



Dynamics And Politics Of Human Resources Development And Utilization In Nigeria:
Implications For National Development

Sakiemi A. Idoniboye-Obu (PhD)¹

&

Chris Barigbon²

ABSTRACT

The size of a country's population matters a resource for national development only by reason of the mixture of skills, knowledge and discipline it possesses. It is by this that other resources could be harnessed and mobilized for the economic progress of the society. This is the focus of this paper. Drawing on the knowledge provided by our theoretical framework- political economy, we find the problem with human resource development and utilization in Nigeria in the nature and character of its politics largely in the hand of a kleptocratic, visionless, undisciplined ruling and political class. This is driven entirely by private accumulation. To provide some empiricism, we apply content analysis to a set of data derived from secondary sources. The recommendation made include increase allocation to education and research to catch up with the requirement for accelerated development; disciplined utilization of the fund; and the encouragement of research spirit. The cry for a visionary leadership to drive the development process to expected height is strongly emphasized.

Keywords: Politics, Resources, Growth, Development.

JEL Classifications: I25, O11, Q32, Q56, R11.

1. INTRODUCTION

Classical economists since the time of Adam Smith have recognized several factors as the basics of development or economic development per se. These factors are population, natural resources, capital accumulation and technological process (Landes, 1998). As such, societal growth and development in the estimation of these scholars is a function of the increase in the supply of the factors of production, improvement in the quality of the factors and organization of their use (Lewis, 1954; 1966, 1979; 1980 cited in Barigbon, 2018). The radical and orthodox scholars all explained development and underdevelopment in terms of capital accumulation.

¹ Senior Lecturer, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

² PhD Candidate, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Lewis remarked “the central fact of economic development is capital accumulation” (Meir, 1976, p246). Frank (1969), Rostow (1960) Baran (1973) and many more are some thoughts in this line. However, within the past few decades, several economists and development scholars have shifted attention to the fundamentals of human resources and particularly investment in human capital for development. To this end, Schultz (1971, p.34) remarked that: “we gave altogether too much weight to non- human capital because we did have a concept of all capital, therefore, we failed to take account of human capital and the important part it plays in production in a modern economy.

The above underscore the importance of human resources (capital) in the development discourse. These human resources are a product of the population. Humans constitute the most valuable asset in both developed and developing countries (Hadir and Lahrech 2015). Value is raised and added to natural resources through application of capital organizing technical skill and labour (Bauer, 1957, p.47). It therefore follows that, natural resources in a country, their diversity and quantity notwithstanding, are passive factors relative to the preparation and will of the population for development. This is the role of human resource development.

Nigeria is abundantly blessed in this ramification with a population estimated at over 198 million (NBS/NPC, 2018); occupying a landmass of 923,768 sq. km ((Executive Diary, 2009). Udo (1978) remarked that “out of every five African, at least one person is a Nigerian”. Ironically, a country so enviously blessed in mineral resources, water, vegetable, livestock and other economic resource without much environmental challenges. According to Eya (2010) Nigeria, one of the world 50 richest countries in the early 1970s now lags in the development race and becoming one of the 25 poorest countries of the world. Nigeria is occupying an abysmal 159 ranking position out of 177 countries surveyed on the Human Development Index (UNDP, 2016). It is our contention that much has not being committed to the optimal development and utilization of human resource for national development. This is the focus of this paper.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 *Human Resources*

In this paper, we shall use human resources, manpower and human capital interchangeably. The centrality of man in development processes is a settled issue in academics. Man activates, defines and determines the path of the development process. His character inevitably changes in the course of development (Okowa 1996, p.34). Human resources refer to “the totality of energies, skill, knowledge and experiences available in a country” (Diejomaoh, 1978, p. 34). It is the leadership, managerial, scientific, engineering, technical, craftsmanship and other skills which are employed in creating, designing, developing, organizing, managing and operating productive and service enterprises and economic institutions (Yesufu cited in Anyanwu, Oyetusi, Oikhena, & Dimowo, 1997, p 286). According to Harbison (1973):

Human resources constitute the ultimate basis for the wealth of nations. Capital and natural resources are passive factors of production; human beings are the active agents who accumulate capital, exploit natural resources, build a social, economic and political organization, and carry forward national development. Clearly, a country which is unable to develop the skills and knowledge

of its people and utilize them effectively in the national economy will be unable to develop anything else.

For Schultz (1993), it is a tool for enhancing competitive advantage since it involves the process of training, knowledge acquisition, initiative and others which are achieved through the process of empowerment. Odimegwu (2005) says “it is human capability and productivity engendered through knowledge and skills acquired from education, training, training and experience and facilitated by enabling environment”. He emphasized that human resources has four cardinal aspects, namely educational system, health, social services and good governance. Finally, human capital has been seen as “developed human resources” (Korgbeelo, 2012, p. 14).

Central to all the definitions reproduced above are knowledge, skills, training, and experience which acquisition is prime to the development of other resources. The development of knowledge, skills, and training is the function of education while knowledge development and innovation result from investment in research. It is to this extent that we shall focus more on the development of the education sector as a pivot for human capital or resource development.

2.2 Economic Growth and Development

Economic growth is measured by gross national product (GNP). It is a complex process that involves more than physical capital formation. Economic growth is different from development as there may be growth without development or what Ake referred to as “motion without movement”. But there cannot be development without growth as development per se encompasses economic growth. Development therefore is beyond rise in national income, “it implies sustained, secular raise in national income accompanied by changes in social attitude and customs which impede development” (Kalagbor, 2004, p.164). As remarked by Harbison and Myers (1964), capital, natural resources, foreign and international trade of course play important roles in economic growth but none is more important than manpower. As countries embark on policy of accelerated growth and development, it evidently became clear that natural resource endowment of material by them do not provide a sufficient condition for growth and development, hence the renewed emphasis on human capital development.

Human Resource Development here involves the improvement and /or transformation of a nation’s human resources by better Medicare, nutrition, accommodation, environment, education, and training. Emphasis here is placed on education and training. Anyanwu et al, (1997, p.289), explains that the development of human resources is achieved through formal and informal means especially primary, secondary and tertiary education .

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This paper examines the role of human resource development and utilization and its effect in economic growth and development. For lack of space, it will be pertinent to state that our data shall be derived from secondary sources and the method of data analysis shall be content analysis. Our discussion is framed in the political economy approach of the Marxist tradition.

Our political economy of the dynamics of human resource utilization and development in Nigeria is centred on the basic understanding that in Nigeria -type society, power is central to the structure of the economy and one’s position in it. The process by which it (power) is acquired, the purpose to which it (power) is deployed, and the manner in which it (power) is

transferred is very critical to development, as political institution and leadership drives development.

To be sure, Nigeria's very unproductive ruling class sees politics as an investment with expectant high return. "The state here is the source of economic power as well as instrument of it. The state is the major means of production" (Ekekwe, 1986, p. 18). Political is an avenue to seize state power for personal accumulation because it is profitable to do so. The Nigerian ruling class is uninterested in the development of Nigeria. According to Ake (1981) "the prospect for capitalist appropriation through political power are so attractive that some people who want to be wealthy and who would normally have engaged in productive enterprise have preferred to seek their fortune in politics" (p.126).

As such attention of the ruling class is focused on those investments that protect and perpetuate their privileged position. Investment in this circumstance is skewed in the direction of coercive instrument of the state rather than productive capacities. Education and human resource development are the first casualty of this pattern of investment of state resources. What passes for an ideology of development for the political class is private accumulation (Ekekwe, 2011, p.28). This is an explanation also for high budgetary allocation to defense (even in peace times), than to education, research and human resource development. Such high allocation for defence and security is basically for the protection of their properties. The political economy of contract and contract award for capital structure would not also allow for investment in scientific – technological development in education.

The nature and character of Nigeria's petrodollar industry also contributes to the poor investment in education. Thus, Nigeria's petrodollar industry, rather than the drive capital and infrastructural development, has instead, turned into a resource curse manifesting in the "Dutch Disease". It has destroyed the social fabric of the nation; heightened corruption, destroyed agriculture and triggered social crises and criminality. A further ramification of the character of the petrodollar industry is that the operators of the state (ruling class) are less reliant on the citizens for revenue; more so as revenue from taxation (in their thinking) is insignificant in comparison to that from the petroleum industry, to drive the economy. The compounding dilemma of an inactive role for the citizens in this regard is more catastrophic and damning than the ordinary man on the street can imagine or understand.

The quest to cling on to power by the ruling class subjects the generality of the population to exclusion from power structures, deprivation, and abject poverty. Wright's class explanation of poverty renders this more clearly. According to him;

- (i) inverse interdependence welfare principle: where the material welfare of the exploiter usually depends on the material deprivation of the exploited. The welfare of the exploiter is at the expense of the exploited.
- (ii) The exclusion principle: the causal relation that generate principle (i) above involves asymmetrical exclusion of the exploited to and control of important productive resources (here politics and state power).
- (iii) The appropriation principle: the causal mechanism which transfer (b) exclusion into (a) differential welfare, involves appropriation of the fruit of labour of the exploited by those who control relevant productive resources (here politics and state power) (Wright, 1994, p.10) (underlining, ours).

Mark Anikpo's contribution is also instructive. He sheds light on Wright. Adopting a political economy approach, Anikpo explained that:

Poverty is the historical process of individuals or groups being forcefully eliminated from control of decision-making machinery that determines the production of resources in a society. It manifests in forms of hunger poor health, poor education. Poverty becomes a euphemism for underdevelopment (1995, p.13).

Akeredolu-Ale's treatment of "Power Theory of Poverty" is also an argument in our line of thought. The deliberate and conscienceless reproduction of poverty and deprivation which are manifestations of the underdevelopment of human resource of Nigeria will in turn induce "circulation of elite" (*using the concept for want of a better word*). The deliberate suffocation of the educational system will have the offspring of the (political class) foisted on the rest of society upon return from the better developed foreign universities. The understanding of the nature of underdevelopment and underutilization of Nigeria's human resource as well as the causes of her dysfunctional human resource development system would find explanation in the nature and character of Nigerian politics.

4. PERSPECTIVES OF HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT AND PLANNING IN NIGERIA

Human capital is so important that Adedeji explains that at the Khartoum Declaration of 1988, it was declared that:

the human dimension is the sine qua non of economic recovery, no SAP or economic recovery programme should be formulated or can be implemented without having at its heart detailed social and human priorities. There can be no real structural adjustment or economic recovery in the absence of the human imperative (cited Adedeji, et al., 1990, p.281)

It is pertinent to note that the problem of Nigeria is not the poverty of natural resources but the underdevelopment and underutilization of her human resources. Thus, Anyanwu et al (1997) and Yang (1967), arguing that the first step to development is the building up of human capital, explain that attempts are still been made to determine ways and means of utilizing this resource as evidenced by the resort to national development planning. Okigbo (1993) corroborates their position about Nigeria.

Development planning began in Nigeria in 1946 with the 'Ten Years Plan of Development and Welfare for Nigeria'. There was also the First National development Plan (1962-1968); the Second National Development (1970- 1974); the third National Development Plan (1975-1980); the fifth National Development Plan which lasted 1985-1988 before the introduction of the structural adjustment programme; the vision 2010; the Vision 20:20:20.

Similarly planning for human resource development birthed the Ashby Commission, which was established preparatory to independence. From it we got the 'Ashby Report of 1960' which recommended a projection of enrolment figure in Nigeria Universities for a decade (1960-1970). There is also the National Manpower Board 1962, the National Universities Commission

established in 1974; and the National Directorate of Employment established in 1986 . All these bodies were established to deal with human capital development.

These development plans and efforts recognize the development of the nation's human resources as a key in the development process. Thus, the Vision 20:20:20 specifically and interestingly has as one of its objectives: *to improve the educational system in terms of access, equity, infrastructure, teacher quality, cumulative relevance, funding and planning*. The National Policy on Education which is a component of the human resource development strategy of Nigeria has "the acquisition of appropriate skills, activities and competence both mental and physical as equipment for the individual to live in and contribute to the development of his society" (FRN, 1981, p.8) as one of its key objectives.

The National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS), introduced by President Obasanjo, in its development plan and poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, stipulated a goal of increasing government's budgetary allocation to health and education from 8% to 10% between 2004 and 2007, comparatively paltry. Despite the emphasis on education as a medium for human capital development in all the development plans, commitment to these lofty ideals remains the bane of Nigeria. A good reading of Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala's "*Reforming the Unreformable*" finds substantiation for our assertion that dedicated effort is not channeled to Human resource development by the ruling class. Except a passing remark in one paragraph, there is no discourse on human development viz- a- viz the commitment of government in this guise.

5. PUBLIC EXPENDITURE ON HUMAN RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT IN NIGERIA

A report of the National Manpower Council of the United State remarked thus:

Our strength as a nation depends more on the quality than the number of our people. Their potential capacity and capability are at once our richest and most precious possession. Every field of our endeavor will benefit as we provide greater opportunity for the training of skills and the development of talent and leadership (cited in Yang, 1967, p.1).

Highlighting the centrality of human capital development as key to the productive capacity of the people, Adams Smith also asserted:

whatever be the soil or extent of the territory of any particular nation, the abundance or scantiness of its annual supply, must in that particular situation depend on two circumstances... the proportion of its people engaged in useful occupation and skills (cited in Todaro & Smith, 2011, p. 236).

It is to this extent that the United Nations recommended that third world countries in the development race should commit a minimum of 26% of their national budget to education and 5% to health. While education and health as corollaries of development are both fundamental to the broader notion of expanded human capabilities, we focus on education because it is more instrumental to knowledge development and innovation than health which is more concerned with wellbeing and productivity of human capital. To drive home our point, we shall now consider in details government expenditure on education.

Table 1: Expenditure on Education in Nigeria: 1925 – 1952

Year	Total Expenditure (E)	Expenditure on Education (E)	Expenditure on Education as % of Total Expenditure
1925	6,509,244	116,301	1.8
1929	6,045,621	263,457	4.3
1933	6,898,816	237,732	3.3
1936	6,585,458	231,983	3.5
1939	6,576,835	282,820	4.3
1951/52	49,131,000	8,325,000	16.9

Source: Central Bank of Nigeria (2013). Statistical Bulletin and Information

From Table 1, it could be seen that expenditure on education progressed from 1.8% in 1925 to 16.9% in 1951/52. This was in the colonial period. The period witnessed more of educational financing by the missionary and voluntary agencies than by the colonial government. In the First National Development plan, the percentage of cumulative actual government expenditure on education was 8.5 %, and health 1.4%. In the Second National Development plan of 1970-1974, the actual government expenditure on education stood at 11.4% of the cumulative budget of that period while health stood at 5.0%. In the Third National Development Plan, it was 13.8% for education and 10.2% for health.

TABLE 2: Federal Government Budgetary Allocation to Education in Nigeria 1960-2015

Year	Allocation as % of Total Budget	Year	Allocation as % of Total Budget
1960	6.02	1987	1.93
1961	6.15	1988	2.40
1962	5.19	1989	3.55
1963	3.45	1990	2.83
1964	3.65	1991	1.09
1965	3.57	1992	3.86
1966	4.23	1993	5.62
1967	4.88	1994	7.13
1968	2.84	1995	7.13
1969	2.20	1996	12.23
1970	0.69	1997	17.59
1971	0.53	1998	10.27
1972	0.62	1999	11.12
1973	0.88	2000	8.36
1974	2.96	2001	7.00
1975	4.57	2002	5.9
1976	8.71	2003	1.83
1977	3.12	2004	10.5
1978	11.44	2005	9.3
1979	3.70	2006	11.00
1980	4.95	2007	8.09
1981	6.45	2008	13.0
1982	8.09	2009	6.54
1983	4.04	2010	6.40
1984	4.49	2011	1.69
1985	3.79	2012	10.0
1986	2.69	2013	8.70
		2014	10.6
		2015	9.5

Sources: Central Bank of Nigeria (2015) statistical bulletin and information, various issues www.nigeria.gov.com

For the Fourth National Development Plan, 8.6% of the total expenditure of government for the period was spent on education (including N.U.C, science and technology) while 2.5 % was spent on health. (Obi, 2005, pp.134 – 161). This figure has even declined since the return to democracy. Shockingly a paltry 6.0% was invested in the educational sector in 1999 and 1.5% in the health sector. The investment and expenditure in the education sector remained in that range over time with the 2015 figure standing at 6.9% for education and 3.6% for health.

Juxtaposing, the fact presented above with the UN requirement earlier stated shows clearly that Nigeria has not met the benchmark. This is an indication that investment in human capital development is not a priority to the operators of the Nigerian state. This is also reflected in her HDI which is at the very lower rung of the development index. The highest budgetary allocation to education was in 1997 with 17% of the total budget. The allocation for 1996 was 12.23%, both in military regime. Unfortunately, the trend has nosedived in our democracy. It is so appalling that in the 2011 budget, the education sector got a paltry, 1.69%. The ruling class cannot at all be taken seriously despite the endless mantra of development and dividend of democracy.

TABLE 4: Research Grant Allocation and Releases from 1987 – 2003

S/NO	Year of Release	Allocation	Amount Released (Naira)
1	1987	12,776,000.00	12,776,000.00
2	1988	20,000,000.00	17,237,875.00
3	1989	20,000,000.00	20,000,000.00
4	1990	24,000,000.00	22,075,371.00
5	1991	51,266,530.00	16,645,034.00
6	1992	14,500,090.00	17,472,972.00
7	1993	122,182,102.00	122,182,102.00
8	1994	132,213,817.00	98,662,255.00
9	1995	155,534,575.00	73,973,806.00
10	1996	153,842,000.00	50,583,686.00
11	1997	194,013,732.00	122,020,447.00
12	1998	215,618,453.00	149,993,549.00
13	1999	302,735,543.00	183,501,468.00
14	2000	448,127,780.00	612,666,910.00
15	2001	206,410,910.00	206,410,619.00
16	2002	-	-
17	2003	73,435,618.00	73,435,618.72

Adapted: Okebukola P. 2004: “Strategies for stimulating Research and Development in Nigeria Universities.” In Nigeria University System Chronicle, Vol.12; No.2 pp.17-18.

The official figure contained above may at best be described as official distortion. We say so because, going through the document from which it was prepared, spurious terminologies as such “Grant allocation” and “actual release” create a negative mental picture of the manipulations behind the scene. This would translate to distortion in actual release and utilization of the research grant by the receiving universities. The research bulletin of National Universities Commission (NUC) for example states that , out of the total fund budgeted for research between 1990- 2000, less than 20% was actually allocated to the NUC by the Government. Interestingly so to speak, less than 5% were allocated to the universities and out of the allocation less than 3% of the fund was utilized for research. Where the monies did go to, the same document provides the answer.

The record available shows that for the last ten decades (that is up to 2004), Nigerian Universities has been spending over 98% of its recurrent expenditure to pay salaries and only 2% on maintaining services, with *zero allocation to research*. 4% of capital grant were misappropriated at the *corridors of power*, the remaining 60% is looted through inflated contacts, contracts, *kickbacks* etc. It is however more worrisome to note that over. 70% of the laboratory equipment and books in today's Nigerian Universities for example were bought and placed between 1960- 1980 (Nigerian Universities System Chronicler, 2004, p.18

Figures from the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND) corroborate our assertion of paltry and abysmal allocation to research. For details see Appendix B, C, and D. The tables show that from 2009 to 2013 (i.e. over a five-year period) a total of ₦1122,83 million was allocated to the f education sector over the five years from 2009-2013. From this sum only ₦32.5 million which is 2.89% of the total sum went to research while ₦ 200 Million (17.8 %) went to staff training and development and the bulk went to capital projects which gulped ₦692.83 million (61.7 %) of the total sum. Unfortunately, most of the project were also abandoned, some never executed.

Within the same period 2009 to 2013, ₦2070.14 million was allocated to averagely 62 Universities across the country. Available information indicates that research got ₦ 57 million (2.75%); staff training, and development got ₦ 640million (30.9 %); and projects got ₦1, 122.14 million (54.20%) of the total allocation. For Polytechnics, ₦ 1283.8 million was allocated to averagely 50 Polytechnics within the same period. From the amount allocated, ₦ 37m (2.88 %) was allocated to research; staff training and development got, ₦ 239 Million (18.6%) and the greater share of ₦ 780.3 Million (60.78%) went to capital projects.

Research and staff training are both components of human resource development (R & D). It is therefore bizarre to find the paltry percentage allocated to human development even by TETFUND and NUC that should ordinary champion the course of human resource as a tool for national development. In most cases, private accumulation of the allocated fund has been the order of the day. Those saddled with the responsibility see it as their opportunity “trickled down”.

It is in similar way that priority is given to defense spending, public debt servicing and others that do not directly and significantly contribute to economic growth and development. We do not intend to jettison the place of a peaceful environment in national economic growth and development. However, the attendant contribution of a developed human resources and their proper utilization cannot be wished away. It remains our contention that internal strife will be reduced to the barest minimum if the minds and hands of the people are engaged in productive thinking.

TABLE 5: Universities Funding from 1997 – 2006 (recurrent only)

Year	Amount requested (N)	Amount allocated (N)	% of amount allocated	Amount received	% of amount received
1997	10,522,155,501.00	4,929,093,300.00	47%	3,697,817,940.00	35%
1998	17,472,030,158.00	5,415,461,292.00	31%	7,295,447,523.50	42%
1999	34,695,109,125.00	7,568,388,580.00	22%	10,362,430,271.98	30%
2000	47,346,272,832.00	28,206,218,865.91	60%	282,218,865.91	60%
2001	49,150,259,219.11	26,948,001,227.42	55%	28,419,719,502.84	58%
2002	57,545,682,641.00	26,425,549,500.00	46%	30,351,483,193.00	53%
2003	65,516,123,727.00	34,411,319,280.00	53%	34,203,050,936.33	52%
2004	199,677,706,206.00	41,051,218,783.61	21%	41,492,948,787.01	21%
2005	42,604,258,068.00	50,961,971,536.00	120%	49,453,098,168.72	116%
2006	71,090,382,041.00	75,400,267,475.00	106%	75,400,267,475.00	106%

Adapted: NUC Records as cited in Okojie J.A. (2009).

In Table 5, above we found what looks like a progressive increase in funding to universities. They are distorted official figures and they remain so at all times material to the writing of this paper. The phenomenal rise in school enrolment at all levels as well as increase in number of institutions carries with it, corresponding decline in percentage of the national budgetary allocation to universities which has been on a steady decline. Shockingly, this allocation has declined from an average of 30% in the 1960s, 15% in the 1970s, 8% to 6% in the 1990s and less than 3% in the 2000s. (Calculation derived from table 2 above.)

The first casualty of the underfunding of the university is the society as the first evidence is seen in the decline of production. Many are poorly trained and unfit for the competitive labour market. A World Bank report notes that “university graduates are poorly trained and unproductive on the job and short comings are particularly severe in oral and written communication and in applied technical skills are mostly half-baked” (2001, p.3).

Quality education provides critical thinking engendering the application of new technology and entrepreneurial activities. It is worthy of note that countries like Hong Kong, Korea, Singapore and Taiwan have recorded high level of productivity and development through a developed work force. Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew statement at the opening of the Science Tower in the University of Singapore in 1966 demonstrated the commitment of a leader keen on development. He said:

Our population.... is the one thing we have which make up for our lack of size and numbers, and it is of utmost important that in the field of science and technology, we should lead the field in this part of the world (Yew, 2011, p. 36).

With determination and vision, this dream was followed in the case of Singapore with strong government commitment in public funding, a rich and diverse research ecosystem which has been built over the last two and half decades. There was significant investment in the universities and other public institutions as the epicenters of research crystallization. A National R & D Survey of Singapore, 2014, show progressive funding to R & D through budgetary allocation from S\$2 billion under the 1991 five-year National Technology to S \$ 19billion under the recently RIE 2020 Plan. Nigeria and Singapore began the journey in the 1960s. While Nigeria lags behind in the development race, Singapore has developmentally progressed from a “third world” to a “first world” in all sense of the word (Yew, 2011)

High population does not necessarily imply a nation has potentials for human resource development. Nigeria has a bigger population and more abundant natural resources (water, forestry, marine. Solid mineral, good environment, location) than Japan, Norway, Sweden, Australia, Singapore just to mention a few; but these countries and Nigeria are not at par in term of technological advancement or socio-economic development. It all depends on the country's capacity for research and development which is measured by the size and quality of its scientific community. The emergence of China as a new and major player in the process of globalization can be mostly attributed to its development of her scientists. Nigeria does not have a dedicated and well-funded national core research community. As noted 'China has the second largest number of researchers in the world (862,000) acquired through public funding, behind USA (1.3 million in 1999) but ahead of Japan (675,000) and Russia (487, 000) (OECD Science, Technology and Industry Scoreboard 2005, p.2).

6. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

A cursory look at human resource planning, development and utilization in Nigeria would reveal the problem in general terms as : poor funding of research; lack of concerted research on planning and manpower utilization; low percentage response from establishment saddled with manpower surveys; lack of current and comprehensive information on the stocks of skill available; incapability to evaluate manpower content of development projects; lack of proper guidance of educational planner; little evidence of coordination in matters relating to employment, education and manpower training; inability to attract and retain competent professional staff, hence brain-drain of the little available; use of inadequate estimation techniques; lack of data; lack of coordination between manpower planner and educational system; and lack of coordination of among agencies charged with the responsibility of resource planning and development (Anyanwu et al, 1997, p.287). But Nigeria's problem is more specific than those stated above. The problem is leadership: the emergence of courageous, dynamics and visionary leadership prepared to harness the country's potential for national development. Lee Kuan Yew is a starling example. Nigeria needs a leadership that looks beyond accumulation of oil revenue; that will emancipate her from the 'resource curse or Dutch disease'. This leadership that will mobilize the population in pains and labour for economic prosperity is currently lacking, but we cannot look outside for it. It must come from within.

Conclusively, our poor human resources development and utilization is not entirely the problem of inheritance of a dysfunctional educational education system traced back to colonialism. That system produced the manpower it needed for it functioning. The problem is the ruling class who has not displayed the degree the foresight, tenacity and capacity to adapt to a changing economic, social and political environment. It is worrisome that over six decades after independence, with her resources, Nigeria is still distance far in the threshold of economic stability and development. What must be done? While Nigeria await the emergence of focused leadership, we recommend as follows:

- a) Allocation to education has not to meet the standard recommendation of the united nation (UN), by implication, it will aid Nigeria economic growth rate. Government should as a matter of priority implement the minimum United Nations recommendation of 26 percent budgetary allocation on education.
- b) There is the need for appropriate channeling of the nation's capital expenditure on education and more importantly scientific-technology based research to promote economic growth and development.

- c) The business sector should open up a dialogue with the education on the need for skills, especially at the technical, vocational and tertiary levels. There are good examples from Korea on how this can work to the benefit of the entire society.
- d) Whether human development in general or education in particular is looked upon as a right, or from the goals of a social contract between the state and its citizens to enhance the well-being of all individuals in the society, there is a need for government and public intervention. Public interventions in education can lead to an improvement in the future income stream of individuals, enabling equitable distribution of wealth and help reduce poverty.
- e) Some level of internal discipline is needed.
- f) Above all a committed leadership to drive our development process remains the all time solution.

REFERENCES

- Ake, C. (1981) Political economy of Africa. Essex –London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Akeredolu-Ale, E.O. (1975) “*Poverty as a social issue: A theoretical note*” in Teribe O. (ed) (Poverty in Nigeria. Ibadan: The Nigerian economic society.
- Anikpo, M. (1995) Poverty and democratic process: The new face of mass poverty in Nigeria. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Publishing House.
- Anyanwu, J.C, Oyefusi, S.A. Oikhena, H.E., Dimowo (1997). The structure of Nigeria economy (1960- 1997) Onitsha: Joanee Educational Publisher Ltd.
- Baran, P. A. (1973) The Political economy of growth. London: Harmondsworth-Pengium Book.
- Barigbon, C. B. (2018) Rethinking “Lewis” in the Nigerian development question Port Harcourt: IAUE Unpublished Ph.D Class discussion paper No.2
- Diejomaoh, V. P. (1978) “Nigeria human resources : A preliminary assessment” In Domachi, U. G. Diejomaoh (ed) Human resources and African development
- Egwu, S. (2003) Electoral violence and demoralization project in Nigeria. In Olasupo, B. A. (Ed) Electoral violence IN Nigeria: issues and perspectives. Abuja: Friedrich Robert Stiffing Publication.
- Ekekwe, E. N. (1986) Class and state in Nigeria. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Ekekwe, N. (ed) 2011 Nigeria, leadership and development: Essays in honour of Chibuikwe Rotimi Amaechi. Boulevard-UK: Authur House UK Ltd.
- Frank, A. G. (1969) Latin America: underdevelopment or revolution. New York: Monthly Review Press retrieved from [https://www.scribd.com>document](https://www.scribd.com/document) accessed 22/5/2018.
- FRN (1981). National policy on education. Lagos.
- Hadir, A & Lahreh, A. (2015) Human capital development and economic growth in Morocco. International Journal of Education and Human Development (1) 49.
- Harbin, F. H. (1973) Human resources as the wealth of nations. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Josey, A. (2012) Lee Kuan Yee: The crucial years. Singapore: Marshal Cavendish.
- Korgbeelo, C. (2012) Investment in human capital and the Nigerian economy (1970- 2010). Unpublished M. Sc Thesis. University of Port Harcourt.
- Landes, D. (1998) The wealth and poverty of nations. London: Little Brown Book Group.
- Maier , G.M. (1964) Leading issues in development economics. New York: Oxford University Press.
- NBS/NPC (2018) ‘Nigeria’s estimated population is 198’ available at population.gov.ng/publication/journal retrieved 22:04,24/4/2018

- Obi, E.A. (2005) Political economy of Nigeria. Onitsha: Book Point Ltd.
- OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) 2008 Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2008. Paris: OECD Publishers.
- Okongwu, C.S.P. (1986) The Nigerian economy. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Okonjo-Iweala, N. (2012) Reforming the unreformable: Lessons from Nigeria. London: The MIT Press.
- Okowa, J. W (1996) How the tropics underdevelopment the Negro: A questioning theory of development. Port Harcourt: Paragraph
- Rostow, W.W (1960) The stages of economic growth: A non-communist manifesto. <https://www.britainica.com> accessed 23/5/2018 at 1:5am.
- Schultz, T. (1971) Investment in Human capital: The role of education and research: <https://www.researchgate.com>. accessed 22/5/2018.
- Todaro, M. P & Smith, S.C (2011) Economic development, England: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Wright, E.O. (1996) ‘*Class Analysis of Poverty*’ Acta Sociologica Vol. 1. NO. 1.
- Yang, W. (1967) Human Resource development as a Key of Economic Development. Available at <http://digitalcommons.auctr/dissertations>
- Yesufu, M. T. (1962) “The Nigeria Manpower Problem. Journal of Economics and Social Studies.” Vol 4 (3) November.
- Yew, L. K. (2011) From third to first world. New York: Harper Collins Publishers.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX : A.

Variables on public expenditure and GDP in Nigeria, 1999-2015

YEAR	GDP	EDU	HLT	DES	AGR	PDS	TOTAL
	N' BILLION	N' BILLION	N' BILLION	N' BILLION	N' BILLION	N' BILLION	N' BILLION
1999	4679,21	43,61	16,64	91,82	59,32	30,84	4921,44
2000	6713,57	57,96	15,22	68,55	6,34	131,05	6992,69
2001	6895,2	39,88	24,52	85,92	7,06	155,42	7208
2002	7795,76	80,53	40,62	132,37	9,99	163,81	8223,08
2003	9913,52	64,78	33,27	119,44	7,54	363,51	10502,06
2004	11411,07	76,53	34,2	174,12	11,26	382,5	12089,68
2005	14610,88	82,8	55,66	153,62	16,33	393,96	15313,25
2006	18,564,59	119,02	62,25	202,11	17,92	249,33	650,63
2007	20657,32	150,78	81,91	253,39	32,48	213,73	21389,61
2008	24296,33	163,98	98,22	292,75	65,4	381,2	25297,88
2009	24794,24	137,12	90,2	276,49	22,44	251,79	25572,28
2010	54612,26	170,8	99,1	422,91	28,22	415,66	55748,95
2011	62980,4	335,8	231,8	563,16	41,17	527,18	64679,51
2012	71713,94	348,4	197,9	659,3	33,3	679,3	73632,14
2013	80092,56	390,42	179,99	565,07	39,43	828,1	82095,57
2014	89043,62	343,75	195,98	547,67	36,7	941,7	91109,42
2015	94144,96	325,19	257,72	740,75	41,27	1060,38	96570,27
TOTAL	584354,8	2931,35	1715,2	5349,44	476,17	7169,46	601996,5

SOURCE: CBN Statistical Bulletin 2016

APPENDIX B:

TETFUND intervention allocation to universities 2009 – 2013

S/N		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	ALL YEARS
	NUMBER	57	56	58	63	70	
		Amount					
		(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)
A	Projects	57	193,14	175	347	350	1122,14
B	Research	7	10	10	10	20	57
C	Library Development	10	20	25	53	60	168
D	Staff Training & Dev,	50	60	80	130	140	460
E	Publication of Journals	3	5	10	10	10	38
F	Manuscripts Dev,	-	-	5	5	5	15
G	Conference Attendance	-	15	20	40	40	115
H	Entrepreneurship Centres	-	-	75	-	20	95
	TOTAL	127	303,14	400	595	645	2070,14

Source: tETFUND.gov.ng/index.php/interventions/projects/disbursement.

APPENDIX C:

TETFUND intervention allocation to polytechnics 2009 – 2013

S/NO		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	ALL YEARS
	NUMBER	52	47	50	51	52	
		Amount					
		(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)
A	Projects	38,34	126,06	169,9	208	238	780,3
B	Research	3	5	10	9	10	37
C	Library Development	5	10	10	30	50	105
D	Staff Training & Dev,	25	30	40	64	80	239
E	Public of Journals	1	2	5	5	10	23
F	Manuscripts Dev,	-	-	1	1	10	12
G	Conference Attendance	-	7,5	10	20	30	67,5
H	Entrepreneurship Centres	-	-	10	-	10	20
	TOTAL	72,34	180,56	255,9	337	438	1283,8

Source: tetfund.gov.ng/index.php/interventions/projects/disbursement

APPENDIX D:

TETFUND intervention allocation to colleges of education 2009 – 2013

S/NO		2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	ALL YEARS
	NUMBER	61	62	54	54	54	
		Amount					
		(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)	(N Million)
A	Projects	37,16	112,67	125	208	210	692,83
B	Research	2,5	5	10	5	10	32,5
C	Library Development	5	10	10	20	30	75
D	Staff Training & Dev,	15	20	30	55	80	200
E	Publication of Journals	1	2	5	5	10	23
F	Manuscripts Dev,	-	-	1	1	5	7
G	Conference Attendance	-	7,5	10	15	30	62,5
H	Entrepreneurship Centres	-	-	10	10	10	30
	TOTAL	60,66	157,17	201	319	385	1122,83

Source: tetfund.gov.ng/index.php/interventions/projects/disbursement

Abstracting and Indexing in:

GIGA - The Electronic Journals Library of the German Institute of Global and Area Studies, Information Centre, Hamburg; Google Scholar; Global Development Network (GDNNet); Social Science Research Network (SSRN); Econlit - The American Economic Association's Index (ECONLIT); EBSCO; IndexCopernicus USA; British International Libraries; Anton's Weekly Digest; International Abstracts in Operations Research; Environmental Science and Pollution Management; Research Alert

www.juliapublishers.com