

# Policy Directive and Implementation of University Education in Rivers State

ADIELE, E. EDWARD

IJINDA VALENTINA CHRISTIAN

Department of Educational Management (Planning)  
Faculty of Education  
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni,  
Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria  
vcijinda@gmail.com

---

## Abstract

This study examined policy directive for implementation of university education in Rivers State. Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The population for this study comprised three hundred (300) respondents which was made up of selected academic and non-academic staffs of the 3 public universities in Rivers State. The sample for this study was 171 respondents which was determined using the Taro Yamane formula. The simple random sampling technique was utilized to select the sample for this study, and data for the study was collected through the use of structured questionnaire titled: 'Policy directive and implementation of University Education Questionnaire (PDEIUEQ)'. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while a z-test was used to test the hypothesis at 0.05 alpha level of significance. Findings from the study showed that there is a significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staff on how strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State; there is no significant difference between the mean responses of academic and non-academic staff on the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State, amongst others. It was concluded that effective implementation of prevocational education curriculum will lay a solid foundation for the training of future engineers, technologist, accountants, and entrepreneur. Finally, the study recommended that proper planning should be taken to make provisions for instructional materials needed for effective learning and proper implementation of educational policy in Nigeria.

**Keywords:** Policy directive, effective implementation, university education, Rivers State.

---

## INTRODUCTION

### Background to the Study

Education can be defined as a formal system of learning which includes acquisition of knowledge, skills, attitudes and training of people's mind in a particular direction to bring about desired changes. The importance of education cannot be over-emphasized; as nations who

prioritize education progress by leaps and bounds. Global educational policy as the United Nations Human Rights declared access and participation of education as a fundamental human right for all global citizens of the world (Okafor, 2012). To this effect, the greatest investment a nation can make for the development of its economic, sociological and human resources is that of education (Okafor, 2012). Ogbonnaya (2013) defines education as the “aggregate of all the processes by which a child or an adult develops the abilities, attitudes and other forms of behavior which are of positive value to the society in which they lives, that is to say, it is a process of disseminating knowledge either to ensure social control or to guarantee rational direction of the society or both” (Fafunwa, 2017). However, that is to say that every child regardless of tribe, race or family background has a right to sound and quality education in the society where they lives; as education contributes to the growth and development of societies in Nigeria (FRN, 2017).

Educational policies are the principles and government policy-making in educational sphere, as well as the collection of laws and rules that govern the operation of education systems. Education occurs in many forms for many purposes through many institutions. Therefore, education policy can directly affect the education of people engage at all levels of education. According to Thomas, Emilie and Wayne (2018) sees education policy analysis is the scholarly study of education policy which seeks to answer questions about the purpose of education, the objectives that is designed to attain, the methods for attaining them and the tools for me assuring their success or failure. To Okoroma (2010) educational policies are initiatives mostly by governments that determine the direction of an educational system. According to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO,2015) education policy consists of the principles and government policies in the educational sphere as well as the collection of laws and rules that govern the operation of education systems. From the above definitions, the researchers are of the view that every modern society needs some educational policies to guide it in the process of such initiation towards achieving the purpose and objectives for which educational institutions were established.

Implementation is the act of executing a plan, a policy or an assignment. Ogbonnaya (2013) views implementation as the process of carrying out objectives or a plan. It is the process of performing a task, an activity or objective. Nweke (2015) defined implementation as the ability to put law or policy. It is also a tool or means of making something that has been officially decided to start to happen or be used. According to Ibiam (2012), implementation means putting into use or practices the policy that has been made by the government or organization as applicable. It is the realization of an application, plan, ideas, model, design, specification, standard, or policy (Rouse,2017). The action must follow any preliminary thinking in order for something to actually happen. Hrebiniak (2016) asserted that the failure of many implementation processes often stems from the lack of accurate planning, and coordination in the beginning stages of the project due to inadequate resources or unforeseen problems that may arise. Implementation therefore, connotes the activities of transforming ideas and policy into an identified objective.

The pioneering National Education policy was direct fallout of the 1969 national curriculum conference brought about due to a culmination of expressions of general

dissatisfaction with the education system existing at the time as handed over by the colonial administrators. The colonial administrators had administered education through the use of certain education ordinances and education codes, such as the 1882, 1887, 1916, 1926, 1946 and 1926 education codes which had become irrelevant to national needs, aspirations and goals. The national curriculum conference produced a draft document that was subsequently discussed, reviewed and finally updated to the final document now known as the National Education policy. This policy has since become the national guideline for effective administration, management and implementation of education at all tiers of government.

Efforts have been made to develop education in Nigeria since independence in 1960. Various policies in the interest of education have been formulated, some of which will be presented in this study. Unfortunately, these efforts have not produced the desired effect. The state of university education in Nigeria is still deplorable. It is so bad that some Nigerians prefer to send their children to Europe, America and even small African countries such as Ghana and Uganda. Apart from the general problems of policy implementation common to most countries, especially those of the third world, some factors have been identified as peculiar to Nigeria and inhibiting her educational growth. It is no longer news that Nigeria is the giant of Africa in terms of resourcefulness as a major oil and gas producer. Mockingly, most Nigerians live below the poverty line of one dollar per day. However, Okoroma (2016) highlighted the following reasons, among others as responsible for non-implementation of the educational policies in Nigerian Universities to include; lack of political will, corruption, politics and non-motivated teaching and non-teaching staffs, amongst others.

University management in Nigeria has been described as bi-faceted and supposedly managed externally through government agencies and internally through a management structure specific to each institution. The university management structure is saddled with the responsibility of administrative functions, institutional policy formulation, staff development, general discipline, budget approval and liaison activities with the government. Internal management of universities involves the main organ regulating the internal academic activities of universities usually called the 'Senate' and headed by the 'Vice-Chancellor'. The senate of a university manages the academic and non-academic activities of the university in line with the general and specific guidelines provided by the supervising government agency. The need to comprehensively analyze and resolve existing and emerging challenges seems therefore a top priority of university managers and supervising government agencies. Hence, this study will seek to examine policy directive and implementation of university education in Rivers State

## **STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**

National Education policy was formulated for effective administration, management and implementation of education guidelines at all tiers of government. The policy was formulated to assist and ensure universities are managed optimally towards achieving set objectives. Institutional educational policies are local, and the internal administration of each tertiary institution shall bear the responsibility of running their institution according to the FRN (2014). The institutions are also be responsible for developing frameworks, procedures and guidelines

that will ensure the attainment of the policies goals and objectives. Institutional educational policies shall be in line with the national and state policies on education.

Universities are traditionally leaders in the field of knowledge production, research, and societal development. Universities are expected to be drivers of innovation, thereby contributing to the development of a learning society. Impediments against this expectation include lack of inadequate research and learning resources to permit the universities the freedom to carry out the basic functions of academics; erosion of university autonomy and academic freedom as guaranteed by the government of the FRN (2014); brain-drain; student unrest and constant strikes by both students and academic staff. Other potential drawbacks seemingly include poor funding, poor management, corruption, infrastructure deficit, poor working conditions, poor teachers' training and development etc. It is pertinent to know how institutional educational policies of universities in Rivers State address these issues and others such as quality intake of students; quality teaching and learning; research and development; etc. Finding answers to these and other burning questions is one of the key motivations for this study. Therefore, the driving force to conduct an empirical investigation that will seek to examine policy directive and implementation of university education in Rivers State

### **AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

The aim of this study is to investigate policy directive and implementation of university education in Rivers State. The following specific objectives of the study are to:

1. ascertain the extent to which the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State.
2. examine the factors responsible for non-implementation of educational policies in Universities in Rivers State.
3. determine the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies in Universities in Rivers State.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions guided the study

1. To what extent does the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State?
2. What are the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State?
3. What are the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State?

### **Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study

1. There is no significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staffs on the how strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State.

2. There is no significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staffs on the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.
3. There is no significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staffs on the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

## **Review of Related Literature**

### **Policy**

A policy is a statement of principles(s) with supporting rules of action, guidelines, laid down in general and specific terms that governs the achievement of goals to which a business is directed (Wali, 2018). Policy is a general guide to action that helps in management. It is the compass that directs the management in the day-to-day affairs of the institution (Daniel-Kallo, 2018). Nwangwu (2013) defined policy as the official statement by the Government on the chosen course of action and the procedures for achieving it. To Ezeani (2016) policy is the proposed course of action which government intends to implement in respect of a given problem or situation confronting it. Governments are guided to facilitate the achievement of their own goals by policies (Ololube, 2018b). Cochran (2015) posited that policy comprised political decisions for implementing programs to achieve societal goals. Ozor (2014) believed that policy is central to the operation and activities of both private organizations and public institutions. Ikelegbe (2016) in a more elaborate form defined policy as the integrated course and programmes of action that government has set and the framework or guide it has designed to direct action and practices in certain problem area. Policy plays a vital role in management of any institution and states the principles by which members of an institution will act (Rahimi & Noruzi, 2011).

### **National Educational Policy**

Since understanding 'Educational Policy' is germane to the success of this study, the need to review existing literature on the term cannot be over emphasized. Espinoza (2019) posited that educational policy can be formally understood as the actions taken by governments in relation with educational practices, and how government address the production and delivery of education in a given system. Okoroma (2010) believed that educational policies are initiatives mostly by governments that determine the direction of an educational system. Okoroma (2016) stated that the National Education policy is anchored on Nigeria's philosophy on education as enunciated through the nation's objectives. A policy is a statement of principles(s) with supporting rules of action, guidelines, laid down in general and specific terms that governs the achievement of goals to which a business is directed

### **Policy Implementation**

The effectiveness of university management is hinged on successful implementation of education policy. Udey, Ebuara, Ekpoh and Edith (2019) revealed that educational system is plagued with multi-facets problems; notably are: inadequate funding by Federal, State and Local Government,

the problem of access, quality/standard learning, political and social. Edukugho (2013) believed that the consequences of failed policy implementation and poor university management include incessant strike actions by the major unions in the tertiary institutions which leads to instability of academic calendars, poor funding, lack of appropriate autonomy, inadequate infrastructure, crowded classrooms, ill-equipped laboratories and libraries, lack of adequate research grant or incentives, and insufficient accommodation for students and teachers. Ajayi and Ayodele (2012) opined that higher education in Nigeria is in travail, the system is riddled with crises of various dimensions and magnitude.

### **Tertiary Education**

Tertiary Education is the education given after secondary education in universities, colleges of education, polytechnics, monotechnics including those institutions offering correspondence courses (FRN, 2014). The control and general management of tertiary institutions devolves on National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) which regulates polytechnics, monotechnics and technical colleges; National Commission for colleges of Education (NCCE); and National Universities Commission (NUC). Tertiary education therefore produces skilled manpower relevant to the needs of the labour market (FRN, 2014). Nagoba and Mantri (2015) noted that quality of teachers determines the success of any education system in obtaining functionality, which ultimately reflects on the effective teaching and learning process. Waas et. al., (2012) further expressed that tertiary education is generally seen as a potential catalyst to work towards sustainable national development. Abiodun-Oyebanji, (2019) also posited that universities either public or private undoubtedly have come to be regarded as the apex of Nigeria educational system. It is therefore expected of every university to be the think tank of the society in all areas of ramification, generate ideas and knowledge, and equally disseminate them (Ajayi, 2010).

In the study “Institutional Policies and University Students. Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning” by Oladejo (2015), institutional policies on admission, accommodation and health were investigated as correlates of university students' scholastic achievement at the University of Lagos, Nigeria. Findings from the study showed that scholastic achievement was significantly related to admission policy ( $r=.024$ ;  $P<.05$ ); to accommodations policy ( $r=.042$ ;  $P<.05$ ) and to health policy ( $r=.063$ ;  $P<.05$ ).

Nguyen (2016) in the study “Institutional influence on HRM practices in equitized state owned enterprises in Vietnam” examined the effect of human resource policies on employees' performance. Results and findings of the study showed over half of the respondents (52%) agreed that Human Resource recruitment policy had helped in new role adjustment. In addition, majority of respondents with the highest mean of 2.7 felt the policy had also provided opportunities for development and career progression as a motivation for achievement of targets. Moreover, findings showed 72.2% of the respondents agreed that HR appraisal policy supported employees' performance. There was general agreement that HR appraisal policy helped particularly in personal growth leading to better performance. Data analysis specific to the non-management staff revealed that the policy had developed a learning organizational culture to enable performance improvement.

Subair, Okotoni and Adebakin (2012) in the work “Perceived Quality of Infrastructure in Selected Nigerian Universities” investigated the place of infrastructure in maintaining quality in Nigerian universities. It was found that there was no significant difference in infrastructural development between the state and federal universities.

Olasupo (2017) in his study titled “Influence of Infrastructural Facilities on Research Output of Academic Staff of University of Ibadan” investigated the influence of infrastructural facilities on research output of academic staff of University of Ibadan, Nigeria. The finding showed that neither internet facilities nor availability of office furniture had significant relationship lecturers’ research output.

Aydin (2017) in the study titled “Research Performance of Higher Education Institutions: A Review on the Measurements and Affecting Factors of Research Performance” sought to draw attention to “research performance” which is a significant part of the competition among the universities. The researcher determined that research productivity was influenced by several factors classified into external and internal factors. External factors included institutional attributes, such as institutional structure and offered opportunities, while internal factors included individual attributes and demographic variables.

Quimbo and Sulabo (2014) conducted a study to analyze the research productivity of selected higher education institutions. In the study titled “Research productivity and its policy implications in higher education institutions” and covering five state universities in the Philippines, a total of 377 randomly selected faculty members served as research participants. Path analysis showed that educational attainment, research benefits and incentive system were important predictors of both research self-efficacy and research productivity. Self-efficacy was found to be a significant determinant of productivity.

## **METHODOLOGY**

This study employed the descriptive survey research design. The population for this study comprised of 300 respondents which was made up of selected academic and non-academic staff of the 3 public universities in Rivers State, which are University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State University and Ignatius Ajuru University of Education all of them in Rivers State. The sample of this study was 171 respondents which was determined using the Taro Yamane formula. The simple random sampling technique was utilized to select the samples for this study. Data collection for the study was collected through the use of structured questionnaire. The questionnaire was titled: ‘Policy directive and implementation of University Education Questionnaire (PDEIUEQ)’. The structured questionnaire underwent face and content validity testing so as to ensure that the items on the instruments actually measure the constructs they were intended to measure. Validation was done by professionals in the Department of Education Management, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt. Data analysis for this study was done using the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) 23.0 version. Mean and standard deviation were used to describe the set of data used for the study and to answer the research questions, while a **z-test** was used to test the hypothesis at 0.05 alpha level of significance.

## Data Presentation, Analysis, Results and Discussion of Findings

**Research Question 1:** To what extent does the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State?

**Table 1: Mean Responses of Academic and Non-Academic Staff on the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of Educational Policies Influence University Education in Rivers State?**

| S/N               | Questionnaire Items  | Academic    |             | Non-Academic |              | Mean        | Remark        |
|-------------------|--|-------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|
|                   |  | Mean        | SD          | Mean         | SD           |             |               |
| 1                 | My institution readily implements educational policies that improve the welfare of its staffs                    | 3.05        | 0.67        | 2.15         | 0.79         | 2.60        | Agreed        |
| 2                 | University education experiences a backdrop when policies that affects the staffs are not given priority         | 3.04        | 0.74        | 2.19         | 0.74         | 2.62        | Agreed        |
| 3                 | Lack of implementation of staffs salary and remuneration policies hinders quality university education provision | 2.94        | 0.80        | 2.43         | 0.67         | 2.69        | Agreed        |
| 4                 | My institution politicizes policies that does not favour the governing council                                   | 3.06        | 0.80        | 2.10         | 0.70         | 2.58        | Agreed        |
| <b>Grand Mean</b> |  | <b>3.08</b> | <b>0.77</b> | <b>2.14</b>  | <b>0.712</b> | <b>2.57</b> | <b>Agreed</b> |

Source: Survey Data, 2022

### Legends:

$\bar{X}$  : Mean

S.D: Standard Deviation

n : Number

### Scales:

1.00 - 2.49: Low extent

2.50 - 4.00: High extent

Data on table 1 shows that item 1, 2, 3, and 4 had mean sets above the criterion mean of 2.50. The cluster has a grand mean of 2.57 which is above the criterion mean of 2.50 and can be interpreted to mean that the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State.

**Research Question 2:** What are the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State?

**Table 2: Mean Responses of Academic and Non-Academic Staff on the Factors Responsible for the Non-Implementation of Educational Policies for University Education in Rivers State?**

| S/N | Questionnaire Items   | Academic    |             | Non-Academic |             | Mean        | Remark        |
|-----|---|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
|     |   | Mean        | SD          | Mean         | SD          |             |               |
| 6   | Lack of basic amenities for practical teaching                                    | 3.60        | 0.48        | 3.21         | 0.60        | 3.40        | Agreed        |
| 7   | Lack of instructional learning materials to facilitate effective learning process | 3.20        | 0.67        | 2.60         | 0.49        | 2.77        | Agreed        |
| 8   | Non-availability of guidance and counselling services                             | 2.94        | 0.75        | 2.40         | 0.92        | 2.80        | Agreed        |
| 9   | Lack of political will and poor remuneration of lecturers                         | 3.10        | 0.78        | 2.86         | 0.85        | 2.92        | Agreed        |
| 10  | Poor supervision and monitoring   | 3.16        | 0.30        | 3.40         | 0.49        | 2.83        | Agreed        |
|     | <b>Grand Mean</b>   | <b>3.20</b> | <b>0.60</b> | <b>2.89</b>  | <b>0.73</b> | <b>2.94</b> | <b>Agreed</b> |

Data on table 2 shows that item 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10 had mean sets above the criterion mean of 2.50. Item 6 had a mean set of 3.40 above the criterion mean indicating that the enumerated items were among factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State. The cluster has a grand mean of 2.94 which is above the criterion mean of 2.50 and can be interpreted to mean that all the items are factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

**Research Question 3:** What are the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State?

**Table 3 Mean Responses of Academic and Non-Academic Staff on the Strategies for Effective Implementation of Educational Policies for University Education in Rivers State?**

| S/N | Questionnaire Items  | Federal     |             | State       |             | Mean        | Remark        |
|-----|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|
|     |  | Mean        | SD          | Mean        | SD          |             |               |
| 11  | Provision of enabling learning facilities and equipment  | 3.20        | 0.40        | 2.90        | 0.82        | 3.05        | Agreed        |
| 12  | Development of organizational capacity and human resource capacity   | 3.10        | 0.30        | 3.10        | 0.53        | 3.12        | Agreed        |
| 13  | Provision of education to meet the target of the sustainable development goals                                 | 3.51        | 0.50        | 3.05        | 0.38        | 3.28        | Agreed        |
| 14  | Provision of functional education as a way out of youth unemployment   | 3.21        | 0.40        | 3.14        | 0.47        | 3.17        | Agreed        |
| 15  | Provision of quality infrastructural facilities to make school environments learners-friendly for all learners | 3.41        | 0.49        | 2.90        | 0.53        | 3.15        | Agreed        |
|     | <b>Grand Mean</b>  | <b>3.28</b> | <b>0.50</b> | <b>3.44</b> | <b>0.57</b> | <b>3.15</b> | <b>Agreed</b> |

Data on table 3 shows that item 11, 12, 13, 14 and 15 had mean sets above the criterion mean of 2.50. Item 11 had a mean set of 3.05 above the criterion mean indicating that the enumerated strategies were effective implementation for educational policies for university education in Rivers State. The cluster has a grand mean of 3.15 which is above the criterion mean of 2.50 and can be interpreted to mean that all the items were viable strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

### Test of Hypotheses

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staff on the how strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State.

**Table 4: Summary of z-Test Analysis of Mean Ratings of Academic and Non-Academic Staff on the how Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats of Educational Policies Influence University Education in Rivers State.**

| Groups       | N   | $\bar{x}$ | S.D  | Df  | z-cal. | z-crit.    | Decision     |
|--------------|-----|-----------|------|-----|--------|------------|--------------|
| Academic     | 98  | 3.08      | 0.77 | 170 | 2.88   | $\pm 1.96$ | Rejected     |
| Non-Academic | 73  | 2.14      | 0.71 |     |        |            | Significance |
| N=           | 171 |           |      |     |        |            |              |

*Level of significance = 0.05*

Data on Table 4 shows summary of mean, standard deviation and z-test of difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staffs on the how strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State. The calculated z-value used in testing the hypothesis stood at 2.88 while the z-critical value stood at  $\pm 1.96$  using 170 degrees of freedom. At 0.05 level of significance. The calculated z-test of 2.88 is higher than z-critical value of  $\pm 1.96$ , hence there is a significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staffs on the how strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State.

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staff on the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

**Table 5: Summary of Z-Test Analysis of Mean Responses of Academic and Non-Academic Staff on the Factors Responsible for the Non-Implementation of Educational Policies for University Education in Rivers State**

| Groups       | N   | $\bar{x}$ | S.D  | Df  | z-cal. | z-crit.    | Decision        |
|--------------|-----|-----------|------|-----|--------|------------|-----------------|
| Academic     | 98  | 3.20      | 0.60 | 170 | 0.94   | $\pm 1.96$ | Accepted        |
| Non-Academic | 73  | 2.89      | 0.73 |     |        |            | No Significance |
| N=           | 171 |           |      |     |        |            |                 |

*Level of significance = 0.05*

From Table 5 above, the data depicts the summary of mean, standard deviation and z-test of difference between the mean responses of academic and non-academic staffs on the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State. The calculated z-value used in testing the hypothesis stood at 0.94 while the z-critical value stood at  $\pm 1.96$  using 170 degrees of freedom. At 0.05 level of significance. The calculated z-test of 0.94 is less than z-critical value of  $\pm 1.96$ , hence there is no significant difference between the mean responses of academic and non-academic staffs on the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staff on the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

**Table 6: Summary of z-test Analysis of Mean Responses of Academic and Non-Academic Staff on the Strategies for Effective Implementation of Educational Policies for University education in Rivers State**

| Groups       | N   | $\bar{x}$ | S.D  | Df  | z-cal. | z-crit.    | Decision        |
|--------------|-----|-----------|------|-----|--------|------------|-----------------|
| Academic     | 98  | 3.28      | 0.50 | 170 | 0.88   | $\pm 1.96$ | Accepted        |
| Non-Academic | 73  | 3.44      | 0.57 |     |        |            | No Significance |
| N=           | 171 |           |      |     |        |            |                 |

*Level of significance = 0.05*

From Table 6 above, the data reveals the summary of mean, standard deviation and z-test of difference between the mean responses of academic and non-academic staffs on the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

The calculated z-value used in testing the hypothesis stood at 0.88. The z-critical value stood at  $\pm 1.96$  using 170 degrees of freedom. At 0.05 level of significance, the calculated z-test of 0.88 is less than z-critical value of  $\pm 1.96$ , hence there is no significant difference between the mean responses of academic and non-academic staffs on the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State.

## DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Findings from this study showed that there is a significant difference between the mean rating of academic and non-academic staffs on the how strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of educational policies influence university education in Rivers State. This result not is in line with the study by Oladejo (2015), who evaluated institutional policies on admission, accommodation

and health as correlates of university students' scholastic achievement at the University of Lagos, Nigeria. Findings from the study showed that scholastic achievement was significantly related to admission policy ( $r=.024$ ;  $P<.05$ ); to accommodations policy ( $r=.042$ ;  $P<.05$ ) and to health policy ( $r=.063$ ;  $P<.05$ ).

Findings from this study showed that there is no significant difference between the mean responses of academic and non-academic staffs on the factors responsible for the non-implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State. This is consistent with the study of Quimbo and Sulabo (2014) who conducted a study to analyze the research productivity of selected higher education institutions. Path analysis showed that educational attainment, research benefits and incentive system were important predictors of both research self-efficacy and research productivity. Self-efficacy was found to be a significant determinant of productivity. Findings of this study suggested a number of policy implications for institutions of higher learning including the need to have a strong faculty development program.

Findings from this study showed that there is no significant difference between the mean responses of academic and non-academic staffs on the strategies for effective implementation of educational policies for university education in Rivers State. This is in line with the study by Subair, Okotoni and Adebakin (2012) in the work "Perceived Quality of Infrastructure in Selected Nigerian Universities" investigated the place of infrastructure in maintaining quality in Nigerian universities. It was found that there was no significant difference in infrastructural development between the state and federal universities. However, the result does not correspond with the study of Olasupo (2017) who evaluated the influence of infrastructural facilities on research output of academic staff of University of Ibadan" investigated the influence of infrastructural facilities on research output of academic staff of University of Ibadan, Nigeria. The finding showed that neither internet facilities nor availability of office furniture had significant relationship lecturers' research output.

## **CONCLUSION**

From the findings of this study, it can be confirmed that some universities are yet to implement the educational policy in their institutions as a result of lack of planning, insufficient fund, political instability and poor attitude of stakeholders and policymakers in education. However, lack of implementation of educational policy in universities in Nigeria has led to the failure of the education policy to meet its desirable goals and objectives in the society and unless necessary actions are taken for effective implementation of the educational policies in Nigeria and the society at large. Also, the good intension of the Federal Government to making education functional has not been achieved. Effective implementation of prevocational education curriculum will lay a solid foundation for the training of future engineers, technologist, business men and women, accountants, and entrepreneur

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Proper planning should be taken to make provisions for instructional materials needed

- for effective learning and proper implementation of educational policy in Nigeria.
2. Governments should make provision for basic education amenities and laboratory equipment for effective implementation of education set objectives.
  3. There is need to encourage both academic and non-academic staff through motivation on performance of duties, payment of salaries and allowances as at when due.
  4. Government should take responsibilities and make adequate provision for facilities to enhance teaching and learning quality control.
  5. There should be proper monitoring and evaluation for effective implementation of educational policies in Nigerian university.
  6. Nigerian governments and leaders should develop the necessary political will for education to grow and for political instability.

## REFERENCE

- Adegbite, J. G. O. (2017). The education reform agenda: Challenges for tertiary education administration in Nigeria. *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Seminar of the Conference of Registrars of College of Education in Nigeria, Ikere-Ekiti, Ekiti State*, 7, 77-89.
- Adekola, B. (2012). The role of status in job satisfaction level of academic staff in Nigerian universities. *International Journal of Management and Business Affairs*, 2(1), 1-10.
- Adeyemi, K. (2011). Equality of access and catchment area factor in university admissions in Nigeria. *Higher Education and Equality Journal*, 42(3), 307-332.
- Aina, O.I. (2017). *Alternative modes of financing higher education in Nigeria and implications for university governance*. In J. B. Babalola and B. O. Emunemu (Eds.), *Issues in higher education: Research evidence from sub-Saharan African*. Bolabay Publishers.
- Arikewuyo, M.O. (2014). Democracy and university education in Nigeria: Some constitutional considerations. *Higher Education Management and Policy Journal*, 16(3), 121-133.
- Arikewuyo, M.O. (2019). Restructuring as a panacea for the sustainable development of the Nigerian university system. *Journal for Higher Education Policy*, 22(9), 245-257.
- Arikewuyo, M.O., & Ilusanya, G. (2010). University autonomy in a third-generation university in Nigeria. *Tertiary Education and Management Journal*, 16(2), 81-98.
- Assien, J.E., & Lawal, Y. (2017). Admission into tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual Conference of the International Association for Educational Assessment (IAEA), held at Baku, Azerbaijan*, 8, 45-60.
- Aydin, O. T. (2017). Research performance of higher education institutions: A review on the measurements and affecting factors of research performance. *Journal of Higher Education and Science*, 7(2), 312-320.
- Faboyede, S., Faboyede, A., & Fakile, S. (2017). Funding of university education in Nigeria: Challenges and prospects. *Journal of Social Sciences Studies*, 8(9), 551-566.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2013). *National policy on education*. NERD Press.
- Harrison, J. S., & John, C. H. (2014). *Foundations in strategic management*. South Western Press.
- Igbuzor, O. (2016). The state of education in Nigeria. Economic and policy review. *African Policy Review Journals*, 12(3), 9-15.
- Ikelegbe, A. (2016). *Public policy analysis: Concepts, issues and cases*. Imprint Services Publishers.
- Jourshari, A. N. (2015). Role of strategic management in the development of port of Anzali. *Journal of Social Issues and Humanities*, 3(9), 216-222.

- Moti, U.G. (2010). The challenges of access to university education. *DSM Business Review*, 2(2), 27-56.
- Nguyen, Q. N. (2016). Institutional influence on HRM practices in equitized state owned enterprises in Vietnam. *Journal of Institutional Influence and Enterprises*, 55(8), 61-79.
- Nwagwu, L. (2018). *Leadership and management of institutions through respectable character*. Pearl Publishers.
- Nwangwu, I. O. (2013). Educational policies in Nigeria: Trends and implementation, Nsukka Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Policies, Trends and Implementation*, 8(8), 41-54.
- Ololube, N.P. (2018a). *Education law, institutional leadership and management (ILM): Staff-personnel promotion in tertiary education in Nigeria*. In N.P Ololube (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of institutional leadership, policy and management* (pp. 344-368). Pearl Publishers.
- Ololube, N.P. (2018b). *Leadership use of scenarios and alternatives in policy analysis in Nigerian educational systems*. In N.P Ololube (Ed.). *Handbook on research on educational planning and policy analysis* (pp. 201-224). Pearl Publishers.
- Oyeneke, O. Y. (2016). Current issues in the administration of university education in Nigeria. *Proceedings of the 15th Convocation Ceremony of the University of Ado-Ekiti, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria*, 6, 12-22.
- Rahimi, G. R., & Noruzi, M. R. (2011). A brief look on policy, typology of policy, and its related affairs. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2(11), 651-669.
- Subair, S. T., Okotoni, C. A., & Adebakin, A. B. (2012). Perceived quality of infrastructure in selected Nigerian universities. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 111-124.
- Thompson, A. A., & Strickland, A. J. (2013). *Strategic management: Concepts and cases*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin Publishers.
- Viennet, R., & Pont, B. (2017). *Education policy implementation: A literature review and proposed framework*. OECD Publishers.
- Wali, W. I. (2018). *Policy formulation in education*. In N.P Ololube (Ed.). *Handbook of research on educational planning and policy analysis*. Pearl Publishers.
- Wordu, A. (2018). Impact of internally generated revenue in development of tertiary educational institutions in Rivers State. *International Journal of Innovative Finance and Economics Research*, 6(2), 84-91.