- The system of collecting comprehensive, relevant data for planning is weak;
- There are social and cultural barriers that are hindering female participation;
- There is a lack of enforcement of the UBE Act 2004 on enrolment and retention.
- Stakeholder engagement

The main stakeholders involved in the Nigerian education policy were the federal government, state governments, as well as some international institutions that have provided support over the years.

However, although there is a clear responsibility and involvement of state actors in terms of implementation and funding, there is no evidence of communication or consultations between institutions at the federal and state level in the design of the UBE programme, which led to misalignment later in the implementation phase. UNESCO mentions, for example, that insufficient consultation with the states in designing and implementing the UBE programme, including project selection, has been one of the main causes of problems in the funding allocations in the years since its launch.

### **POLITICAL COMMITMENT**

The Government of Nigeria has made recurrent attempts to reform its education system since the 1970s, but has lacked the alignment and political continuity to implement its programmes successfully.

Although UPE has been announced as a priority by every Nigerian government since its introduction in the 1970s, the actual commitment of the different governments to the scheme has varied substantially. The economic problems encountered have also contributed to the difficulties experienced in its implementation.

Despite being set up with specific targets, funds and implementation procedure, the national education policy faced significant discontinuity between governments, which negatively affected commitment and consistency across the years. “Educational policies were formulated by various governments, but political instability stalled or discouraged the political will to implement such policies. As new governments came in quick succession and with relative uncertainty, continuity in policies could not be guaranteed. Every political player was in a hurry to help himself before he was displaced by another group. This has affected educational policy implementation in Nigeria.”

### **PUBLIC CONFIDENCE**

Although the Nigerian public viewed the objectives of the UBE positively, their perception of the country's education infrastructure - as well as the government and institutions responsible for running it - were negative.

A study produced for the World Bank in 2000 on the Nigerian education sector concluded that: “The public perception is that the quality of education offered is low and that standards have dropped. These perceptions are based on lack of adherence to acceptable educational practice. Teacher qualifications are low. The learning

environment does not promote effective learning. Basic facilities, teaching and learning resources are generally not available. Teacher-pupil ratios are high. General performance in examinations is poor and the graduates have low levels of competencies in the work environment.”

Corruption was also a factor affecting public confidence. According to a survey conducted by GeoPoll in Nigeria, over half of respondents reported that they frequently encounter corruption in public services, especially in the education sector. “54 percent of Nigerians report that they always or frequently encounter corruption in their interactions with public services. The poll surveyed 2,000 Nigerians about their experiences with corruption in fundamental sectors and found that while Nigerians consider education and electricity to be among the most important public services, they are also seen as the most corrupt. The poll also found that the poorest Nigerians are most affected by corruption.”.

### **CLARITY OF OBJECTIVES**

The objectives of the UBE initiative were stated at the outset, with some measurable targets and some less well-defined objectives:

- “Develop in the entire citizenry a strong consciousness for education and a strong commitment to its vigorous promotion;
- “Provide free, universal basic education for every Nigerian child of school-going age;
- “Reduce drastically the incidence of drop-out from the formal school system (through improved relevance, quality and efficiency);
- “Cater for the learning needs of young persons who, for one reason or another, have had to interrupt their schooling, through appropriate forms of complementary approaches to the provision and promotion of basic education;
- “Ensure the acquisition of appropriate levels of literacy, numeracy, manipulative, communicative and life skills, as well as the ethical, moral, and civic values needed for laying a solid foundation for lifelong learning.”

### **STRENGTH OF EVIDENCE**

The programme was expected to be a continuation of the UPE programme, which was abandoned in 1976, and was similar to its predecessor in many respects. President Obasanjo launched the new UBE programme in September 1999 in order to realise the country's educational ambitions, but it shared with UPE many of the elements that had made the previous initiative unsuccessful.

A study published in 2006 reviewing both programmes concluded that the problems affecting the UBE were the same as those that affected its predecessor, and there was no evidence of improvements to its formats after the relaunch. “[UBE's] problems are the same as those that handicapped the implementation of the UPE. This indicates that



the relaunching of the UPE with the new nomenclature of UBE did not result from any lesson that was learned from the failure of the UPE. The quality of education at the primary level today is worse than the pre-1976 era."

### **FEASIBILITY**

Nigeria has implemented several initiatives since the 1970s to improve their education sector, but they have had important challenges to their implementation, which have compromised the resources and infrastructure required to achieve these programmes' goals.

The key elements and resources for the implementation of the UBE initiative were established in the UBE Act and the National Policy on Education (revised 2004). Some of the policy initiatives from this law include:

- It requires every government in Nigeria to provide compulsory, free, UBE for every child in primary or junior secondary school
- It establishes that all services in public primary and junior secondary schools are to be free of charge - and penalties are prescribed for those who do not comply
- Parents have a duty to enrol their children, and make sure they complete the basic education cycle - with penalties for noncompliance.
- A provision is made to finance the UBE from - a federal government grant of not less than 2% of its Consolidated Revenue Fund, funds or contributions in form of federal guaranteed credits, and local and international donor grants.

In this regard, funding availability for the programme has not actually been a limitation but rather its allocation and accessibility. "It is on record that between 2000 and 2008, the sum of NGN22.6 billion that had been allocated to some public tertiary institutions, state Ministries of Education and Universal Basic Education Boards by the Education Trust Fund was not accessed during the period."

Similarly, human capacity for UBE delivery has been a constraint on programme delivery. A UNESCO report states that the government committed to have the human resource base necessary to manage and implement the UBE Scheme by 2015.

### **MANAGEMENT**

The implementation of the UBE programme is overseen by the UBE Commission (UBEC), with a range of other institutions specifically responsible for education in the country. However, there is no clarity on the management structures and guidelines for the programme's delivery.

Basic education administration and management in Nigeria is the responsibility of Local Education Authorities (LGEAs) under the supervision of State Universal Basic

Education Boards (SUBEBs) and the UBEC at the federal level. There are a large number of other institutions, including: the National Commission for Nomadic Education (NCNE), the National Commission for Mass Literacy, Adult and Non-formal Education (NMEC), the National Teachers' Institute (NTI), the Nigerian Education and Research Development Council (NERDC), the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) and the Teachers' Registration Council of Nigeria (TRCN).

Many argue that, with this array of organizations, the country's institutional framework lacks a clearly defined structure. A study published in 2015, which reviewed a decade of the UBE programme, concluded that "Nigeria does not possess the required executive capacity to effectively implement the UBE programme because of the overlapping functions of bureaucratic agencies. The Nigerian education sector suffers from weak capacity at the institutional, organisational and individual levels. They observed that a weak institutional framework that has multiple agencies with overlapping roles and responsibilities remains unreformed."

### **MEASUREMENT**

There is some evidence of tracking and measurement of basic education data by the UBEC after 2007. However, measurements and monitoring since the outset of the different education initiatives have been weak, and improved only slightly over time.

#### ***The UBEC published some basic education data after 2007, including:***

- Enrolment by the state for different educational levels (primary, junior secondary school, senior secondary school)
- The number of teachers by state for different educational levels
- The annual reports after 2012. The reporting format, however, changes every couple of years, which makes it difficult to track progress effectively.

UNESCO's Education review of Nigeria in 2015 addresses this challenge as one of the main obstacles to achieving progress. "The 2002 Global Monitoring Report documented the fact that Nigeria was one of the countries in sub-Saharan Africa without data on UPE. The report also shows that Nigeria had no data on Gross Enrolment Ratio (GER) and Net Enrolment Ratio (NER), and that the country is one of the 11 African countries at serious risk of not achieving the goal. The exercise to analyse progress towards the goal of UPE has been based on country net enrolment ratios, and these countries had NERs of less than 80%."

Other papers reviewing the initiative also point out that the monitoring systems in place were not appropriate. "Effective performance management systems and efficient monitoring and evaluation within government can help to assess the progress made in the key educational policy priority areas, yet have not been implemented."

## **ALIGNMENT**

The structural alignment of institutions at the national level is not strong, with several organisations overlapping, or with unclear management objectives.

The UBE framework has been described, by Professor Pai Obanya, as “a clear case of discordant dancing to the same musical tune”. Nigeria's UBE was originally conceived to be a coordinated response to the challenge of basic education. However, it has not managed to achieve that degree of coordination, as there are three different government institutions for basic education: the UBEC, the NMEC, and the NCNE. A similar lack of coordination is replicated at state level. “The primary section of UBE is controlled by the SUBEB, while the junior secondary segment is under the control of a Secondary Education Board. Second, the chair of SUBEB is a direct appointee of the state governor and stands on the same pedestal as the head of the education sector in the state - the commissioner for education. Consequently, there is a situation in which a SUBEB is headed by an ‘executive chairman’, who reports directly to the state governor. By the Act establishing the SUBEBs, it means that a large bulk of the school system is under the direct control of the SUBEBs excluding the state ministries of education.”

The under-utilization of funds has also become a major challenge in the implementation of the UBE programme. Several reasons relate to the lack of alignment:

- Insufficient consultation with the states in the design and implementation of the UBE programme;
- Inadequate policy coordination across three tiers of government in the implementation;
- Lack of capacity within states to use funds in accordance with the guidelines;
- Complex conditions for accessing the funds and the associated bureaucracy;
- Lack of capacity and political will at the federal level to amend guidelines in light of experience and to drive through disbursements, etc.

Moreover, the economic difficulties of the country aggravate the situation at the household level, where the levels of poverty make it difficult for parents and families to support children's education. “The UBE programme was not actually performing on its mandate because of the harsh economic realities of parents, which have forced many school age children out of school in search of means of livelihood through hawking or other menial jobs.”

## **THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

### **Fenshaw’s (2009) theory of organization bureaucracy**

Fenshaw’s (2009) theory of organization bureaucracy provided a framework to explore the shared understanding of policy and its implementation. Through Fenshaw,

it was possible to examine how bureaucratic decisions and actions in an organizational setting affected the process of implementation of the universal education program in Nigeria. This theory suggested an analysis of policy implementation, which occurred on three levels: federal, state, and local. At the highest stratum was the UBEC, in charge of central administration and coordinating human resources, controlling financial expenditure, supplying learning resources, and monitoring curriculum innovation and adaptation processes. At the state government level was the SUBEB, delegated with the management duties of supervising schools, teachers, and resource distribution to facilitate instruction and learning for students as stated assisted by the local government level (LGEA) responsible for implementation.

### **EMPIRICAL REVIEW**

Study by Bolaji et al (2016) examined the implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) program and sought to understand the degree of shared understanding among bureaucrats regarding the policy intent and the level of alignment articulated in the policy related to access to basic education in Nigeria. Bureaucrats in two geo-political zones and the Federal Capital Territory were interviewed to assess this shared understanding and its effect on the outcomes for UBE. The attainment of the UBE access goal was limited due to bureaucratic implementation issues. This study recommends an approach that may help operationalize improvement in access to basic education in Nigeria at the system level of implementation.

### **RESEARCH METHOD**

This chapter discusses the methodology of the study which include design of the study, area of the study, population of the study, sample and sampling techniques. Others include instrument for data collection, validation of instrument, reliability of the instrument, method of data collection, and method of data analysis.

### **DESIGN OF THE STUDY**

The design of the study is survey design. According to Iketaku (2011), a survey research design is the collection of sample, attitudes, performance of feelings and in order to estimate the total or overall reaction of an entire group. In other words, survey research design is a method of studying a group of people by collecting information from a few regarded to be the representation of the entire group. The research design was chosen because of high number of students in the study area which the researcher cannot reach out to.

### **AREA OF THE STUDY**

The area of the study is Enugu Education Zone. Enugu Education Zone is made up three local government areas namely: Enugu North, Enugu East and Isi-Uzo Local Government Areas.

### **POPULATION OF THE STUDY**

The population of this study comprised all the teachers in the 31 public secondary schools in Enugu education zone.

### **SAMPLE AND SAMPLING TECHNIQUES**

Sample size is the total number of the population that has been selected, having the attributes of the study to be carried out (Ugofunle, 2007). The sample size for the study is 180. The researcher sampled 12 schools and later sampled 15 teachers each of the schools.

### **INSTRUMENT FOR DATA COLLECTION**

The instrument used for data collection was a 6-item questionnaire titled Accreditation Delivery Questionnaire (ADQ). The questionnaire was structured based on the research questions which were set out to guide the study.

### **VALIDATION OF INSTRUMENT**

The instrument used was validated by an expert in Measurement and Evaluation and two other experts in educational management department; all of them are lecturers in Enugu State of College of Education Technical. The experts critically examined the items and made corrections where necessary. The instrument was finally rewritten by the researcher by considering the suggestions and corrections pointed out by the experts.

### **RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENT**

To ascertain the reliability of the instrument, the questionnaire was administered to ten (10), principals and ten (10) teachers for trial-testing in public secondary schools in Oji Education zone that was not used for the study. A reliability estimate was computed using Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient which gave the value of 0.65. This value indicates that the instrument was reliable.

### **METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION**

The researchers distributed 180 copies of the questionnaire to the respondents and all were collected back on the spot after they had been filled to ensure optimum return of the instrument. The feedback from the questionnaires that were distributed formed the basis for analysis

### **METHOD OF DATA ANALYSIS**

In analyzing the data in this project, data were presented in tables according to the research questions. The researcher weighted the responses of the respondents and converted them into mean scores.

Decision rule was any item that has a mean value below 2.50 indicates disagreement from the respondents while any with mean value 2.50 and above indicates that the

respondents agreed to the items. In analyzing the data, mean scores will be used to answer the research questions

**PRESENTATION OF RESULTS**

The following chapter will be discussed under the purposes and research questions which guided the study

**Research question one:** What is the extent to which the secondary school authorities responsible for UBE implementation hold a shared understanding of the policy intent?

S/N	Items	X	Decision
1.	School Authorities Has In-Depth Knowledge To Implement Policy of UBE	2.54	Agree
2.	School authorities could interpret and execute the policy as stated in the policy blueprint	2.71	Agree
3.	School authorities also have sufficient knowledge of their specific roles in the UBE implementation.	2.67	Agree

In the research question one which sought to know extent to which the school authorities responsible for UBE implementation hold a shared understanding of the policy intent. It was determined in items 1 to 3 with mean values above the cutoff point of 2.5 that school authorities has in-depth knowledge of implementation policy of Ube, School authorities could interpret and execute the policy as stated in the policy blueprint and that School authorities also have sufficient knowledge of their specific roles in the UBE implementation.

**Research Question 2:** To what extent do the actions of the secondary school authorities shape implementation of the UBE policy?

S/N	Items	X	Decision
4.	The actions of school authorities have helped in Monitoring and supervision of the implementation process of UBE policy	3.01	Agree
5.	The school authority structure of implementing UBE policy decisions in Nigeria affects the implementation task due to the top-down hierarchical organizational behavior	2.91	Agree
6.	The school authority structure makes responses to implementation tasks of UBE very slow	2.58	Agree

In the research question two which sought to know the extent actions of the school authorities shape implementation of UBE policy. It was discovered in items 4-6 with mean values above the cutoff point of 2.5 that actions of school authorities have helped in Monitoring and supervision of the implementation process of UBE policy,

The school authority structure of implementing UBE policy decisions in Nigeria affects the implementation task due to the top-down hierarchical organizational behavior and school authority structure makes responses to implementation tasks of UBE very slow

### **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

1. School authorities has in-depth knowledge of implementation policy of Ube, School authorities could interpret and execute the policy as stated in the policy blueprint and that School authorities also have sufficient knowledge of their specific roles in the UBE implementation.
2. Actions of school authorities have helped in Monitoring and supervision of the implementation process of UBE policy, The school authority structure of implementing UBE policy decisions in Nigeria affects the implementation task due to the top-down hierarchical organizational behavior and school authority structure makes responses to implementation tasks of UBE very slow.

### **DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

In the research question one which sought to know extent to which the school authorities responsible for UBE implementation hold a shared understanding of the policy intent. It was discovered that school authorities have in-depth knowledge of implementation policy of Ube, School authorities could interpret and execute the policy as stated in the policy blueprint and that School authorities also have sufficient knowledge of their specific roles in the UBE implementation. In policy implementation, the leadership commitment, and interpersonal relationships among the implementing officials largely determined the overall outcome of any government policy (Lawal & Oluwatoyin, 2011).

In the research question two which sought to know the extent actions of the school authorities shape implementation of UBE policy. It was discovered that actions of school authorities have helped in Monitoring and supervision of the implementation process of UBE policy, the school authority structure of implementing UBE policy decisions in Nigeria affects the implementation task due to the top-down hierarchical organizational behavior and school authority structure makes responses to implementation tasks of UBE very slow

### **CONCLUSION**

The study hereby conclude that School authorities has in-depth knowledge of implementation policy of Ube, School authorities could interpret and execute the policy as stated in the policy blueprint and that School authorities also have sufficient knowledge of their specific roles in the UBE implementation. Actions of school authorities have helped in Monitoring and supervision of the implementation process of UBE policy, the school authority structure of implementing UBE policy decisions in Nigeria affects the implementation task due to the top-down hierarchical

organizational behavior and school authority structure makes responses to implementation tasks of UBE very slow.

### **SUMMARY OF THE STUDY**

This research is aimed to determine the management of policy implementation process in universal basic education (UBE) in Nigeria, the evidence from practice. In carrying out this research, two research purposes with their corresponding research questions were formulated to guide the study. Survey research design was used to carry out the research. The population of the study involves all the secondary school teachers in Enugu Education Zone. The sample size for the study is 180 respondents. The instruments for data collection were a 4 point likert questionnaire. The instrument was validated by three lecturers. The data collected was analyzed using mean statistics. The findings of the study reveals that school authorities has in-depth knowledge of implementation policy of Ube, School authorities could interpret and execute the policy as stated in the policy blueprint and that School authorities also have sufficient knowledge of their specific roles in the UBE implementation. In policy implementation, the leadership commitment, and interpersonal relationships among the implementing officials largely determined the overall outcome of any government policy. That study recommends that there should be adequate monitoring and supervision of the UBE policy for proper implementation in secondary schools

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

The study recommends that:

1. There should be adequate monitoring and supervision of the UBE policy for proper implementation in secondary schools
2. the monitoring mechanism of UBE policy implementation has been very weak and needs to be strengthened

### **REFERENCES**

- Adesina, S. (2016). Planning and educational development in Nigeria. Ibadan, Nigeria: Education Industries Nigeria Limited.
- Adeyanju, T. K. (2010). Evaluation for nation building and sustainable development. In M. H. Mohammed, N. S. Talla, S. A. E. Aparu, & E. O. Ogungbe (Eds.), Education for sustainable development in Nigeria (pp. 25–32). La pai, Nigeria: Faculty of Education and Arts IBB University.
- Akowe, T. (2011, August 25). North still backward in education. The Nation Newspaper, p. 12.
- Aluede, R. A. O. (2006). Universal basic education in Nigeria: Matter arising. *Humanities and Economics*, 20(2), 97–101.
- Anaduaka, U. S., & Okafor, C. F. (2013). The universal basic education program in Nigeria: Problems and prospects. *Basic Research Journal of Education Research and Review*, 2(3), 42–48.



- Bolaji, S. D. (2014). *Intent to action: Overcoming the barriers to universal basic education policy implementation in Nigeria* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Edith Cowan University, Mt Lawley, Western Australia.
- Bolaji, S. D., Olufowobi, O. O., & Oluwole, S. K. (2013). Reinventing the wheel of progress in Nigerian Education: The Deweyian Perspective. *Journal of Educational Studies and Management*, 1(12), 167–176..
- Cresswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications.
- Denga, I. D. (2000). Evolving a new education culture: The universal basic education focus. *International Journal of Research in Basic Education and Long-life Learning*, 1(1/2), 1–6.
- Duffy, B. (2005). Analysis of documentary evidence. In J. Bell (Ed.), *Doing your research project* (p. 97). Berkshire, England: McGraw Hill, Open University Press.
- Edukugho, E. (2006, September 9). Jail terms for parents whose kids are not in school. *Vanguard Newspaper Nigeria*, p. 15.
- Elton, G. R. (2002). *The practice of history*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Ezekwesili, O. (2013, July 28). Governors divert universal basic education funds for other purposes. *Punch Newspaper Nigeria*, p. 23.
- Fafunwa, A. B. (2004). *History of education in Nigeria*. Ibadan, Nigeria: NPC Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Federal Government of Nigeria [FGN]. (2008). *National policy on education*. Lagos, Nigeria: NERDC Press.
- Fenshaw, M. (2009, April). The link between policy and practice in science education: Where does research fit in? Paper presented at the NARST Conference, Baltimore, MD.
- Hakim, C. (2000). *Research design*. London, England: Routledge.
- Ikoya, P., & Ikoya, O. (2005). Determinants of rural-urban variability in the implementation of educational decentralization program in developing countries: The Nigeria experience. *Educational Administration*, 43(5), 500–518.
- Johnson, D. (1984). Planning small-scale research: A new look at Max Weber and his investigation in educational management. In J. Bell & A. Fox (Eds.), *Conducting small-scale investigations in educational management* (pp. 108–121). London, England: Harper and Row.
- Lawal, T., & Oluwatoyin, A. (2011). National development in Nigeria: Issues, challenges and prospects. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 3(9), 237–241. Millennium Development Goals [MDGs]. (2006). *Nigerian Millennium Development Goals*. Federal Republic of Nigeria.