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ABSTRAK


Kata kunci: Bajet Pendidikan, Nigeria, Pendidikan Asas, dan Suruhanjaya UBE.
ABSTRACT

Despite the role of the government, which aims among other things, to provide quality education for the masses, there are outcries from many quarters about the quality of education provided in Nigeria. Basic education is in serious jeopardy due to poor coordination of the programme and low budgetary allocation. Thus, this study analyses problems of political will and its impacts on basic education delivery in Nigeria. This study uses universal basic education (UBE) as a unit of analysis. The qualitative method was used for data collection; two states, Kebbi and Kano, were sampled and 31 respondents from the staff of the UBE Commission, NGOs, alumni, parent-teachers’ association, international partners, such as UNICEF country representatives, the Legislature and members of the Nigerian Union of Teachers were interviewed. The data were analysed using NVivo 10. The result shows that the transaction cost is a major setback to the realisation of basic education provision. Over the years, the analysis of the budgetary allocation to the UBE Commission has shown a downward trend which has affected the growth and development of the educational institution. The findings also reveal that the three levels of government, i.e. the federal, state and local governments are responsible for funding basic education in Nigeria; but the lack of commitment from these three levels as well as other stakeholders have created problems. In addition, the study also discloses that the existing system’s monitoring mechanism is weak, such as inadequate vehicles for supervision, non-utilisation of monitoring reports and lack of provision of incentives to the monitoring staff. The existing system also lacks autonomy due to politics; the politicians determine what the allocation to the Commission is. Other problems hindering the development of the institution are weakness in planning, roles and responsibilities, unclear funding among the three levels (federal, state and local) of governments, corruption, teachers leaving the profession for greener pastures, dilapidated infrastructure such as classrooms, and also a high rate of dropouts. The study recommends increased commitment of the governments, public-private partnership and adequate autonomy to be given to the institution, as well as building consensus with the stakeholders.
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CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

It is an indisputable fact that education is the most important instrument for the development of individuals and the nation at large. It is also important to note that primary education is the nucleus of whatever efficacy is traceable to education. That is why efforts were made during the time of Nigeria’s first generation nationalist leaders to make primary education qualitative and accessible to all. Unfortunately, their efforts were thwarted by three main problems: funding, management and structural deviation. The national primary education programme would have achieved significant development if it had taken care of these main problems. When the national primary education initiative was launched in 1976, the enrolment was eight million pupils, and by 1983 when the programme went awry, the enrolment stood at 16 million. With this astronomical increase and without adequate funding, the programme could not see the light of day. By 1984, the primary schools were in short supply of everything - school buildings were dilapidated and children were reading under trees. As a result, the federal government had to intervene in order to rescue the system. Since then, the primary education programme has witnessed changes from one tier of government to another until the year 1999 when the federal government once again came in to salvage the situation (UBE, 2012).
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