

# Historical Development of Nomadic Education in North Central Nigeria and Northern Region of Ghana from 1989 to 2009

Michael Foluso Fakayode<sup>2</sup>, B. O. Lawal<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Adeniran Ogunsanya College of Education  
Oto-Ijanikin, Ojo, Lagos

<sup>2</sup>University of Ibadan  
Department of Teacher Education, Nigeria

---

**ABSTRACT---** *Nomads' lifestyles are shaped by their pastoral occupation, and nomadic education, established in Nigeria in 1989 and in Ghana in 1995, has been provided to cater for their special educational needs. The descriptive survey research design was adopted using the comparative stratification and human capital theories. The purposive sampling technique was used to select Niger, Kwara and Kogi states from North Central Nigeria, and Yandi, Gushegu and Benbenla provinces from Northern Region of Ghana due to the high presence of nomads in the areas. The proportionate stratified random sampling technique was used to select 70 board members (Nigeria: 40; Ghana: 60 ministry officials (Nigeria: 40; Ghana: 20), 201 teachers (Nigeria: 120; Ghana: 81) and 833 pupils (Nigeria: 433; Ghana: 400) in the chosen states and provinces from the two countries. Four research instruments were used: Teachers/Facilitators Questionnaire (r=0.72), Officials of State Primary Education Board of Nomadic Questionnaire (r=0.81), Ministry Officials Questionnaire (r=0.85) and Nomadic Academic Achievement test (r=0.79), Archival materials and records on nomadic education from the two countries were consulted. Three research questions were answered. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics and content analysis. The pupil's enrollment rate was higher in Nigeria than in Ghana with a ratio of 4:1 regardless of grade or cohort. Also, Nigeria had a teacher pupil ratio of 1:81 compared to Ghana's 1:58; with higher number of qualified and competent instructors. Infrastructural provisions and instructional materials were fairly better in Nigeria than in Ghana. Funding of nomadic education within the period of study was higher in Nigeria (\$281,250) than in Ghana (\$66,250), with the Ghanaian government's role weighted average = 2.15 and that of Nigeria's = 2.01. Achievements of nomadic educational objectives in both countries were rated high, but there were differences in respondents' perception. Board members perceived the objectives as highly relevant compared with ministry officials ( $\bar{x} = 3.10$ ) and teachers ( $\bar{x} = 3.301$ ). Generally, Nigeria had a higher implementation effectiveness of nomadic education ( $\bar{x} = 1.81$ ) than Ghana ( $\bar{x} = 1.58$ ). Inadequate funding, instructional materials and facilities, class absenteeism, distance location, low continuity prospect, cultural barrier and low political will were similar challenges facing both programmes, but the Nigerian programme was more constrained by the problem of high attrition and low retention.*

**Keywords---** Nomadic education, Shepherd schools, North Central Nigeria, Northern Region of Ghana

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### Historical Development of Nomadic Education in Nigeria

Pastoralism figures heavily in the lives of the people of Northern Nigeria, even among those who do not own cattle, by virtue of their frequent contact with those who do so. The early and as yet unmatched anthropological studies of the predominant pastoral people in Nigeria, the Fulbe, *Ver Eeck (1989)* also provided invaluable ethnographic information and equally showed the importance of the physical and social environment in shaping Fulbe social organization which has clearly been in flux. *Stenning (1959)* equally opines that agnatic descent group is not a monolithic unit but is acutely sensitive to demographic changes and ecological fluctuations. Descent groups adjust themselves by periodic fragmentation to the conditions in which their subsistence is grounded. Therefore, *Stenning (1959)* was among the first to point out the necessity for government aid to pastoralists.

They could be assisted in increase stocks. Thereby contributing to Nigeria economy and they might be assisted in setting on ranches. But this could only be possible if the policies worked with and not against the social organization and culture of the pastoral Fulbe.

Interestingly, whereas in the 1970s, millions of dollars were received in external aid by such countries as Niger, Mali and Chad to study and alleviate the effects of the sahelim drought on pastoral populations, hardly any attention was given to Nigeria, despite the existence of several large veterinary institutions in Nigeria. It is only in the past few years

that some of the major problems facing the nomads (e.g. lack of pasture land and water conflicts with farmers inaccessible to cattle routes, diseases, inability to secure veterinary services and so on) have become recognized (Křatli (2001).

Consequently, little intensive research has been conducted or made available publicly to confirm the severity of these problems. Only a few developmental programmes have been implemented for nomadic groups. And with little success many others have been designed and not implemented. For instance, as early as the 1960s, grazing reserves were demarcated throughout the Northern territories of Nigeria, but up to the present day, few attempts have been made to develop them. Ezeomah (1987) wrote that those that were designed failed to involve the pastoralists directly in their operation and most have fallen into disrepair. Even the initially successful settlement programme of Fulbe in Mambilla, an environment which allows for year-round grazing did not anticipate the extreme ethnic strife which now is problematic among the nomadic settlement.

Prior to 1986, the problem of educating minority populations in Nigeria was practically unheard of except in some academic circles. A few attempts were made by the State or Local Government to register nomadic children for attendance at school and some Fulbe ardoen (Chiefs) were urged to encourage their people's school registration and attendance (Gongola State, 1986). A few governments attempted to erect schools for nomads, which were not supported by the intended participants (Eecke, 1989). However, efforts to force school attendance were met with emigration (Eseomah, 1983). It was therefore concluded that mobile schools which cater to the nomad's life-style and aim at providing functional literacy to them should be instituted at the state level. It was also argued that the nomads must have a role in planning their own lives and those of their children because any imposed programmes are bound to fail. Hence, a proposal for a large scale nomadic education programme was then drafted. However, in 1984, a very good contribution was made by the (UNDP) United Nations Development Programme for nomadic education programme in Bauchi, Gongola and Plateau States, to be completed in 1986, the UNDP contributions to be matched by Nigerian government funds (Kwame, 2005).

It was during 1986 that more open concern for nomads' education emerged. A conference held in Gongola State on the feasibility of mobile schools and an appropriate school curriculum for nomads drew national attention. Educationists from the University of Jos also received the support of the then Minister of Education (who is Fulbe from Gongola State). They began to draft a national plan for nomadic education on the grounds that the state and local government were incapable of implementing large-scale programme of soliciting international funds and of dealing with nomads who move across the border (Federal Ministry of Education, 1987).

Therefore, the teams from University of Jos were then commissioned to expand its research into ten Northern States, focusing on plan implementation. Shortly thereafter, they informed NNNDP that the programme to which it had contributed had not being on schedule and was only about to commence. The completion date was postponed until 1988. Thus the conference continued to be held on nomadic education. The debate in academic circles concerned these three issues (Lar, 1982):

1. Should the nomads be settled first before they are educated?
2. Should schools be designed explicitly for nomads, even if it is at the expense of other people's education?
3. Are mobile schools the best and most feasible way of preserving and enhancing the nomadic livelihood while providing nomads with functional literacy?

Consequently, a national policy on nomadic education was drawn up under the contention that nomadic education can be an indirect solution to many, if not all, of the nomads' problems. According to one educationist, Ezeomah (1987), it is only through education the nomads life style can be improved. In his view, the benefits of nomadic education include that:

1. They will learn to stand up for their grazing rights and to improve the land they do own.
2. They will learn "scientific" knowledge about diseases and how to avoid it.
3. They will learn how to better feed and manage their herds.
4. They will learn how and when to sell their livestock and how to increase milk production and maximize their profits.
5. They will know more about health care for their families and animals.
6. They can also be taught leadership abilities so that they can participate actively in development programmes.
7. They will become aware of avenues of settlement should they decide to settle.

The idea of providing special education to mobile societies, especially the pastoralists, dated back to the colonial period, particularly in Borno (1920s) and Katsina (1950s) provinces, but it could not be sustained. A fresh initiative was embarked upon by some state governments in the north in the mid 1970s. During this period pilot schools were established in the North-East, Kano and North-Central states to cater for the educational needs of the mobile pastoral Fulbe children. These efforts were sporadic but many of the pastoral families did not avail themselves of this opportunity because the curriculum was irrelevant to their needs and interests (Gidado, 1998).

It was actually the 1979 Federal Constitution and the pertinent provisions of the new National Policy of Education (1977) which recognized the need to provide equal educational opportunity for all. That gave rise to a Federal Government initiative that was determined not to exclude anyone from acquiring basic education. With technical support from UNDP, UNESCO and the World Bank, researches were undertaken in the early 1980s to provide base-line data on

the nomads, as a basis for designing an appropriate education for them. Consequently, the Federal Government launched the programme in 1986. It went on to embark upon mobilization and sensitization campaigns to win support for the programme so as to engender high level of pupil enrolment in the nomadic schools. Several states especially in the northern part of the country had registered their willingness to participate in the programme and had therefore launched it, signaling their willingness to participate in the federal programme. The goals of the programme are as follows.

- i. integrating the nomads into the national life by providing them with relevant and functional basic education and
- ii. improving the survival skills of the nomads through improved methods of animal husbandry. (Gidado, 1998)

According to Akinpelu (1993), the contemporary definition of ‘nomadism’ refers to any type of existence characterized by the absence of a fixed domicile. He identifies three categories of nomadic groups as: hunter/food gatherers, itinerant fishermen, and pastoralists (a.k.a. herdsman). In Nigeria, there are six nomadic groups:

1. The Fulani (with population of 5.3 million)
2. The Shuwa (with population of 1.0 million)
3. The Buduman (with population of 35,001)
4. The Kwayam (with population of 20,000)
5. The Badawi (with population yet to be established)
6. The Fishermen (with population of 2.8 million).

The last group, the Fishermen, is concentrated in Rivers, Ondo, Edo, Delta, Cross River, and Akwa-Ibom States (FME, Education Sector Analysis, 2000). The first five nomadic groups listed are considered pastoralist nomads.

Delivery of educational services to the children of all nomadic groups has tended to follow the lines of the formal school system. Special attention was paid to these groups by the Nigerian Government when it set-up the National Commission for Nomadic Education by Decree 41 of 12 December 1989 (Federal Government of Nigeria, 1989). Of the estimated 9.3 million people that currently comprise Nigeria’s nomadic groups, approximately one third, that is 3.1 million are of school and pre-school age. The pastoral nomads are more highly disadvantaged than the migrant fishermen, in terms of access to education primarily because they are more itinerant. As a result, the literacy rate of pastoral nomads is only 0.28 percent, while that of the migrant fishermen is about 20 percent (FME, 2000). The basic responsibility of the Commission for Nomadic Education, among others, is to provide primary education to the children of pastoralist nomads – a responsibility shared with the States and Local Governments. To provide education to its nomads, a multifaceted strategy has been adopted by the Commission that includes on-site schools, the ‘shift system,’ schools with alternative intake, and Islamiyya (Islamic) schools. The current mobile school system in the strictest sense remains sparingly used, primarily due to the enormity of problems associated with this model. Some mobile schools, however, are in operation in the River Benue area of Taraba, Benue, Adamaw, Nassarawa, Borno and Yobe States.

By the beginning of the 1995/1996 school session, there were 890 nomadic schools in 296 Local Government Areas of 25 states of the federation catering for the education needs of the children of pastoral nomads along. Of these, 608 schools are owned and controlled by States, 130 by Local Government, and 152 by Local Communities. Together, they serve 88,871 pupils of the estimated population of the 3.1 million nomadic school-age children. Of this number, 55,177 (62%) were boys and 33,694 (38%) were girls. There were 2,561 teachers, a majority of whom 1,326 or 51 percent were teacher-aides, who are unqualified and in need of upgrading. This has been the usual practice because of the nature and characteristics of the nomadic populace. As of 1993, 661 schools had been built for pastoral nomads, out of which 24 percent (n = 165) had permanent classrooms and 46 percent (n = 293) had temporary classrooms built of grass, mats, canvas, tarpaulins, et cetera. Subsequently, mobile, collapsible classrooms were procured. Altogether, the schools had an enrolment of 46,982 children taught by 1,896 teachers. This number, however, only scratches the surface of the problem, as it only serves as estimated 3.1 million primary school age nomadic children. The Comprehensive Education Analysis Project, (Federal Government of Nigeria, 2000) provides the enrolment figures during the 1990s in Table 1.

Table 1. Enrolment of Pastoral Nomads in the 1990s

<b>Pastoral Nomads</b>	
1993	46,982
1994	49,617
1995	64,459
1997	118,776
1998	116,944
1999	122,517

**Source:** ESA (2000)

Note that between 1993 (n = 46,982 students were enrolled) and 1999 (n = 122,517 students were enrolled), there has been an increase of 260.8 percent. Considering that there are an estimated 3.1 million pastoral nomads in Nigeria, however, there is still a long way to go.

### Historical Development of Shepherds Schools in Ghana

*Kwame (2005)* opines that the Northern region of Ghana accounts for almost a third of Ghana's land mass and is inhabited by about 10% of its population, representing a population density of less than 25 people per square kilometer. The Upper West Region accounts for only 3% of the country's population and only 17.5% of the population can be classified as urban. Population density per square kilometer in Upper West is 31 persons as against the national figure of 79. With a harsh climate and poor vegetation, the people are dispersed, nomadic and deprived.

Poverty is endemic in Northern Ghana with people facing formidable challenges with regards to water, food and employment opportunities. The community context, low production and storage facilities contribute to the basic food security problems. Therefore, studies on child poverty indicate that a lot of children in Northern Ghana fend for themselves by engaging in economic activities to support their basic food and nutritional requirements (*Casley Hayfor, 2002, cited in Kwame, 2005*). Also, a vast majority of children supplement their family's income through the provision of their labour in economic activities (e.g. farming) which makes participation in an education programme often a luxury (*Obed, (2003)*).

National statistics indicates that literacy rate among adults in Northern Ghana is lower than 5% and less than 40% of children up to 14 years attend school. This leaves about 60% of children out of school, most of whom are girls and shepherd's children. Consequently, majority of children do not complete the compulsory nine years of basic schooling and thus do not attain a basic level of literacy. Also, in some districts more than one-third of the population of school going age is not attending school, (*Ghana Living Standards Survey, GLSS, 2000*), either as a result of limited or not access to any type of educational opportunity. In comparison to other region, the Northern region receives very little of the national education budget approximately 4% of recurrent budget expenditure (*GES, Internal Budget Book, 2002, cited by Kwame, 2005*).

The Northern Ghana also suffers from an acute shortage of teachers in rural areas leading to a situation where numerous schools are simply unproductive. Although the challenges facing teachers who teach in rural areas of Ghana are similar to terms of poor infrastructure and accommodation, the region present a particularly difficult challenge for teachers, especially the newly appointed and trained teachers. Teachers posted to the rural parts of Northern Ghana have to learn how to live within the extended family household compound (*Obed, 2003*).

Rural community housing requires communal living arrangement that teachers unaccustomed to find especially difficult. Also, teachers face problems of unsafe drinking water, lack of electricity, poor health facilities, limited transport to neighbouring towns, security of properties and lack of personal development opportunities (*Action Aid Survey Report, 2000*).

Another difficulty of providing basic education for children in the Northern Ghana is the nature of community settlements. These tend to be small (sometimes comprising about 10 household units) and widely scattered. Finding appropriate location for building schools to service reasonable size population then becomes a real problem. Also, many of these areas do not meet government criteria for building schools because of the small population of 6 – 15 years old and the low growth rate. Thus, the solution has always been to build a school within the most central location and this land had led to some primary schools in Ghana being built in the most obscure places with no community identity (*Fobihetal, 1999*).

However, with this strategy, numerous communities are still not close enough to a formal school which means that pupils have to walk long distance to reach them. According to the core welfare indicators report (1998), the Upper West and Upper East Regions have the highest percentage of children walking over 30 minutes to school each day. Distance to school is ranked with costs and child labour as a major reason for many children not attending school in the Northern Ghana. However, pastoralists although poor, are far from being a mass of drifting unskilled under-class as they should be according to the popular understanding of basic education as a fundamental need.

Consequently, on the contrary, as a necessary requirement for their livelihood in the dry lands, pastoralists live their everyday life with a high sense of responsibility and as individuals with a high social specialization. They are confident, articulate entrepreneurial, with good negotiating and management skills; they also show a strong sense of dignity and self respect. Their societies usually have long traditions of self government with sophisticated institutional structures and exceptionally high level of social capital. *Kratli, 2001* equally opines that it is impossible to analyze the cause of the continuous failure in the education of pastoralists without a careful analysis of this paradox. For a fact, *Kratli* argues, education programmes appear to oppose nomadic education and culture at all levels: in their principles and goals, in their explanatory paradigms, in their solutions and implementation. Therefore, *Kratli (2001)* concludes, education for nomads should be flexible, multifaceted and focused enough to target specific structural problems such as social and economic marginalization, lack of political representation or coping and interacting successfully with the new challenges raised by globalization.

Basic formal education is seen as essential for the full accomplishment of individuals as human beings, their survival and life-long development. Thus, this position is reaffirmed for instance, in the first article of the World Declaration on the Education for All, EFA (1990). As such, is represented as a fundamental human right. However, this view offers many advantages; in the specific context of education provision to shepherd's boys. It also presents some dangers.

The first is that by focusing on individuals, it separates wards or children livelihoods and best interest from those of their households, therefore, antagonizing the structural organization of the pastoral economy, the basic unit of which is the

household or a group of households not the individual. Hence, the emphasis on the universal value of education makes it difficult to recognize the cultural specificity and ideological dimension of all educational practices on the ground (Kwame, (2005).

In response to the peculiar educational problems in Northern Ghana, the School for Life (SfL) Programmes was developed. The programme started in 1995 as a pilot project in two Districts of the Northern Region with 50 classes in each District. The two partners to the programme, the Ghana Developing Communities Association (GDCA) and the Ghana Friendship Groups in Denmark (GV, succeeded in developing an effective model to provide functional literacy to out-of-school children in rural areas. Following the success, the scale of service delivery was increased during the second and third phases of the programme. In Phase 2, (1998 to 2003), SfL was implemented in 8 Districts and benefited 40,000 children. In Phase 3, (2003 to 2008) the programme areas was expanded to cover 10 Districts and 48,000 children, with mainstreaming, advocacy and replication becoming part of the programme strategy. *The Leap to Literacy and Life Change in Northern Ghana, an Impact of Assessment of School for Life (SfL) (2007).*

SfL's mainstreaming efforts aim at contributing to the improvement of quality in the formal school. The main activities in the area include the integration of SfL Facilitators in the formal system along with teacher training and support at the lower primary school level to improve instructional practices of teachers. In the third phase, replication was defined as the implementation of SfL by other donors and organizations. The mid-term review of SfL Phase 3, which took place in June 2006, defined future perspectives for the Programme and acknowledged its extensive experience, setting out a timeframe and direction for planning Phase 4. Key milestones in the plan included implementation of an extensive impact assessment; conclusion of a change management process on the cooperation and partnership among the GV SfL Committee, GDCA SfL Executive Committee (EC) and the SfL management; establishment of an Advocacy Think Tank to develop advocacy strategies for Phase 4; and formulation of visions for Phase 4 by both SfL (EC and Management) and the SfL Committee (*The Leap to Literacy and Life Change in Northern Ghana, An Impact of Assessment of School for Life (SfL) 2007*).

School for Life is a functional literacy programme for out-of-school/shepherds children in the Northern Region of Ghana. The programme is designed as a complementary educational programme targeted at children between the ages of 8 – 14. The programme offers a nine-month literacy cycle in the mother tongue, aimed at assisting children attain basic literacy skills and then integrate into the formal education system (*The Leap to Literacy and Life Change in Northern Ghana, An Impact of Assessment of School for Life (SfL) (2007)*).

Consequently, the equity in the state's provision of services to its citizens is clearly a desirable goal. This should guarantee children's right to education and prevent the deliberate practice of cultural assimilation of minority groups into the hegemonic societies. Therefore, the issue of the inclusion of 'educational disadvantaged' nomad children into national education system should henceforth be considered with attention to the way those systems and relative policies understand:

- a. The integration of nomad children within their own household's economy;
- b. The causes of their school drop-out or under-enrolment; and
- c. The causes of the marginalization of the nomads at social, economic, religious and political levels (Křatli, 2001, SCF 2000, Dyer and Chokes, 1979).

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### Research Design

The study employed the descriptive survey research design type.

### Research Questions

1. How relevant is the curriculum of Nomadic educational programmes to the needs of the nomads and the shepherds in the views of:
2. To what extent does the government support for Nomadic education in Nigeria and Ghana?
3. What is the level of implementation of Nomadic Education in Nigeria and Ghana?

### Sample and sampling techniques

The population for this study comprised all board members, ministry officials, teachers and pupils in nomadic primary schools in North Central Nigeria and Northern Region of Ghana.

The study adopted the comparative stratification and human capital theories. The purposive sampling technique was used to select Niger, Kwara and Kogi states from six states of North Central Nigeria, and Yandi, Gushegu and Benbela provinces from Northern Region of Ghana. The proportionate random sampling technique was also used to select the participants. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics and content analysis. The stratified sampling techniques were then used to select sample from the different categories of stakeholders. All officials of the state ministry, primary education board and local government education authority were purposively included. In each of the three selected states of Nigeria, five Nomadic Schools were randomly selected and this was done in the three selected provinces of Northern Region of Ghana. This makes 15 schools from each of the two countries and 30 schools altogether. In each of the

schools, all the Head Teachers, teachers and pupils were purposively selected. In all, 70 board members, 60 ministry officials, 201 teachers and 833 pupils participated in the study.

**Research Instruments**

Four instruments were used for the study. They are:

1. School Headteacher and Teachers Questionnaire (SHTQ)
2. Officials of State Primary Education Board on Nomadic Questionnaire (OSPEBNSQ).
3. Officials of the Ministry of Education Questionnaire (OMEQ).
4. Nomadic/Shepherd Pupils Questionnaire (NSPQ)

The questionnaire on the school headteacher and teachers (SHTQ) was divided into three sections. The first part is on the demographic data such as their qualifications, the second part on the impact of the programme on nomadic children while the third part sought the views of the respondents on the impact of the government policies on the implementation of nomadic educational programmes and on the development of nomadic child education in their areas. The questionnaire on the officials of State Primary Education was divided into two sections – section A contains personal data of the respondents such as sex, local government area, official status and school location while section B contains sections of various items made up from the objectives of the nomadic child education as contained in the National Policy. The questionnaire for the officials of the Ministries of Education (OMEQ) was divided into two sections (Section A and B). Section A is on demographic information while section B contains items presented on the Likert scale. The respondents were required to respond to specific statements along Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The last questionnaire is for the nomadic/shepherds pupils and has two sections (Sections A and B). Section A contains personal data of the respondents such as name of the school, district, local government area, state, class, sex and age while Section B contains twenty-eight questions to be answered by the pupils. The respondents can pick their choice from two suggested alternatives of Yes or No. This was scored over 28.

**Methods of Data Analysis**

The data collected in this study were analyzed by using descriptive statistics such as frequency count, percentages, mean and standard deviation. Also, weighted average was computed to comp

**3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Research Question 1:** How relevant is the curriculum of Nomadic educational programmes to the needs of the nomads and the shepherds in the views of:

**Table 1. Teachers’ Assessment of the Relevance of Nomadic Education Objectives in Nigeria and Ghana**  
**N=201**

Item	Statement	Ratings				X̄	Std Dev.
		4	3	2	1		
1	Citizenship education for effective societal contribution and participation	87 (43.3)	81 (40.3)	20 (10.0)	13 (6.5)	3.20	.87
2	Ability to adapt to changing environment	74 (36.8)	96 (47.8)	18 (9.0)	13 (6.5)	3.15	.84
3	Effective communication	63 (31.3)	37 (18.4)	81 (40.3)	20 (10.0)	2.71	1.02
4	Development of manipulative skills	67 (33.3)	88 (43.8)	23 (1.4)	23 (1.4)	2.99	.95
Weighted Average =		3.01					

Table 1 shows that the teachers rated the objectives as highly relevant as indicated in their responses to items 1 - 4. These yielded mean values of 3.20, 3.15, 2.71 and 2.99 respectively and revealed that teachers in the Nomadic programmes in Nigeria and Ghana assessed the objectives of the programmes, as highly relevant. This is also evident in the overall weighted average of 3.01 which is also high.

Table 2 presents the responses of the Board members on the programme objectives.

**Table 4.2: Board Members’ Assessment of Relevance of Nomadic Education Objectives in Nigeria and Ghana  
N=70**

Item	Statement	Ratings				X <sup>-</sup>	Std Dev.
		4	3	2	1		
1	Citizenship education for effective societal contribution and participation	45 (16.6)	21 (7.8)	1 (6.4)	3 (1.1)	3.56	8.72
2	Ability to adapt to changing environment	40 (14.8)	19 (7.0)	9 (3.3)	2 (0.8)	3.35	0.81
3	Effective communication	39 (14.4)	18 (6.6)	5 (2.1)	8 (2.9)	3.25	1.02
4	Development of manipulative	42 (15.5)	18 (6.6)	2 (0.7)	8 (2.9)	3.34	0.99
Weighted Average =		3.39					

From Table 4.2, the Board members who make policy decisions on the Nomadic education programmes in Nigeria and Ghana rated the objectives as highly relevant across the four items. These are reflected in high mean values of 3.56, 3.39, 3.25 and 3.34 while the weighted average is 3.39.

Table 3 presents their ratings of the relevance of Nomadic education objectives.

**Table 3: Ministry Officials’ Assessment of Relevance of Nomadic Education Objectives in Nigeria and Ghana  
N=60**

Item	Statement	Ratings				X <sup>-</sup>	Std Dev.
		4	3	2	1		
1	Citizenship education for effective societal contribution and participation	36 (10.7)	14 (4.1)	6 (1.8)	4 (1.2)	3.34	0.94
2	Ability to adapt to changing environment	25 (7.4)	19 (5.6)	11 (3.6)	5 (1.4)	3.02	1.01
3	Effective communication	26 (7.7)	18 (5.3)	12 (3.5)	4 (1.2)	3.01	0.95
4	Development of manipulative skills	25 (7.4)	18 (5.3)	9 (2.7)	8 (2.4)	3.04	1.01
Weighted Average =		3.10					

From Table 3, the officials rated the four items highly as they have high mean scores of 3.34, 3.02, 3.01 and 3.04 respectively. With the high weighted average of 3.10, the Ministry officials rated the objectives of the nomadic education programme as very relevant to the needs of the society. A comparison of the ratings by teachers, board members and ministry officials revealed that the Board members rated the objectives best (weighted average = 3.39), followed by the ministry officials (weighted average = 3.10) and then the teachers (weighted average = 3.01).

**Research Question 2:** How adequate are the material resources for the implementation of Nomadic child education/shepherds schools programmes in Nigeria and Ghana?

**Table 4. Teachers’ Assessment of the Adequacy of Resources in Nigeria and Ghana**

Item	Statement	Nigeria N=111				Ghana N=90			
		NA (1)	ANA (2)	AAA (3)	X <sup>-</sup>	NA (1)	ANA (2)	AA A (3)	X <sup>-</sup>
1	Infrastructure such as desks, benches, tables, good class rooms	27 (24.3)	82 (73.9)	2 (1.8)	1.77	50 (55.6)	32 (35.6)	8 (8.9)	1.53
2	Instructional facilities such as, text books, note books and other relevant materials	25 (22.5)	83 (74.8)	3 (2.7)	1.80	40 (44.4)	42 (46.7)	8 (8.9)	1.64
3	Human facilities, such as qualified and competent teachers, head teachers, security men, cleaner and others.	22 (19.8)	84 (75.7)	5 (5.6)	1.85	45 (50.0)	40 (44.4)	5 (5.6)	1.56
Weighted average		1.81				1.58			

**KEY:** NA = Not Available, ANA = Available But Not Adequate, AAA = Available And Adequate

Table 4 shows that teachers in the Nomadic Education Schools in Nigeria rated adequacy of resources as very poor (item 1: 1.77), (item 2: 1.80) and (item 3: 1.85). For teachers in Ghana, they also rated resource adequacy as very poor with mean scores 1.53, 1.64 and 1.56. However, comparing Nigeria and Ghana Nomadic education programmes based on adequacy of resources, Nigeria is better (weighted average = 1.81) than in Ghana (weighted average = 1.58). Hence, the situation is better off in Nigeria, although the availability in the two countries are still grossly inadequate.

**Research Question 3:** To what extent does the government support for Nomadic education in Nigeria and Ghana?

**Table 5: Teachers’ Responses on the Role of Government Funding in Nomadic Education in Nigeria and Ghana.**

Item	STATEMENT	Nigeria N=111					Ghana N=90				
		Ratings				X <sup>-</sup>	Ratings				X <sup>-</sup>
		4	3	2	1		4	3	2	1	
1.	Payment of teachers salaries	8 (7.2)	9 (8.1)	90 (81.1)	4 (3.6)	2.19	24 (26.7)	10 (11.1)	42 (46.7)	14 (15.6)	2.49
2.	Payment of non-teaching staff	6 (5.4)	11 (9.9)	86 (77.5)	8 (7.2)	2.14	16 (17.8)	10 (11.1)	37 (41.1)	27 (30.0)	2.17
3.	Purchase of chalks	22 (19.8)	14 (12.6)	72 (64.9)	3 (2.7)	2.50	17 (18.9)	20 (22.2)	30 (33.3)	23 (25.6)	2.34
4.	Purchase of text books.	15 (13.5)	27 (24.3)	7 (6.3)	62 (55.9)	1.96	14 (15.6)	18 (20.0)	34 (37.8)	24 (26.7)	2.24
5.	Building classrooms	12 (10.8)	10 (9.0)	65 (58.6)	24 (21.6)	2.09	17 (18.9)	11 (12.2)	32 (35.6)	30 (33.3)	2.17
6.	Building hostels	10 (9.0)	1 (0.9)	9 (8.1)	91 (82.0)	1.37	13 (14.4)	10 (11.1)	28 (31.1)	39 (43.3)	1.97
7.	Health facilities	9 (8.1)	5 (4.5)	14 (12.6)	83 (74.8)	1.46	11 (12.2)	8 (8.9)	30 (30.3)	41 (45.6)	1.88
8.	Good roads		3 (2.7)	76 (68.5)	32 (28.8)	1.74	12 (13.3)	17	25	36	2.06
9.	Conducive learning environment	8 (7.2)	63 (56.8)	21 (18.9)	19 (17.1)	2.54	15 (16.7)	13 (14.4)	24 (26.7)	38 (42.2)	2.06
10.	Employment of teachers and other personnel	8 (7.2)	15 (13.5)	75 (67.6)	13 (11.7)	2.16	13 (14.4)	21 (23.3)	18 (20.0)	38 (42.2)	2.10
Weighted Average		2.01					2.15				

Table 5 revealed that in Nigeria, the teachers’ responses indicated low level of the roles of government in Nomadic education. The mean scores yielded are average for only items 3 and 9 with 2.50 and 2.54 respectively. The remaining 8 items yielded low mean scores between 1.37 and 2.19. For Ghana, all the mean scores were very low (1.88 – 2.49) also showing that government is not doing well enough. Comparing the weighted average values, the Ghanaian government’s role is fairly better (weighted average = 2.15) than that of Nigeria (weighted average = 2.01).

**Research Question 4:** What is the level of implementation of Nomadic Education in Nigeria and Ghana?

**Table 6: Implementation of Nomadic Education supplied by the respondents in the two countries**

From Table 6, the implementation of the Nomadic education in Nigeria is fairly good as revealed in the high mean values

Item	STATEMENT	Nigeria N=111					Ghana N=90				
		SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	X <sup>-</sup>	SA (4)	A (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	X <sup>-</sup>
1.	Objectives of nomadic child educational programmes are not properly implemented by the policy makers.	77 (69.4)	25 (22.5)	5 (4.5)	4 (3.6)	3.58	34 (37.8)	27 (30.0)	4 (4.4)	25 (27.8)	2.78
2.	There are enough human and material resources for the effective teaching of the nomadic child in my school.	13 (11.7)	19 (17.1)	72 (64.9)	7 (6.3)	2.34	17 (18.9)	15 (16.7)	17 (18.9)	41 (45.6)	2.09
3.	All the laudable of the objectives of nomadic/child educational programmes have been properly implemented in my school.	21 (18.9)	73 (65.8)	9 (8.1)	8 (7.2)	2.96	22 (24.4)	26 (28.9)	19 (21.1)	23 (25.6)	2.52
4.	The development of the nomadic child education has not made any meaningful contributions to the society.	14 (12.6)	4 (3.6)	76 (68.5)	17 (15.3)	2.14	17 (18.9)	14 (15.6)	25 (27.8)	34 (37.8)	2.16
5.	The perception of my pupils about schooling is not encouraging.	5 (4.5)	8 (7.2)	82 (73.9)	16 (14.4)	2.02	15 (16.7)	22 (24.4)	14 (15.6)	39 (43.3)	2.14
6.	International organizations and non-governmental organizations are not making any positive contribution to the development of the nomadic child educational programmes in my country.	15 (13.5)	11 (9.9)	71 (64.0)	14 (12.6)	2.24	23 (25.6)	16 (17.8)	29 (32.2)	22 (24.4)	2.44
7.	There are numerous problems facing the development of the nomadic child educational programme in my school.	20 (18.0)	77 (69.4)	4 (3.6)	10 (9.0)	2.96	24 (26.7)	28 (31.1)	11 (12.2)	27 (30.0)	2.54
Weighted Average		2.61					2.38				

for items 1 (X = 3.58), 3 (X = 2.96) and 7 (X = 2.96). However, the remaining 4 items yielded low mean scores which

indicated poor level of implementation. For Ghana, 3 items made high mean scores of 2.78, 2.52 and 2.54 (items 1, 3 and 7). The remaining 4 items yielded poor mean scores. Comparatively, Nigeria has higher level of implementation effectiveness (weighted Average = 2.61) than Ghana (weighted Average = 2.38). These scores put Nigeria as fairly good in the implementation of Nomadic education while Ghana was rated poor.

#### **4. DISCUSSION**

It was found in this study that both the Nigerian and Ghanaian nomadic education programmes' objectives were highly relevant to the needs of the respective societies. It is therefore, expected that Board members, ministry officials and the teachers who rated these objectives highly would put in everything they could offer to ensure the effective delivery of the programme and make it works. For Board members, policy formulation and monitoring is not supposed to become difficult. For ministry officials, provision of resources, release of budgeting allocation (funds) and other statutory responsibilities are expected to be perfect; and teachers who are the direct implementers of the curriculum would not shirk in their roles and responsibilities of effective instructional delivery, efficient use of time and resources as well as impactful assessment strategies. Above all, based on this finding, the expectation is that the programme would have little or no problem achieving its goals in the two areas of study. However, the strategies provided in the Draft Policy document on Complimentary Basic Education (2007) and white paper on the Report of Education Review Committee, Ghana (2004) have it that in the two areas of study, a large proportion of children of school age were out of school. This casts doubts on the extent of fulfillment of expectations concerning the achievement of the desired objectives of the programmes.

It was also found that material resources for the implementation of nomadic child education were not adequate in North Central Nigeria and in northern Ghana. Again, the job of the teacher would be rendered ineffective without resources and children learning cannot be meaningful to any appreciable extent. That Nigeria fared a bit better than Ghana could be due to the fact that Nigeria has a quantum of financial resources at its disposal compared to Ghana. However, that both countries, irrespective of their different financial stature, did not provide adequate resources for nomadic education shows that what is lacking is the political will and commitment to the educational needs of the nomadic children.

Further, the results showed that the role of government in nomadic education was not good enough both in North Central Nigeria as well as in Northern Ghana. To this end, government seems not to be doing all within its powers to provide primary education for the nomadic children. For instance, government was not paying teachers and other staff salaries regularly, materials were not available and in good condition, and the learning environment was not conducive. All these did not make for instructional effectiveness, teacher commitment and pupils' interest in schooling. The role of government in Ghana surpassed that obtainable in Nigeria. This shows that the Ghanaian government showed more commitment to nomadic education than the Nigerian government. This finding corroborates the earlier finding that material resources for the implementation of nomadic child education were grossly inadequate as that is part of the roles government should play in the implementation of nomadic education.

The study found that the overall implementation of nomadic education programme in Nigeria was fairly good. This is at the instructional level in the schools and reveals that the teachers made frantic efforts towards effective instructional delivery, curriculum implementation and put in their best in spite of the earlier findings such as inadequate materials, poor performance of roles by the government etc. In Ghana, the implementation of the programme was poor. This leaves much to be desired about the teachers' commitment to the success of the programme no matter what problems they faced. It was also found that apart from the federal government, states, local government, PTA's and non-governmental organizations fund nomadic education in Nigeria. This could be responsible for the fairly good level of implementation of the programme in North Central Nigeria. This funding could be due to the nature of Nigeria education which is on the concurrent list. However, in Ghana, only the federal government fund nomadic education with support from NGO's and external bodies such as international organizations whose contributions can only be occasional and subject to their convictions about the possible success of the programme.

The study also found that so many problems militate against effective implementation of nomadic education in the two areas of study. Given this situation, very little success is expected from the two areas of study. Little wonder, the level of achievement of the objectives of the programme based on pupils performance is only fair. Indeed, more problems effectively constrain nomadic education in North Central Nigeria than those in the case of Northern Ghana. Hence, the pupils in Ghana performed slightly better than their Nigerian counterparts.

#### **5. RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION**

Based on the findings, the following recommendations were made.

The governments of Nigeria and Ghana should capitalize on the good and highly relevant objectives of nomadic education and pursue its implementation with more vigour, greater commitment and improved policy guidelines for stakeholders of the programme.

Governments of the two countries need to provide adequate material resources and employ qualified teachers and non-teaching staff such as care givers for instructional effectiveness in the nomadic schools.

In both Nigeria and Ghana, governments should perform their roles as much as possible especially in the areas of monitoring, policy formulation and implementation, funding, incentives, remuneration, awareness campaigns and periodic evaluation.

Teachers and other critical stakeholders in the implementation process of the programme in North Central Nigeria should put in more efforts by adopting more effective instructional strategies. For the Ghanaian teachers, greater efforts are required and these should be intrinsic and extrinsic. Hence, government, society, board members and ministry officials should help to monitor instructional delivery in the Ghanaian Nomadic schools.

More stakeholders such as PTAs, states and local government need to be involved in funding nomadic education in Ghana. Above all, in both Nigeria and Ghana, more funds should be provided for successful implementation of Nomadic education.

Government and other stakeholders need to collaborate towards providing lasting solutions to the enormous problems confronting nomadic education in North Central Nigeria and Northern Ghana.

Based on the recommendations above, we can conclude that both the Nigerian and Ghanaian nomadic education programmes' objectives were highly relevant to the needs of the respective societies and that material resources for the implementation of nomadic child education were not adequate in North Central Nigeria and in Northern Ghana; the role of government in nomadic education was not good enough both in North Central Nigeria as well as in Northern Ghana and that so many problems militate against effective implementation of nomadic education in the two areas of study. Given this situation, very little success is expected from the two areas of study.

## 6. REFERENCES

- Action Aid Pilot Education Survey: *Draft Ghana Report, Accra.*
- Ezeomah, C. 1978. Educating the Nomads: the attitude of the Cow Fulani towards Education. Jos.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1982. "The nomadic Fulani child in regular schools, attendance, adjustment and achievement" in Ezeomah, C. (ed). The problems of educating nomads in Nigeria. Jos: Ishaku Press Ltd.
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1988. Statistical Survey of Nomads in Ten Northern States, Jos; Nomadic Education Unit.
- Federal Ministry of Education 1986. Blue print on education for the gifted and talented person. Lagos: *Federal Ministry of Education (Special Education Section).*
- \_\_\_\_\_ 1997 Blue print on Nomadic Education, Lagos: *Government Printers.*
- Fobih, D.K.A. & Akyeampong, K. 1999. Ghana Primary School development: Final evaluation of project performance. *Report commissioned by Ministry of Education, Accra, Fakayode, M.F. 2005.*
- Gidado, T. 1998 Nmoadic Education in Nigeria: Issues, Problems and Prospects. Journal of Nomadic Studies. Vol. 1, No. 1, Kaduna.
- Křatli, S. 1998. 2001. *Education provision of nomadic pastoralists, a literature review.* Mangolia
  - Institute of Development Studies.
- Lar, M. 1982. "Nigeria indigenous curriculum and its relevance for curriculum. A paper presented at the staff seminar, University of Jos.
- Obed, M.M. 2003. *Fostering educational participation in pastoral communities through non-formal education: The Ghananian Perspective.* Htt:// [www.escoted.org/infocus/home.htm](http://www.escoted.org/infocus/home.htm).
- VerEecke, C. 1991. "Pulaoku – an empowering symbol among the pastoral Fulbe people in Nigeria" in Tahir, G. (ed) *education and pastoralism in Nigeria*, Zaria: Ahmadu Bellow University Press Ltd.