

Redressing the Management Challenges of Nomadic Education Institutions for Optimum National Security in Nigeria

Sa'adu Isa Bashar and Aminu Malami Sifawa

Department of Educational Foundations, Sokoto State University, Nigeria
mmbashar1984@gmail.com; aminumalamisifawa5@gmail.com

Abstract

National security is only achievable if the schools that provide learning to the teeming students are properly managed. The paper reports the findings of the study conducted on the challenges that affect the management of nomadic education schools in Shagari Local Government Area of Sokoto State. The main thrust of the study was to find out whether funding, facilities, staffing and supervision affect the management of nomadic schools in the area. Four (4) research questions were raised and answered. The study was descriptive survey which targeted 16 stakeholders as its population which comprised of teachers and head teachers of the 5 nomadic schools in the area. Purposive sampling technique was used in determining the sample size while Questionnaire was used as the instrument for data collection. The data was presented in simple frequency distribution table. Findings revealed that poor funding, inadequate facilities, inadequate qualified staff and irregular supervision are the major challenges that affect the management of the nomadic schools. To get rid of these challenges for effective management of the schools, the paper recommended that government, and non-governmental organizations should double their commitment towards ensuring proper funding, providing adequate teaching and learning facilities, deployment of adequate and qualified teachers; and conducting regular supervision for ensuring improvement of education and proper management of the schools.

Keywords: Challenges; Management; Nomadic; Schools; National Security.

Introduction

Education is “the process of acquiring knowledge, skills, attitudes, interest, abilities, competence and the cultural norms of a society by people to transmit this life to the coming generations so as to enhance perpetual development of the society” (Uwaifo and Uddin, 2009; p. 81). Throughout the world, Education is considered as the major yardstick for measuring development; thus the higher the level of nation’s educational attainment, the greater the level of its development (Nelson, 2002; Saint, 2002; Tettey, 2002; Nunn, 2005; Mouton, Boshoff, Kulati and Teng-Zeng, 2007; Uwaifo and Uddin 2009). This is why in the history of man, societies through different ages, survived with one form of education or the other: indigenous or western education (Uwaifo and Uddin, 2009) because, education is as essential to man as life itself on this planet earth and it varies from place to place and from time to time (Uwaifo and Uddin, 2009). The Federal Government of Nigeria in its National Policy on Education (FGN, 2013) described education as an instrument per excellence and an investment that covers the all-round development of an individual which enables one to “acquire practical skills, innovative ideas, creativity, spirit, and development of mental, physical and social abilities that will enable one live, produce and contribute to the development of the society in which one lives” (P. 1). Adedeji and Campbell (2014) posited that education is the most powerful instrument for developing and empowering the citizens to master their social and cultural environment and compete for survival. Also in their own perspectives, Akhuenonkhan, Raimi and Dada, (2014), reiterated that education remains the catalyst of social change in that it is a medium through which the societal norms and values could be transmitted to future generations. It is still a means through which economic growth, technological progress, and individual capacities could be boosted to the desired level for the overall national and or international development (World Bank, 2008). Education undoubtedly helps in providing solutions to some given problems that affect the individuals and serves as an essential tool for achieving sustainable development and is a key to moving society towards sustainability (Tilbury, Stevenson, Fien and Schreuder, 2002).

Literature Reviews

The concept of National security implies the state of a nation being free from any harm or danger, criminal activities or violence. According to Adebajo, (2004), the security of a nation could be perceived when such

a nation feels safe and secured from any harm or danger, whereby the defense protection and preservation of core values and the absence of threat to acquire values prevail. However, Bashar, Sambo, and Ibrahim (2017) also perceived national security as the state of being free from any threat of life and be capable of preserving the nation's core values in the society so as to live a better life and benefit one's self, society and the nation at large. National security could never be fully achieved until every citizen knows his/her full responsibilities and this could be known through formal education. To this end, Nigeria as a multi-ethnic, multi-religious, multi-linguistic, multi-cultural and multi-identity (Abdulrahman, 2016), recognizes and pledged more commitment towards providing equal education opportunities for all its citizens including the nomads. The nomads are the people who include the Fulani herds men, the farmers and the fishermen who move from one place to another in search for food or pasture. These people, even though they are in disadvantaged group, yet they contribute meaningfully in national development through food security, meat, milk and skin production. To get them educated for national security, nomadic Education Programme was introduced to cater for them (NCNE, 2019).

Nomadic Education Programme is an educational initiative of the Federal Government of Nigeria that aims at providing the children of the nomad equal education opportunity (NCNE, 2019). The Federal Government defined Nomadic Education in the National Policy on Education (2013) as the first six years of Basic Education provided to the children of the disadvantaged nomadic population in the country which include the pastoralists, the migrant fishermen, and the migrant farmers. However, the NCNE (2019), clarified that Nomadic Education Programme aims at providing and widening access to quality basic education for nomads in Nigeria, boosting literacy and equipping them with skills and competences to enhance their well-being and participation in the nation-building process. According to (Tahir, Muhammad and Mohammed, 2005), the aims of the Nomadic Education program (NEP) are to provide an unfettered access to quality basic education for nomads and to boost literacy and equip them with skills and competencies to enhance their well-being and participation in nation building.

The National Commission for Nomadic Education (NCNE, 2019, P. 1) has further outlined the general objectives of the nomadic education programme in Nigeria to include:

“exposing the nomadic child to the elementary forms of modern education; enabling the nomadic child take part in the development of his immediate environment, in particular, and the country in general; making the nomadic child self-reliant to improve his living conditions, thus eliminating the hardships and constraints in his/her life; helping him/her modernize his/her techniques of herdsman ship on animal management, fishing or farming as the case may be; assisting the nomadic child develop rapidly and fully, both physically and intellectually, to cope with the demands of the contemporary world; and developing the initiative of the nomadic child and stimulate in him/her scientific and analytical modes of thinking”.

To achieve the goals of nomadic education in the country, Shagari, Bello and Umar (2013) affirmed that Nomadic Education in Nigeria has been provided to its targeted beneficiaries through different dimensional schooling approaches. These include regular school system, on-site school system, mobile school system, adult education programmes, and distance education programmes. The regular school system is an approach that is being used in teaching the nomadic children that have a proper settlement. The on-site school system is often used for used for educating semi sedentary nomadic groups, and are the schools mostly situated along the routes of the nomads. The mobile schools otherwise called portable classrooms are the ones that are suggested to be used for teaching the nomads' mobile families. Adult Education programmes are also other approaches that are used for educating adult nomadic men and women, while Radio and television which are also known as distance education programmes are also other media for educating the nomads. Nomadic education in Nigeria is faced by numerous challenges that affect its proper conduct and implementation across the country. According to (Iro, n.d.), this programme is affected by many problems which hitherto include defective policy, inadequate finance, faulty school placement, incessant migration of students, unreliable and obsolete data, and cultural and religious taboos. While some of these problems are solved by policy and infrastructure interventions, most of the problem are complex and difficult to

solve. According to him, the persistence of these problems is causing the roaming Fulani to remain educationally backward. Similarly, Ibanga, (2016) contends that nomadic education in Nigeria suffers from multi-dimensional obstacles which include defective policies which have not been able to translate the objectives of the programme in to tangible realities. Poor planning also affects the programme and this implies the inability of the system to incorporate the nomads directly in planning the programme effectively and this resulted in to programme’s inability to address the salient needs and aspirations of the target nomads. Another problem is insufficient funding in the sense that many of the states in which this programme exists are unable to settle the financial costs of the schools in their states. This is coupled with the inability of some states in paying the teachers’ salaries let alone providing funds for the supply of infrastructures that are needed for running the affairs of the schools for the nomads. The next challenge is that of instability of the nomads due to their mobile nature of the people which consequently affects the proper monitoring and planning of both staff and students of the schools. other problems include inaccurate data for planning, improper locations of the schools as well as inadequate facilities of logistic supports.

This research seeks to bridge a research and literature gap by studying the challenges that affect the management of the nomadic education schools in Shagari Local Government Area of Sokoto State. This is with a view to finding out whether funding, staffing, supervision and facilities affect the management of the institutions in the study area.

Methodology

This research is a descriptive survey that focused on investigating the challenges that affect the management of Nomadic Education schools in Shagari Local Government Area of Sokoto State. The population of the study include 11 teachers, and 5 Head-teachers of the five nomadic schools in the area. Purposive sampling technique was also used in determining the sample size of the respondents based on the suggestion of Krejcie & Morgan, (1970). Data was collected through a survey instrument developed by the researcher tagged “Challenges Affecting the Management of Nomadic Education Schools Questionnaire” (CAMNESQ). After establishing its validity, its reliability was established at 0.9 through the Cronbach’s alpha of the SPSS version 20, after conducting a pilot study. The Instrument was distributed among the respondents and was collected after been completed by the same.

Analysis of Data and Presentation of Results

The data collected were presented and analyzed on the basis of each of the research questions:

RQ1: Does funding affect effective management of Nomadic Education Centers?

Table 1: Responses on Funding of Nomadic Schools

Statement	SA %	A %	SD %	D %	Total %
Our nomadic school does not receive-enough funding from the government.	4 (25%)	8 (51%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	100%
Our nomadic school does not collect-registration fees from the students.	16 (100%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	100%
Our school does not receive any funding from NGOs.	4 (25%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	2 (12%)	100%
International bodies do not help in funding our school programmes.	5 (31%)	8 (51%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	100%
Our nomadic school has no other sources of income apart from that of the government.	10 (63%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	100%

Source: Field Data (2019)

Results in Table 1 show that 76% of the respondents agreed that their nomadic school does not receive enough funding from the government while 24% of the respondents disagreed. However, 100% of the

respondents agreed that their nomadic school does not collect registration fees from the students. Again, 63% of the respondents agreed that their school does not receive any funding from the non-governmental organizations, while 37% of them disagreed. Similarly, 82% of the respondents agreed that international bodies do not help in funding their nomadic school programmes while 51% agreed and also 18% strongly disagreed. Moreover, 69% of the respondents agreed that their nomadic school has no other sources of income apart from that of the government while 31% of the respondents disagreed.

RQ2: Does Supervision affect the management of Nomadic Education Schools?

Table 2: Responses on Supervision of Nomadic Schools

Statement	SA %	A %	SD %	D %	Total %
1. Supervisors do not regularly visit our nomadic schools for supervision.	6 (38%)	6 (38%)	0 (0%)	4 (24%)	100%
2. The supervisors do not have qualification that is needed in performing their job.	4 (24%)	0 (0%)	8 (52%)	4 (24%)	100%
3. The supervisors do not spend time to talk to the teachers and students when they visit the schools.	3 (18%)	2 (12%)	8 (52%)	3 (18%)	100%
4. Supervisors do not always report the school demands to the Nomadic agency	2 (13%)	3 (18%)	9 (56%)	2 (13%)	100%
5. The school supervisors do not offer professional support to the school.	4 (25%)	2 (13%)	5 (31%)	5 (31%)	100%

Source: Field Data (2019)

Results in Table 2 show that 76% of the respondents agreed that supervisors do not regularly visit their nomadic schools, while at the same time 23% of them who are the minority disagreed with the above statement. This means that supervisors do not visit the schools on regular basis. Again, 24% of the respondents agreed that the supervisors do not have the qualification that is needed in performing their job; but, 76% disagreed. This implies that the supervisors have educational qualification that enable them carryout their supervisory functions in the schools. However, 30% of the respondents agreed that the supervisors do not spend much time to talk to the staff and students when they visit their schools; while, 70% disagreed. This shows that majority of the respondents are of the opinion that the supervisors spend time to discuss issues with the school stakeholders while supervision. Furthermore, 31% of the respondents agreed that supervisors do not report the demands of their schools to the Agency for nomadic education. However, 69% of the respondents which constitute the majority of them disagreed with this notion. This means that the supervisors tend to report the needs and demands of the schools to the agency. Lastly, 38% of the respondents agreed that the supervisors do not offer professional support to the school; while 62% of the respondents disagreed. This signifies that the supervisors do provide professional support to the teachers and others in the institutions.

RQ3: Does staffing affect the management of Nomadic Education schools?

This section provides information on whether staffing affects effective management of Nomadic schools in the study area.

Table 3: Responses on staffing of the Nomadic Schools.

Statements	SA %	A %	SD %	D %	Total
------------	------	-----	------	-----	-------

1. Our nomadic school has no enough teaching manpower.	6 (36%)	3 (17%)	4 (17%)	5 (30%)	100%
2. Most of the teachers in our nomadic school are not qualified.	4 (25%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	2 (12%)	100%
3. Our nomadic school has no adequate supporting staff.	10 (63%)	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	100%
4. Almost all subject areas in our school Have no specialized teachers	4 (25%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	2 (12%)	100%
5. The Nomadic Agency does not promptly- act to the requests of teachers and head teachers of our schools	5 (31%)	8 (51%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	100%
6. Staff in our school are not stable as they are frequently transferred and or leave.	4 (25%)	8 (51%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)	100%

Source: Field Data (2019)

Results in Table 3 show that 53% of the respondents agreed that their schools do not have enough teaching manpower; while, 47% of the respondents disagreed. Also, 63% of the respondents agreed, on their own, that most of the teachers in their nomadic schools are not qualified; while 37% of the respondents disagreed. Again, 69% of the respondents agreed their schools have no adequate supporting staff, and only 31% disagreed. Similarly, 63% of the respondents agreed that almost all their subject areas in the schools have no specialized teachers; but only 37% disagreed with the statement. Moreover, 82% of the respondents agreed that the agency for nomadic education does not promptly act to the requests of teachers and head teachers of their schools; it is only 18% of the respondents did not agree. Lastly, 76% of the respondents agreed that the staff in their schools were not stable as they are being frequently transferred or leave the job; while, 24% of the respondents disagreed.

RQ4: Do facilities affect the management of Nomadic Education schools?

Table 4: Responses on facilities in Nomadic Schools

Statement	SA %	A %	SD %	D %	Total %
1. Our school has no enough facilities for running the nomadic education programmes.	8 (50%)	4 (25%)	4 (25%)	0 (0%)	100%
2. Our school has no appropriate classroom structures	7 (44%)	2 (12%)	7 (44%)	0 (0%)	100%
3. Our school facilities are poorly maintained due to poor maintenance culture of the staff and the people in the area	8 (50%)	2 (13%)	2 (12%)	4 (25%)	100%
4. Our school facilities are often damaged because of the hostile nature of the Fulani and farmers in the area	4 (25%)	8 (50%)	4 (25%)	0 (0%)	100%
5. Our school does not have a well-equipped library and laboratory	10 (63%)	0 (0%)	6 (37%)	0 (0%)	100%
6. Our school does not have electricity supply and does not use ICT facilities in running its educational programmes	10 (63%)	0 (0%)	6 (37%)	0 (0%)	100%

Source: Field Data (2019)

Results in Table 4 show that 75% of the respondents agreed that their schools had no enough facilities for running the Nomadic Education programmes; while 25% of them disagreed. Again, 56% of the respondents agreed that their schools had no appropriate classroom structures; while 44% of the respondents disagreed. However, 63% of the respondents agreed that their school facilities are poorly maintained due to poor maintenance culture of the staff and students, but 37% of them did not agree. Similarly, 75% of the respondents agreed that their school facilities are often damaged because of the hostile nature of the Fulani

and farmers in the area; while 25% of them disagreed. Moreover, 63% of the respondents agreed that the nomadic schools do not have well-equipped libraries and laboratories while 37% of the respondents. Lastly, 63% of the respondents agreed that the schools do not have electricity supply and never use ICT facilities in running its educational programmes while 37% of them disagreed.

Discussion of Findings

The study discovered that the nomadic schools in the study area suffer from the challenge of funds. This is because they do not receive enough finances from the government, do not collect registration fees from the students, do not receive any fund from the non-governmental organizations, international bodies do not help the schools with some funds, and that the schools have no investments or other sources through which they generate income for running the affairs of the schools. This challenge has been identified by many scholars (such as Ekundayo, 2010; Okoye, 2017 and Meador, 2018) as a great problem which is capable of deterring the success of schools. According to Ekundayo (2010), the success of any relies on the resources that are accessible to it and the most important of these resources are the financial ones because with it, everything that is important in the school could be can be obtained. However, Jaiyeoba and Atanda (2005) and Omoregie (2005), pointed out that the influx of students' enrolment in formal schools is what resulted into the government's inability to shoulder the funding of education in its fullest possible degree. "There is no doubt whatsoever, that the inadequate funding of ... the ...school systems...has hindered the accomplishment of some of the aims and objectives of ... education as contained in the National Policy on Education" (Ekundayo, 2010; p.189).

It was also found that poor supervision is yet another challenge that affect the management of the nomadic schools in the study area. This is on the ground that majority of the respondents confirmed that supervisors do not regularly visit their schools and that this is a problem because educational supervision is supposed to be on regular basis so that errors and mistakes in the operational issues of the schools could be corrected, remedied or improved. Corroborating this finding, Ekundayo (2010) and Okoye (2017), opined that poor or inadequate supervision remains a great challenge that hinders school effectiveness. To them, effective teaching and learning performances are often improved through routine supervision. Moreover, Ayodele (2002), lamented that poor supervision or irregular supervision perpetually affects the effectiveness of a school system.

Similarly, the study established that shortage and poor motivation of staffing is another problem that bedevils the effective management of nomadic schools in the study area. This is understood from the responses of the majority of the respondents who buttressed that the schools had no enough teaching staff, most of the teachers in the schools are unqualified, most of the subject areas in the schools have no subject-specialized teachers, staff demands are not met or satisfied by the mother ministry or agency of the schools, and the frequent transfer of teachers who are moved by the ministry or leave the job for some reasons. Scholars like Fadipe (2003); Ajayi and Oguntoye (2003); Ekundayo (2010); and Okoye (2010), reported that low morale of teachers and staff in schools is among the factors that hinder effectiveness of a school. They therefore elaborated that teachers as the back bones of the school system and that no school can transcend beyond the quality of its teachers, therefore, teachers whose morale is low or very poor, are not liable to perform as expected in the school. Lamenting on the poor state and low morale of teachers in our schools generally, Ajayi and Oguntoye (2003), stated that schools now become one of the centers of cultism, examination malpractices, drug abuse, indiscipline, and poor academic performance of students; perhaps, because the teachers have not been doing their duties in true form. Upon this premise, Fadipe (2003), placed that teachers, are the most essential resources of the schools; if they are motivated, they would work better and if demotivated, blunders will prevail in the schools. However, these most important resources are somewhat being neglected and demoralized in that they are often denied regular promotion, coupled with low esteem in the society, vis-a-vis poor salary. These, therefore hinder the schools from accomplishing their target objectives.

Furthermore, the study revealed that problem of facilities is another factor that challenges the effectiveness of the management of the nomadic schools in the study area. This comes from the opinions of the respondents who agreed that their schools had no enough facilities for running the Nomadic Education programmes, no appropriate classroom structures, the few available facilities are poorly maintained, the schools had no equipped libraries and laboratories, the schools have no electricity supply and never use ICT facilities in running their educational programmes. This challenge has been analysed by Okoye (2017) and Ekundayo (2010), as one of the problems that limit the school effectiveness. These scholars are of the believe that inadequate school facilities coupled with infrastructural decay (Okoye, 2017 and Ekundayo, 2010), affect the general operational phenomena of the schools. this is because, they perceived that school facilities are the material assets that contribute towards enhancing the effectiveness of schools in terms of teaching and learning processes. This why Ahmed (2003) and Jaiyeoba and Atanda (2005) contend that school facilities, such as good classrooms, good offices, good libraries, good laboratories, and good instructional materials, empower a teacher to accomplish dimensions of teaching effectiveness that far surpasses what is attainable when they are not given. Unfortunately, these resources are not available in many of the Nigerian schools, and where the few available are, are often decayed, dilapidated or even damaged, with little or no renovations. These, in no small measure thwarted the realization of the target educational goals of the schools.

Conclusions

The study investigated the challenges that affect the management of nomadic schools in Shagari Local Government area. The study discovered that the major challenges that bedevil the effective management of the schools include shortage of funds, irregular and poor supervision, shortage of staff and poor motivation, as well as inadequate facilities for supporting teaching and learning processes in the schools.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, the following solutions are recommended:

Adequate funding needs to be provided by the federal government to all the nomadic schools across the country so as to enable them function as effectively as possible. Similarly, the state governments in which the nomadic schools are available, need to intensify effort in complementing the schools' effort through providing financial assistance to them to enable them run their activities smoothly. Also, the non-government organizations need to come-in and involve the nomadic schools in their financial aids which they normally provide to other formal schools so as to empower them in the discharge of their operations. The nomadic schools in the area need to be regularly supervised. This supervision should be from both within the schools and outside the schools. from the within, the school heads need to be supervising the entire routine schools activities and offer necessary support so as to correct the mistakes of the teachers. Similarly, officials from the inspectorate units of the ministries of education or nomadic education agencies must ensure regular supervision to the schools so as to see their problems and proffer possible solutions to them. The ministry of education needs to ensure the posting of more specialised and qualified teachers in the nomadic schools so that quality education could be provided for the overall societal development. However, teachers need to be motivated through regular promotions, payment of salaries and some hazard allowances for them to feel courageous in performing their duties. This will make the teachers stay firm in their job and would not wish to leave the job for another. The governments at all levels need to ensure that more facilities such as classrooms, libraries, laboratories, and other instructional materials are put in place in the nomadic schools in order to boost the teaching and learning processes. Similarly, the dilapidated facilities and equipments need to be repaired, renovated, and improved so as to return to the normalcy of their operations in the schools.

References

- Abdulrahman, Y. M. (2016). Trends and Innovations in Education of Nigerian Nomadic Population. *Foro de Educación, 14*(20), 407–428. <https://doi.org/10.14516/fde.2016.014.020.020>
- Adebajo, A. (2004). *Introduction to business in Adebajo and Rashid (Eds) West Africa's Security Challenges.*
- Ahmed, T. M. (2003). Education and national development in Nigeria. *Journal of Studies in Education, 10*, 35–46.

- Ajayi, I. A. and Oguntoye, H. O. (2003). Motivation as correlate of teachers' job performance in Ogun State Secondary Schools. *UNAD Journal of Education*, 3, 155—162.
- Akhuemonkhan, I., Raimi, L. and Dada, J. O. (2014). Impact of quality assurance on technical Vocational education and training in Nigeria. *Afro Asian Journal of Social Sciences*, 5(2).
- Ayodele, J. B. (2002). The perception of secondary school teachers on the impact of external supervision. *Journal of Educational Foundations and Management*, 2(1), 35–42.
- Bashar, S. I., Sambo, Z. and Ibrahim, B. (2017). Islamic Management Models and their perceived implications on conventional school administration. *Fajr Journal of Islamic Studies, Shehu Shagari College of Education, Sokoto*, 2(4), 234.
- Ekundayo, H. T. (2010). Administering Secondary Schools in Nigeria for Quality Output in the 21 St Century : the Principals ' Challenge. *European Journal of Educational Studies*, 2(3), 187–192.
- Fadipe, J. O. (2003). Quality control in education: the teacher factor. In (eds) , Ondo. . In T. E. A. and J. Fadipe (Ed.), *Skills improvement programme for effective performance of teachers in Nigerian schools*. (p. 128—143). Ondo, Nigeria: A publication of National Institute for Educational Planning and Administration (NIEPA).
- FGN. (2013). *National Policy on Education*. Retrieved from <https://educatetolead.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/national-education-policy-2013.pdf>
- Ibanga, I. (2016). Problem and Prospect of Nomadic Education in Nigeria. Retrieved June 29, 2019, from <https://infoguidenigeria.com/problem-prospect-nomadic-education-nigeria/>
- Iro, I. (n.d.). Problems of Nomadic Education and Education for Nomadic Fulani. Retrieved June 29, 2019, from <http://www.gamji.com/fulani7.htm>
- Jaiyeoba, A. O. and Atanda, A. I. (2005). Quality sustenance in Nigerian educational system: challenges to government. In S. U. U. and E. O. F. G. O. Akpa (Ed.), *Deregulating the provision and management of education in Nigeria*. Jos: M. P. Ginac Concept.
- Krejcie, R.V. and Morgan, D. . (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30, 607-610.
- Meador, D. (2018). *Problems for Teachers That Limit Their Overall Effectiveness*. Retrieved from <https://www.thoughtco.com/problems-for-teachers-that-limit-their-overall-effectiveness-3194679>
- Mouton, J. Boshoff, N., Kulati, T. and Teng-Zeng, F. (2007). *Scientific mobility and the African diaspora*. Retrieved from www.resist.research.net
- NCNE. (2019). Nomadic Education. Retrieved June 28, 2019, from National Commission for Nomadic Education website: <http://www.ncne.gov.ng/mandate/>
- Nelson, B. (2002). *Meeting the challenges: the governance and management of universities*. Commonwealth Department of Education, Science and Training.
- Nunn, A. (2005). *The brain drain: academic and skilled migration to UK and its impacts on Africa*. Retrieved from www.leadsnet.ac.uk/ibs/pvi
- Okoye, A. C. (2017). Entrepreneurship Education: A panacea for graduate Unemployment in Nigeria. *Online Journal of Arts, Management and Social Science*, 2(1), 56–63.
- Omoriegbe, N. (2005). Quality Assurance in Nigerian University Education and Credentialing. *Education*, 129(2), 335–343.
- Saint, W. S. (2002). *Universities in Africa: Strategies for stabilization and revitalization*.
- Shagari, M. ., Bello, H. Y. and S., U. (2013). The Role of Nomadic Education in Developing Nomadic Community. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(6), 17–22. <https://doi.org/10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n6p17>
- Tahir, G., Muhammad, N. and Mohammed, A. M. (2005). Improving the Quality of Nomadic Education in Nigeria: Going Beyond Access and Equity. In *Association for the Development of Education in Africa*.
- Tettey, W. J. (2002). Africa's brain drain: exploring possibilities for its positive utilization through networked communities. Retrieved April 25, 2019, from <http://motspluriels.arts.uwa.edu.au/mp.2002wjt.htm>/Accessed April 25th 2019
- Tilbury, D., Stevenson, R. B., Fien, J. and Schreuder, D. (2002). *Education and Sustainability Responding to the Global Challenge, Commission on Education and Communication* (D. S. Daniella Tilbury, Tobert B. Steven, John Fien, Ed.). Retrieved from <https://books.google.com.my/books?hl=en&lr=&id=>
- Uwaifo, V. O. and Uddin, P. S. O. (2009). Transition from the 6-3-3-4 to the 9-3-4 System of Education in Nigeria : An Assessment of Its Implementation on Technology Subjects. *Stud Home Comm Sci*, 3(2): 81-86 (2009, 3(2), 81–86.
- World, B. (2008). *Global Economic Prospects -Technology Diffusion in the Developing World*. Washington DC.