HIGHER EDUCATION, **THE SOCIAL SCIENCES** AND NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

Geoffrey I. Nwaka
Abia State University
Uturu, Nigeria

This paper reviews the current debates about the place of higher education in national development, and evaluates the contribution of social science research and knowledge to development policy and practice. It considers how academics in general and social scientists in particular can collaborate with policy-makers and practitioners to enrich development work, and thereby promote overall national progress.

We need to reassess the role and methods of the social sciences because we seem to be faced with an ironic situation in which the increase in social science knowledge and writing coincides with the escalation of social and political problems, and the general deterioration of living standards in Africa. Forty-five of Africa's fifty-three countries, including Nigeria, are now listed among the world's least developed, with very high levels of illiteracy, unemployment and disease. The United Nations estimates that Africa accounts for more than half of all war-related deaths worldwide, resulting in over 8 million refugees and displaced persons (United Nations, 1998; Gertzel, 1995). Practically all the institutions of modernization in the continent have retrogressed visibly from the promising start of the 1960s and 1970s.

The social sciences have human culture and society as their main objects of study, and by definition ought to be in the forefront of the quest for African recovery and renewal. Why is so much that is said, written and spent on development having so little effect on the problems it seeks to address?' (Edwards, 1989). Questions are beginning to be asked about the returns to higher education, which is supposed to provide the national think-tank for problem-solving, and about whether researchers and policy-makers are turning to each other sufficiently for insights and mutual enlightenment. There is growing concern about how to widen access, and improve the quality and relevance of higher education; how to strengthen local research capacity, and improve access to the enormous resources and opportunities now offered by the expanding Information and Communication Technologies; how to contain the worsening threat of brain drain by improving the conditions and internal management of our institutions of higher learning.(UNESCO, 2003)

Although useful social science knowledge is produced and disseminated outside tertiary institutions – by the media, the church, independent research organizations, etc. – the present crisis of quality and relevance in the social sciences can best be understood in the context of the institutional crisis that has plagued higher education in Nigeria in the last several years. The difficult economic conditions of the 1980s and 1990s have meant reduced funding and low priority for higher education at a time of increased demand for and rapid expansion in that sector of the education system. This has led inevitably to campus instability and a marked decline in academic quality and performance. We shall examine the relationship between government and the institutions of higher learning, especially in the contentious areas of funding and control, with a view to establishing the appropriate levels of state interest and intervention in the affairs of tertiary institutions, and the limits of the freedom and autonomy which these institutions claim for themselves. We shall consider how universities and sister institutions can improve their financial position,

to lessen their dependence on government and establish a more positive partnership with both the State and the public.

To strengthen the social sciences we shall argue that the logic of the traditional disciplinary structure, which forms the basis for research and undergraduate programmes, is flawed in many respects, and is overdue for review to reflect the inter-relatedness of knowledge and of development issues. The narrow discipline-based approach tends to artificially compartmentalize knowledge, and to promote a fragmented, incoherent and intellectually parochial approach to social science education and research. We shall consider alternative and complementary structures and approaches currently being canvassed by many educationists in order to promote better communication across disciplines, and integrate research and learning more closely with problem-solving and development practice (Gibbon, 1998; Sawyer, 2004; Wallerstein et al., 1998; Marks, 1992; Edwards, 1989; Cernea, 1995). As well, we shall explore ways to bridge the gap in communication and comprehension, and eliminate the barriers of mutual suspicion and conflict between researchers and policy-makers.

We shall conclude with some general reflections on the dilemmas of national development in the context of prolonged internal instability and the constraints imposed by a hostile international economic environment. Creditor nations and the international financial institutions appear to have taken over the policy-making and development process – with their own consultants, research agendas and pre-packaged policy directives. How can local research capacity be strengthened, and local knowledge and expertise mobilized and brought to bear more systematically on these and other challenges of national development?

The tribulations of higher education – and the quality crisis
Nigerian universities and other institutions of higher learning are hopelessly in decline, and now only a shadow of their former glory. Diminishing funding and the unregulated expansion in student numbers have meant that the programmes and products of these institutions, which were previously rated very highly at home and abroad, now appear to be of inferior quality. Nigeria now has 57 universities, 26 of them owned by the Federal Government, 23 by the various State Governments, and 8 privately owned. (NUC, 2004, 2005; Atteh, 1996; Biobaku, 1985). In some of the older universities, the structures and services that were originally designed for much smaller populations are now having to cope with the enormous expansion of recent years, and have therefore come under severe strain. The premier university of Ibadan, for instance, had a student population of about 16,500 in 2004, more than three times the figure for 1972, without any appreciable addition to the institution's infrastructure. The total undergraduate enrolment has grown from 78,000 in 1980/81 to roughly 450,000 in 1999.2000.

The withdrawal of student subsidies as part of the structural adjustment programme of the mid-1980s (Nigeria, Federal Republic of, 1987) has meant that students, parents and other beneficiaries of higher education are now obliged to pay a lot more for services of questionable quality. The Coomber report (1991) presents a fairly representative picture of the appalling state of affairs in the universities:

A student describes a day in her university life. She rises before first light, rolls up her sleeping mat, and leaves the room in the hall of residence that she shares with eleven others. The room had been furnished for two students in the early days, then bunks were installed to permit four to be housed. These days, four students are

official occupants and pay the rent. To share the cost they sublet sleeping space to eight squatters. There is water crisis on campus […] She takes her bucket and walks to join the queue at the stand pipe. On a bad day it is hours before she is able to fill her bucket and return to wash and make tea. She decides whether to take a single meal in the morning (one zero zero), noon (zero one zero), or evening (zero zero one). She goes to the (crowded) class where it is standing room only […] Those who cannot see do their best to copy from the notebooks of those who can. After class, if the money is there, a handout can be purchased from the lecturer. It is his sideline, a supplement to his salary which has been eroded by currency devaluation and inflation. The lecturer recommends reading but the titles are not in the library (Coombe, 1991, p. 2).

The three long decades 1970 to 1990 represent the sad phase in the country's educational development, during which the institutions of higher learning "lost integrity, credibility and professionalism" (Ade-Ajayi, 2001).
Staff and students are cut off from the main currents in their fields of study, and almost completely isolated from international scholarship. Library acquisitions, especially journal subscriptions, have been drastically reduced because of shortage of foreign exchange. For the academic staff, material privations and the diminishing reward and regard for academic credentials have meant loss of morale and professional self-esteem. Those who cannot persevere are driven by the hustle for survival to seek second or third jobs, or to resort to venality, opportunism and other forms of undignified and unprofessional behavior. There are widespread complaints about the sale and abuse of handouts, of 'sorting' and sale of grades, the indiscriminate imposition of levies on students and the widespread abuse of self-publishing. These unethical practices explain the deepening level of intellectual mediocrity, and the general devaluation of the status of the academic enterprise one notices in many of our institutions of higher learning (Ajayi et al., 1996; Atteh, 1996; Coombe, 1991).

These crumbling institutions cannot produce other than poor-quality students and scholarship. A recent report shows that out of 836 undergraduate programmes evaluated for accreditation in 1990/91, only 185 met the requirements in terms of academic content, staffing and physical facilities; 79 were denied accreditation, and as many as 572 received only interim accreditation (Sanyal et al., 1995). The labour market for many categories of our graduates is saturated and there are common complaints that the professional, moral and attitudinal qualities of those who find jobs are extremely disappointing. It is therefore fair to say that the overall contribution of higher education to national development can no longer be taken for granted.

Part of the explanation for this situation lies in the prolonged period of military rule and the deterioration in the internal management of tertiary institutions. The political tensions and economic traumas of the 1980s and 1990s have bedeviled State/university relations (which are uneasy even at the best of times). The pattern of government funding has meant constant questions about accountability and the extent of autonomy these institutions should enjoy. Traditionally, universities and other tertiary institutions act as the guardian of public conscience and as independent critics of government policies and of society in general. They can only perform this role well if they enjoy the right to teach and research freely, and to debate and publish their findings without censorship, or undue political or bureaucratic interference. In Nigeria, the extended period of military rule has meant that political parties and the press were either non-existent or ineffective, and therefore academics and university

students tended towards greater political activism to question the legitimacy and policies of the military. Being generally intolerant of independent voices, successive regimes in the country have been brutally repressive and anti-intellectual, using their informers and agents on the campuses (and often also using the vice-chancellors and other key officials of these institutions) to harass and intimidate staff and students. Universities are accused of being dangerously anti-establishment, confrontational and potentially subversive. Officials have questioned the 'sacred cow of universities', their elitist and ivory tower posture, and their haughty distance from the practical realities of the society they were established to serve. Academics are dismissed as verbalists and theoreticians who take their prestige and privilege for granted, and should no longer be left alone to control their affairs or trusted to assess their own contribution to the nation (Sutherland-Addy, 1993; Daly, 1979. Ade-Ajayi, 2001; Adesina and Awusosi, 2004)

Up to a point government has the responsibility to steer universities and other tertiary institutions away from their colonial traditions and orientation, towards the achievement of current and pressing national policy objectives, and to ensure that these institutions use the money they get judiciously in the public interest. Universities and related institutions sometimes accept that they ought to be accountable, but accountable to the taxpayers and the society in general and not exclusively to each and every government that happens to come into power. As Professor Boateng once observed, while the government that pays the piper has the right to dictate the tune, it does not have the right to tell the piper how to play the tune (in Sanyal et al., 1995, p. 229). The challenge, of course, is to find an appropriate balance between state control and the internal autonomy of these institutions to ensure that academic freedom is not construed as immunity or elite privilege, or used in a selective and partisan way within and outside the campuses. We shall return later to the difficult questions of government funding and control of tertiary institutions, and how these institutions can strengthen and sustain their resource base and reduce their dependence on government, without undermining their primary mission of teaching and research.

The social sciences and national development: a tenuous link
There is an urgent need to explore the interface and the complementarity between social science research and the policy-making process. Critics complain that academic knowledge does not easily or necessarily translate to practical wisdom and action because of the many deficiencies in the methods of generating, communicating and utilizing this knowledge (Bathgeber, 1988; Glover, 1995; MacNeil, 1990). Research tends to be supply-and not demand-driven. On the supply side some of our institutions of higher learning are still very patterned along inherited colonial lines, and tend to hold on to the old ideals of the pursuit of knowledge for its own sake, or the limited objective of producing an indigenous elite for the decolonization and Africanization process. This influenced the form and content of the curriculum, which paid very little attention to direct problem-solving or to the professions as the concern of higher education (see Sawadago, 1995; Ngara, 1995).

Now governments donor agencies and private sector interests are becoming impatient with academic research and learning not related or only remotely related to the practical problems of development. Research is often carried out in a fragmented and narrow discipline-based manner, and research results, often influenced by ideological differences among feuding scholars, are usually ambiguous, inconclusive and sometimes even contradictory. Findings are typically too critical, offering few

concrete suggestions or clear options to guide policy choices. The quality of scholarship and of the knowledge generated is now constrained by the limited exposure of our social scientists to current literature and modern analytical techniques, and their isolation from global discourse and trends in their fields. Besides, scholars often tend to communicate only among themselves or with their captive student audience/market. The research findings that do emerge (for what they are worth) have very restricted circulation and adoption, as information is not widely publicized to get to where it is needed. Admittedly, the high level of illiteracy and the technical and logistical problems of publishing impose severe limits on the extent to which research findings can be disseminated; but it is still imperative to improve on the system of documentation, and the dissemination channels – to help feed research findings into the national press and information system. This should be done in simple, non-technical and user-friendly language, without the jargon, graphs and 'methodologies' that non-specialists sometimes find irritating. Simple-language newsletters, research abstracts/findings, executive summaries, working and discussion papers as well as the regular calendars and annual reports of our institutions of higher education would be helpful in this regard (Dankckwor, 1990; Zeleza, 1997a; MacNeil, 1990).

This would not entirely eliminate the many barriers that get in the way of effective collaboration between researchers and policy-makers since both sides traditionally approach their tasks differently. Policy-makers and politicians are usually under pressure to produce results quickly, while good research tends to be more systematic, reflective and therefore slow. Academic researchers do not sufficiently anticipate problems and prescribe preventive measures, and there appears to be very little link between the process of doing research and the implementation of research findings. As well, policy-makers are asking for policy-relevant research and knowledge 'generated and sustained in the context of application, and not developed first and then applied to that context later by a different group of practitioners' (Gibbon, 1998). They are looking for more 'flexible ways of integrating research into programmes so that the benefits from learning can be applied during, not after the events' (AID-Watch, 1999). This is a departure from or perhaps just an extension of the traditional practice that assumes that:

It is mistaken to expect university research to produce marketable results, for it is essentially fundamental research. It is the entrepreneur who can convert the fundamental research findings into commercial products through applied research conducted in their own laboratories or undertaken in the universities under their sponsorship (Biobaku, 1985).

Policy-makers ad practitioners on the demand side also create problems for the dialogue and co-operation that should exists between them and academic researchers. They often seem to regard academic research contemptuously as esoteric, and as not taking into account the politics and economics of policy-making, which involve reconciling conflicting social and commercial interests. Objective and scientifically based research findings may turn out to be politically awkward or commercially inconvenient to these various vested interests. For this reason it is common for government or business interests to hire their own consultants or set up their own commissions of inquiry or task forces (suitably composed), with specified terms of reference, to look into this or that matter, and provide policy advice. Such a report is then vetted, and a 'white paper' issued to guide official decisions and action. In fact,

the 1988 Civil Service Reform in Nigeria requires government ministries to set up their own research and policy analysis unit within the ministries, rather than get involved in the complications of academic research (Ikpi & Olayemi, 1997). This sort of 'captive science' tends to restrict the independence and objectivity of the researcher, and is therefore not entirely acceptable to the academic social scientist (Glover, 1995; MacNeil, 1990; Garrett & Islam, 1998; Edwards, 1996). Besides, there has been considerably incoherence and many inconsistencies in the policy-making process in Nigeria, resulting from frequent changes of government and policy directions since the end of the Nigerian civil war.

Worse still, most bilateral and multilateral donor agencies and their aid programmes often have heavily funded consultancy components that employ tens of thousands of 'foreign experts'. Sometimes this pattern of technical assistance reinforces the problems of dependency as it underrates local knowledge, and undermines the local capacity-building efforts. The consultancy-dominated approach to aid and development co-operation has been heavily criticized for being ineffective, and for its tendency 'to find local problems to suit pre-packaged assumptions and solutions' rather than empirically ascertain the local perceptions of what the problems and priorities are, and incorporate local knowledge and expertise in the process of solving the problems (Association for the Development of Education in Africa, 1998; Mkandawire, 1998; Mascelli & Sottas, 1996). A recent critic has observed that:

more than 100,000 expatriates from Europe and North America are currently working in Sub-Saharan Africa, mostly for the World Bank, the USAID and Development organizations; this number is far greater than the one at independence in 1960. More than 4 billion USD is being spent annually in Africa on foreign technical assistance primarily for policy analysis and consultations (Atteh, 1996, p. 36, from a World Bank report).

There is also concern that the culture of heavily funded consultancy and contract research may dilute and undermine the character and rigour of academic research, with project reports, feasibility reports and consultancy evaluation reports replacing or otherwise affecting the tradition of scientific inquiry (Buchert & King, 1996, especially p. 105-11). The challenge again is: how to get policy-makers and academic researchers to appreciate the culture, needs and constraints of each other; how to preserve the essence of research and yet make it more useful and responsive to political and other practical realities; how to maintain an appropriate balance between basic reflective research on the one hand, and the pressure for relevant policy and applied research on the other.

There is a further and even more worrying concern that both researchers and policy-makers do not take sufficiently seriously the interests and views of the people whom research and development are meant to benefit. 'Much conventional research is useless because it is for the satisfaction of the researcher rather than the researched' (Edwards, 1989). This is the basis for the call for a more participatory and bottom-up approach to research and development, and a more active outreach and extension component of our development studies programmes.

Rethinking the role and mission of higher education
One has to be a really optimistic person not to give up on the current state of higher education in Nigeria; but the situation could provide the challenge and opportunity needed to review the mission of higher education and the role of the social sciences.

There is no lack of ideas on the main elements of the reform that is required. The international development community, including the World Bank, now appears to be as concerned as national governments to find ways to revive and stabilize the system. The various working groups of the Association for the Development of Education in Africa (ADEA), in collaboration with the Association of African Universities (AAU), UNESCO, the Association of Commonwealth Universities, and various independent research organizations, foundations and aid agencies, have generated numerous ideas and recommendations about what needs to be done by national governments, the international community and the tertiary institutions themselves (see the various newsletters and reports of the AAU and the ADEA; Association of African Universities & World Bank, 1997; Sanyal et al., 1995; Coombe, 1991). What seem to be lacking are the political will and the resources to bring about the needed changes.

We have observed that funding and control are at the heart of the problem. Some analysts believe that the first step in the recovery process is to 'tame the State' and reorder government priorities. Most tertiary institutions are 80% funded from the public purse, and there is the temptation for government to regard them as mere parastatal organizations or an extension of the state apparatus over which they have the right of control and discipline – as in the appointment of governing councils, key administrators, and even over decisions about admission levels, the conditions of service of staff, and so on. And these are precisely the main areas of friction as staff and students often vigorously assert their rights and resist what they perceive as official high-handedness and infringement of academic freedom and autonomy. It is not easy to say what the right balance should be between institutional autonomy and state control, as the pattern varies in different countries, depending on the political system and leadership style. The centralized and authoritarian pattern of military rule in Nigeria involved a repressive system of control that is different from what one should expect in a democratic and truly federal setting. In any event, the ultimate goal is to promote constructive dialogue, understanding and partnership between government and higher education institutions through the development of, for instance, joint projects and programmes, reciprocal membership of committees and boards, the exchange of personnel on short-term secondments, etc., so that government can gradually and with greater confidence move from direct control to supervision through effective intermediary bodies. As one analyst has observed:

Government and society must recognize that the role of universities has always been to challenge the status quo. The nature of their work is to inquire and to seek better understanding. In the process they may also annoy or provoke; but this has always been a recognized risk for any nation that chooses to establish its own university. (Association of African Universities & World Bank, 1997).

For their part the institutions of higher education have much cleaning up and catching up to do in order to redeem their tattered image and earn the trust and goodwill of both government and the people. They need to review their roles and mission, and update their programmes and methods of management. They must improve upon the internal mechanisms for self-regulation and accountability in order to forestall much of the present tendency of government to subject them to needless scrutiny and interference. This means that they must become more transparent, cost-effective, democratic and decentralized in the way they operate. They must uphold and not compromise the high ideals of the 'ivory tower', but shed the negative and pejorative connotations associated with the ivory tower image. Also, the creeping aberrations of

tribalism, statism and clannishness on our campuses should be firmly discouraged because they tend to create vested interests in mediocrity.

Attention has been called time and again to the need for strategic planning to establish priorities and rationalize programmes, and to establish national and regional centres of excellence as a way to reduce costs and pool resources and expertise for greater effectiveness and impact. Unfortunately, the roles and missions of our universities, polytechnics and colleges of education appear to be getting more and more diffused as they increasingly stray from their main functions in order to raise extra money! The proliferation of federal, state and now private universities has meant the multiplication and duplication of courses and programmes even in institutions which were established with a specialized professional, technological or agricultural focus in mind (Ngara 1995; Ajayi et al., 1996).

Underfunding is at the heart of all this confusion. Universities and other tertiary institutions must find ways to legitimately generate more of the money they need, and lessen their dependence on state support. The cost of running the system should be shared equitably between government, the beneficiaries and other stakeholders. The institutions themselves are urged to diversify their sources of income, to become more entrepreneurial, and to commercialize their knowledge and expertise in order to raise more money to refurbish their academic infrastructure and services. Up to a point this is valid, and government and donors should help to strengthen and utilize local research capacity rather than undermine it by undue reliance on outside consultants. Some of the mindless expansion of student enrolments as a means to raise money could be counter-productive. Ways must be found to increase access to tertiary education without sacrificing quality and to establish a healthy balance between enrolment and facilities, even if this means reduced enrolment in some of the traditional fields of study. The limited resources available should not be diverted from the primary academic areas of teaching and research to the provision of municipal and other auxiliary services, or for the provision of remedial and other programmes which may be adequately provided by other sectors or levels of the education system. Part of this rethinking implies substantial changes in the social sciences.

Restructuring the social sciences for greater relevance
We have drawn attention to the diverse ways in which the social sciences are categorized in different places, and to the problem of communication and comprehension among scientists, and between them and policy-makers and administrators. The problems of duplication and overlap in the various disciplines and sub-disciplines are too well known require further comment. Obviously, there is a need to reconsider the organization and update the methods of social science in order to enhance its status and improve its social relevance and impact.

The emerging trends in social science thinking favour greater communication across the traditional disciplines, and with the wider non-academic public, and a move from the disciplinary tradition of narrow specialization to a broad and more flexible transdisciplinary approach. As a critic has recently observed, 'it is no longer valid for researchers to remain entrenched within the boundaries of their own disciplines (as) the process of development is beyond the analytical capacities of any single discipline'. The 1995 Wallerstein Commission on the social sciences questioned the logic of the present disciplinary divisions, and showed that 'the level of consensus concerning the traditional disciplines has diminished'. The report urged social

scientists to innovate, and to 'amplify the organization of intellectual activity without attention to current disciplinary boundaries':

To be historical is after all not the exclusive purview of persons called historians. It is an obligation of all social scientists […] Economic issues are not the exclusive purview of economists. Economic questions are central to any and all social scientific analysis. Nor is it absolutely sure that professional historians necessarily know more about historical explanation, sociologists more about social issues, and economists more about economic fluctuations than other working social scientists. In short, we do not believe that there are monopolies of wisdom or zones of knowledge reserved to persons with particular university degrees (Walerstein et al., 1998).

Professor Ali Mazarui had earlier cautioned about the uncritical adoption of the 'conventional western disciplinary categories' in African universities. He recommended instead problem-based and policy-oriented classifications such as the 'school of rural studies', 'school of urban studies' and similar structures now used for area studies and development studies in some parts of the world. He also prescribed other ways to emancipate Africa culturally by diversifying the external models and influences on our education system, and by domesticating Western and other external ideas and forms which we choose to adopt (Mazrui, 1992). Other educationists have proposed how staff and students should be made to establish multiple departmental affiliations in their in their institutions, and how interdisciplinary research groups and clusters could be formed to work together on specific issues and problems over a given period of time. This approach is already increasingly being adopted in several parts of the academic world.

While considering these long-terms goals, our institutions of higher education should urgently seek to promote their national and African cultural character, without of course diminishing their international outlook and standing. As they rightly aspire to international standards and ideals they must reckon with local conditions and needs without undermining the culture and ideals of academic. More emphasis should be placed on such issues of current concern as the need for unity, justice and inter-ethnic harmony; a home-grown model of democracy and human rights based on African cultural values; and poverty alleviation, national self-reliance and the other development objectives enunciated in our Second National Development Plan, 1970-75, in the Fundamental Objectives and Directive Principles of State Policy in our Constitution, in VISION 2010, and in other more recent policy initiatives and development programmes.

Social scientists should not only align themselves and their programmes with national development goals, but should also press for a greater role in the policy-making process, and take a more active interest in the implementation of their research findings. They should anticipate development issues and problems and provide timely advice, and not wait for 'post-mortem' analysis and commentary after the event. Through their teaching, research and public debates they should seek to produce good, competent and patriotic graduates and citizens through whom the quality of the country's public administration and governance will be enhanced.

Concluding remarks
To conclude, it must be acknowledged that some progress has been made in the reforms initiated in the last few years to revitalize higher education, sometime with the generous support of the international development community. But certainly

Nigeria can ill afford the decline of quality and credibility in its higher education system at a time of growing international competition. However, national development involves much more than the state of higher education and the quality of policy advice offered by the social scientists. It has to contend with the many internal problems of underdevelopment, especially internal mismanagement, and with the heavy constraints imposed by the international economic environment. The goals of national development in Nigeria have been outlined and highlighted time and again; sadly, the record of our national performance has been dismal, especially during the 'lost decades' of the 1980s and 1990s. Internal instability and lack of will provide part of the explanation, but the more fundamental problem is that African governments seem to have lost control of he policy-making process, and are under pressure to accept dictation from creditor nations and international financial institutions. Our governments now tend to discuss development issues less with their own nationals, and more with donors and creditors: about debt repayment, debt relief and rescheduling, and paradoxically about more development assistance. Contradictory as it may seem, our institutions of higher education need large doses of assistance and support from the international community to rehabilitate their crumbling academic infrastructure, and to facilitate access to modern research and analytical techniques, equipment and scholarly literature. Bilateral and multilateral organizations concerned with higher education should provide appropriate levels of support to strengthen local capacity through training in planning and management, international (North-South and South-South) academic exchanges, inter-university linkages and other forms of collaboration that help to build ties of genuine partnership and reduce the existing problems of dependence.

Note
1.   This is a slightly updated version of my earlier paper in *PROSPECTS: Quarterly Review of Comparative Education*, XXX (3) 2000, pp373-385 (UNESCI/IBE, Switzerland)

References

Adesina A L and O. Awosusi, 2004, "Reflections on Nigeria's Universities in the Past Decade", *The Nigerian Social Scientist*, Vol.7, No. 1, pp. 7-11

Ade-Ajayi J F, 2001, "Paths to the Sustainability of Higher Education in Nigeria", *The Nigerian Social Scientist*, Vol 4, No. 2, pp. 1-11

Barrow M I and F E Ukeje, 2002, "The Academic Workplace in a Changing Environment: The Nigerian Scene" in Altbach P G ed., *The Decline of the Guru: The Academic Profession in Developing and Middle Income Countries*, Boston, pp. 377-403

Ajayi, J.F., et al. 1996. *The African experience with higher education*. Accra, Association of African Universities.

Association of African Universities; World Bank. 1997. *Revitalizing universities in Africa: strategies and guidelines*. Washington, DC, World Bank.

Association for the Development of Education in Africa. 1998. *Partnership for capacity building and quality improvement in educatio*n. Darkar, ADEA.

Atteh, S.O. 1996. The crisis in higher education in Africa. *Issues: a journal of opinion (African Studies Association*, Atlanta, GA), vo. 24, no. 2, p. 36-42.

Bathgeber, E.M. 1988. A tenuous relationship: the African university and development policy making in the 1980s. *Higher education* (Dordrecht, Netherlands), vol. 17, p. 399-410.

Biobaku, S. 1985. *Have the academics failed the nation?* Ibadan, Nigeria, University of Ibadan, Institute of African Studies. (Occasional publication, no. 35).

Buchert, L.; King, K. 1996. *Consultancy and research in international education: the new dynamics*. Bonn, Deutsche Stiftung fur Entwicklung/NORRAG.

Cernea, M.M. 1995. Enriching social science by applying it: the test of development practice. In: Cernea, M.M., ed. *Sociology, anthropology and development*, p. 1-6. Washington, DC, World Bank.

Coombe, T. 1991. *A consultation on higher education in Africa*. London, Institute of Education, University of London. (Report to the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation).

Daly, J.C., ed. 1979. Professors and public policy: a round-table discussion. *Dialogue* (Washington, DC), vol. 2, no. 4, p. 96-106.

Edwards, M. 1989. The irrelevance of development studies. Third-world quarterly (Abingdon, UK), vol. II, no. 1, p. 116-35.

____, 1996. Development practice and development studies working together. *Development in practice* (Abingdon, UK), vol. 6, no. 1, p. 67-69.

Garrett, J.L.; Islam, Y. 1998. *Policy research and policy process: do the twain ever meet*? London, International Institute for Environment and Development. (IIED Gate-keeper series, no. 74).

Gertzel, C. 1995. Towards a better understanding of he causes of poverty in Africa in the late 20th century. *Development bulletin* (Australian National University, canberra), vol. 27, (Criefing paper, no. 42).

Gibbon, M. 1998. *Higher education relevance in the 21st century*. Washington, DC, World Bank.

Glover, D. 1995. Policy research and policy makers: never the twain shall meet. Reports (IDRC, Toronto, Canada), vol. 23, no. 3, p. 4-8.

Ikpi, A.E.; Olayemi, J.K., eds. 1997. *Governance and development in West Africa: perspectives for the 21ˢᵗ century*. Morilton, AR, Winrock International.

MacNeil, T.M. 1990. The dialogue between scientists and policy makers. *Sustainable development, science and policy*, p. 505-12. Oslo, Norwegian Research Council for Science and the Humanities (NAVF). (Conference Report).

Manuh, Takyiwaa, 2002, "Higher Education, Conditions of Scholars and the Future of Development in Africa" CODESRIA Bulletin, Nos.3 & 4, pp42-48

Mascelli, D.; Sottas, B., eds. 1996. *Research partnership for common concern*. Hamburg, Lit Verlag.

Mazrui, A.A. 1992. Towards diagnosing and treating cultural dependency: the case of the African university. *International journal of educational development* (Kidlington, UK), vol. 12, no. 2, p. 95-111.

Mkandawire, T. 1998. *Notes on consultancy and research in Africa*. Copenhagen, Centre for Development Research. (CDR working paper, no. 98).

NUC (National Universities Commission) 2004, "The State of Nigerian Universities", *Nigerian University System Newsletter*, Vol. 12, No. 1; See Also NUC *Monday Memo* series, especially Vol 4, No 14, 2005

Ngara, E. 1995. *The African university and its mission*. Roma, Lesotho, National University of Lesotho, Institute for South African Studies.

Nigeria, Federal Republic of. 1987. *Views and comments of the Federal Military Government on the report of the study of Higher Education Curricula and Development in Nigeria*. Lagos, Federal Republic of Nigeria.

Sawyerr, Akilopa, 2004, "Challenges Facing African Universities: Selected Issues" , in Special Issue of *African Studies Review*, Vol 47, No. 1, pp.1-59

Sanyal, B.C., et al., eds. 1995. *Institutional management in higher education in Western Africa*. Dakar; Paris, UNESCO, International Institute for Educational Planning. (Report of sub-regional workshop).

Sawadago, G. 1995. *The future missions and roles of the African universities*. Accra, Association of African Universities.

Sutherland-Addy, E. 1993. *Revival and renewal: reflections on the creation of a system of tertiary education in Ghana*. Washington, DC, World Bank, Human Resources and Poverty Division. (AFTHR technical note, no. 10).

UNESCO (Division of Higher Education) 2003, *Recent Developments and Future Prospects of Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa in the 21st Century*, Paris

United Nations. 1998. *Secretary-General's report on the causes of conflict and the promotion of durable peace and sustainable development in Africa*. New York.

Wallerstein, E., et al. 1998. Restructuring the social sciences. *Nigerian social scientist* (Abuja, Nigeria), vol. 1, no. 1, p. 8-12.

World Bank, 2002, Constructing Knowledge Societies: New Challenges for *Tertiary Education*, Washington DC

Zeleza, P. 1997. *Manufacturing African studies and crises*. Dakar, Conseil pour le développement et la rechercher en sciences sociales en Afrique.