

# THE ROLE OF THE POLITICAL CLASS IN EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND INSTITUTIONAL POLICY IN NIGERIA

**Emenike O. Amadi PhD**

*Department of Educational Management, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.*  
[amadiemenike2@gmail.com](mailto:amadiemenike2@gmail.com)

**Unwanaobong Michael Etamesor**

*Department of Educational Management, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.*  
[wazzee4me@yahoo.com](mailto:wazzee4me@yahoo.com)

**Markba Ibiye Clinton**

*Department of Educational Management, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.*  
[markbaclinton010@gmail.com](mailto:markbaclinton010@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

*Political involvement in education is a complex and multifaceted issue, with implications for educational autonomy, equity, and student outcomes. This paper examines the role of the political class in shaping educational policy and the challenges that arise from this involvement. It was further highlighted that the political class shapes educational leadership through policy formulation, appointment decisions, and external pressures, embedding their values into the very fabric of educational institutions. The historical context reveals pivotal moments where politics and education converged, showcasing the enduring nature of this relationship. The paper concludes that political leaders play a significant role in shaping educational policies and practices and that their decisions can have far-reaching consequences for educational institutions and the students they serve. However, it is important to consider the challenges associated with political involvement and to take steps to mitigate these challenges. To address the challenges, the paper suggested among others that several different stakeholders, including Educational leaders, Policymakers, educators, other educational professionals, Parents and community members need to advocate for increased local control of education, allowing communities to make decisions based on the needs of their students.*

**Keywords:** *Political Class, Educational Leadership, Institutional Policy, Nigerian Institutions.*

## 1. Introduction

Politics and education are interconnected in a complex web of influence and impact. The intricate interplay between politics and education forms a dynamic landscape where policy decisions have a profound impact on the educational system. This nexus is not merely a historical artefact but an ever-evolving relationship that significantly shapes the present and future of societies (Noor, 2017). As societies progress and confront new challenges, the role of the political class in steering educational leadership and shaping institutional policies becomes increasingly pivotal. The political landscape plays a crucial role in shaping educational leadership and institution policies. Education, as a fundamental aspect of society, requires effective governance and policy-

making to ensure equitable access, quality, and outcomes for all students. The political class composed of policymakers, government officials, and elected representatives, holds significant power and responsibility in determining the direction and priorities of educational systems.

Education, as a cornerstone of societal development, is a focal point for political attention. The policies crafted by the political class reverberate through classrooms, influencing not only the content of curricula but also the very essence of educational institutions. This symbiotic relationship is rooted in the recognition that education plays a transformative role, shaping the minds of future citizens and contributing to the overall development of a nation. The role of politics in education cannot be understated.

Policymakers need to understand the critical relationship between the two and make informed decisions that prioritize the needs of students, educators, and communities. Educational leadership is not limited to traditional school administrators but extends to those in positions of power within the political sphere. These individuals have the authority to shape and influence education policy, allocate resources, design curriculum frameworks, and implement reforms (Rhodes, 2008).

The selection and appointment of key figures in the education sector such as Rivers State University, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State College of Health Technology, Captain Elechi Amadi Polytechnic, etc, are inherently political acts, reflecting the values and priorities of the ruling class. This influence extends beyond individual appointments, permeating – the broader landscape of educational governance. The political class also impacts education through policy development and implementation. Educational policies serve as guideposts for schools and institutions shaping their practices and priorities. Policies can cover a wide range of areas, including curriculum development, teacher training and evaluation, student assessments, and support services (Hatch, 2009). Effective policies should be evidence-based, grounded in research, and adaptable to changing educational landscapes.

Institutional policies, the guidelines that govern educational structures and practices, bear the fingerprints of political decisions. Whether through legislative initiatives, budget allocations, or executive orders, the political class moulds the framework within which educational institutions operate. The intricacies of curriculum design, assessment methodologies, and resource allocation are all subject to the sway of political influence. The importance of the political class in shaping educational leadership and institutional policies is underscored by the far-reaching consequences of their decisions. Educational leaders, appointed or endorsed by political authorities; serve as stewards of the educational system, translating political visions into actionable

strategies. Consequently, the ethos of educational institutions reflects the prevailing ideologies and priorities of the political class. As educational institutions are shaped by political policies, they also tend to reflect the underlying ideologies and values of the ruling political class. In Nigeria, the political class has played a significant role in shaping the educational system. For example, during the military rule of General Ibrahim Babangida, educational policies were influenced by the military's emphasis on national unity and discipline. This was reflected in the curriculum, which emphasized patriotism and loyalty to the state. In more recent years, under the democratic government of President Olusegun Obasanjo, educational policies have been influenced by the government's focus on economic development and global competitiveness. This has led to an emphasis on science, technology, and mathematics in schools (Akinbi, 2006; Omotola, 2012).

In Rivers State, the political class has played a significant role in shaping educational leadership and institutional policies. For example, in recent years, the political class in Rivers State has continued to exert a strong influence on educational leadership and institutional policy. The state government has prioritized the development of technical and vocational education, as well as the promotion of skills-based training, in line with the state's economic development agenda. The state has also established several specialized schools and colleges that focus on technical and vocational education. In addition, the state has introduced policies that aim to improve the quality of education, such as the provision of instructional materials and infrastructure, as well as the training and development of teachers (Oyesanya & Mojekwu, 2019).

Interestingly, the political class in Rivers State has a significant influence on educational leadership and policy. The state government prioritizes technical and vocational education, as well as skills-based training, in line with its economic development agenda. The state has established specialized schools and colleges that

focus on technical and vocational education. The political class also controls the appointment and firing of school board members and educational leaders and has a large influence on the state budget for education. These policies and actions of the political class have a direct impact on the quality of education in Rivers State. This paper therefore explores the connection between politics and education, emphasizing the importance of the political class in shaping educational leadership and institutional policies.

## 2. Conceptual Clarification

### Political Class

The political class refers to the group of people who hold power and influence within a political system. They are typically comprised of politicians, government officials, and other individuals who play a significant role in shaping public policy. In the context of education, the political class includes those who determine the direction of education reform and make decisions that affect the educational system. They may also control funding and resources for education and have the power to appoint and remove educational leaders.

Stoker (2005) saw political class as a group of individuals who have a deep understanding of the political system and can use this knowledge to shape public policy. Stoker further added that the political class is composed of individuals who have a deep understanding of the political system, including its structures, processes, and institutions. This understanding allows them to navigate the system effectively and exert influence over public policy. Additionally, Stoker argues that the political class can use its influence to shape public opinion and influence the way that citizens think about political issues.

Callaghan and Fenno (2010) asserted that political class is a group of individuals who have close relationships with the political elite and can influence the decisions of those in power. Callaghan and Fenno opined that the political class includes individuals who have close personal or professional relationships with political elites, such as lobbyists, campaign contributors, and

think tank scholars. They use these relationships to gain access to the decision-making process and influence the decisions of those in power. For example, lobbyists may use their relationships to gain access to key policymakers and push for legislation that benefits their clients. This influence can be subtle or explicit, and it can have a significant impact on public policy.

Urbinati (2014) also defined political class as a group of individuals who have the power to shape and influence public opinion, regardless of whether they are elected or not. Urbinati argued that the political class is not limited to elected officials, but includes a broader group of individuals who can shape public opinion. This includes individuals who work in the media, in think tanks, and in non-profit organizations. These individuals may not have official political power, but they can use their influence to shape public opinion on key issues. For example, a media commentator may use their platform to promote a particular policy agenda, even if they are not an elected official.

### Educational Leadership

Educational leadership is the ability to influence the educational process through the use of authority and power to achieve the desired educational goals and objectives. In other words, it is about using one's position of authority to make decisions and take action that will improve education. Educational leadership is the process of mobilizing people, developing their capabilities, and directing them to accomplish shared educational goals (Ololube, 2014). This definition emphasizes the importance of working with others to achieve educational goals, rather than working alone. Educational leadership is a collaborative process that unites the talents and forces of teachers, students and parents. The goal of educational leadership is to improve the quality of education and the education system itself.

The primary purpose of educational leadership is to ensure academic success through process, material and training improvements. This is mainly accomplished through collaboration with different individuals, such as educators, parents,

students, public policymakers and the public. From a business perspective, educational leadership is a form of academic management and quality control. Moreover, educational leadership is the sciences of helping students achieve academic success through managing and improving educational programs (Bass & Riggio, 2017). Educational leaders work with students of all ages and strive to help them reach their academic goals. Overall, competent and dedicated professionals are needed to provide excellent educational leadership in schools across the country.

In educational leadership, professionals use knowledge and skills to collaborate with others and promote positive change. They work with diverse communities and build partnerships to achieve educational goals and address complex problems. Educational leaders are both academic and practical, using research and theory to inform their work in real-world contexts. They take a comprehensive approach to problem-solving, using evidence and relationships to guide their decisions. Educational leadership is a process that involves empowering, encouraging, and guiding teachers and students. The goal of educational leadership is to improve educational quality and outcomes. Leaders in the education field use this process to promote positive change and create a supportive learning environment (Kouzes & Posner, 2010).

### **The Political Class in Educational Leadership**

In the field of education, the role of political figures in shaping and developing educational leadership cannot be underestimated. From policy-making to the selection and appointment of educational leaders, political ideologies have a significant impact on the direction and functioning of educational institutions. The influence of political figures on the development of educational leadership is a nuanced process that significantly shapes the trajectory of educational systems (Golant & McDonald, 2000). Political leaders, through legislative actions, policy initiatives, and appointments, play a pivotal role in determining

the individuals entrusted with steering educational institutions.

To begin with, political figures play a crucial role in shaping educational leadership through policy-making. Education policies are often driven by political ideologies and agendas. Political figures, including politicians and policymakers, develop policies that directly influence how educational institutions are run and managed. These policies determine the goals, objectives, and standards that educational leader must adhere to (Ozga & Lingard, 2007). For instance, policymakers may introduce reforms that emphasize standardized testing or promote the inclusion of technology in classrooms. Such policies directly impact the roles and responsibilities of educational leaders, as they are required to implement and uphold these policies.

Political figures contribute to educational leadership development primarily through policy formulation. Legislative decisions regarding education budgets, curriculum frameworks, and institutional guidelines set the parameters within which educational leaders must operate. This policy framework not only delineates the scope of educational leadership but also dictates the priorities that leaders must address. For instance, a government emphasizing technological advancements may push educational leaders to foster innovation and integrate technology into the learning environment. Furthermore, political leaders directly influence educational leadership through the appointment of key figures. School boards, university chancellors, and educational administrators are often appointed or endorsed by political authorities. These appointments are inherently political acts, reflecting the values, ideologies, and priorities of the ruling class (Brunner & Grogan, 2011). A political figure's vision for education, whether centred on inclusivity, innovation, or ideological alignment, significantly impacts the type of leaders chosen to implement that vision.

Additionally, political figures contribute to the development of educational leadership through funding and resource allocation decisions. Educational leaders rely on political figures to

provide the necessary resources and financial support for their institutions. Political figures determine the budgetary allocations for education, which directly influence the availability of resources for schools and colleges. Educational leaders must work closely with political figures to advocate for adequate funding and resources for their institutions. Therefore, the relationship between political figures and educational leaders is critical in ensuring the effective functioning of educational institutions (Horsford & O'Day, 2014).

Moreover, political ideologies have a profound impact on the selection and appointment of educational leaders. The appointment of educational leaders is often influenced by political considerations, aligning with the dominant political ideology of the ruling party or government. Political figures may appoint educational leaders who share similar ideological perspectives, ensuring that their policies and principles are implemented effectively (Johnson et al., 2012). This selection process can be influenced by party affiliations, loyalty, and ideological alignment rather than solely based on merit and qualifications. Consequently, political ideologies can shape the composition of educational leadership and influence the direction and decision-making within educational institutions.

On the other hand, the impact of political ideologies on educational leadership selection can also lead to challenges and controversies. The appointment of education may undermine the principles of meritocracy and result in the exclusion of highly skilled and qualified individuals. This practice hampers the development of effective educational leadership and may hinder progress and innovation in the field of education. Furthermore, the dominance of a particular political ideology in educational leadership may limit the diversity of perspectives and hinder the exploration of alternative approaches. It is essential to strike a balance between political considerations and merit-based selection processes to ensure a robust and diverse educational leadership that can effectively meet the needs of diverse student populations.

In democratic systems, the selection of

educational leaders is often influenced by the prevailing political discourse. Elected officials, accountable to the electorate, may appoint leaders who resonate with the ideologies that secured their mandate. This can create a cyclical relationship, where educational leaders appointed by political figures share and perpetuate the same ideologies, reinforcing the political character of educational leadership (Irvine, 2001). This can also create a dynamic where educational leaders are more likely to be responsive to political pressures rather than to the needs of the educational system or the interests of the community. This can lead to a situation where the political ideology of the leaders takes precedence over educational principles and needs. Political figures also impact educational leadership through external pressures and expectations. Leaders may feel compelled to align their strategies with political agendas to secure funding, support, or maintain their positions. This dynamic interplay between political expectations and educational leadership decisions can influence the direction of educational institutions, sometimes at the expense of academic autonomy.

In other words, political figures play a significant role in the development of educational leadership. Through policy-making and resource allocation decisions, political figures shape the goals, objectives, and functioning of educational institutions (Gonsalves, 2015). Additionally, political ideologies have a profound impact on the selection and appointment of educational leaders, influencing the composition and direction of educational leadership. However, it is crucial to strike a balance between political considerations and merit-based selection processes to ensure the effective functioning of educational institutions and promote diversity of perspectives. Ultimately, the collaboration between political figures and educational leaders is vital in achieving common goals and ensuring the success of educational institutions. Understanding this complex interrelationship is essential for comprehending the intricate dynamics that shape educational leadership in the context of political influence.

### **Institutional Policy and Political Influence in Educational Leadership**

Education is a fundamental pillar of any society, playing a crucial role in shaping individual and collective development. The institutions responsible for providing education are influenced by various factors, one of the most significant being political decisions and policies. This essay aims to investigate how the political class shapes institutional policies in education and discuss specific examples of policy changes influenced by political decisions (Chisholm, 2015). The complicated dance between the political class and institutional policies in education underscores the significant role that politics plays in shaping the framework within which educational institutions operate. Political influence is embedded in the very fabric of institutional policies, with decisions made by the political class resonating through curriculum design, resource allocation, and overarching educational objectives. Political figures shape institutional policies in education primarily through legislative actions and policy initiatives.

The allocation of budgets is a potent tool wielded by the political class to direct the course of education. Governments, through their budgets, signal their priorities for education, determining funding levels for different aspects such as infrastructure, teacher salaries, and educational programs (Gonsalves, 2015). For example, a government emphasizing technological advancement may allocate significant funds to integrate technology into classrooms, influencing institutional policies to prioritize digital learning tools. The political class holds the power to shape and influence the policies that govern educational institutions. They have the authority to allocate resources, establish curricula, determine funding levels, and set standards for evaluation and accountability. Through legislation, executive orders, or political pressure, politicians can shape the direction of education policy, impacting both teachers and students.

One way in which politicians influence institutional policies is through the allocation of resources. The amount of funding allocated to

education impacts the quality of facilities, access to technology, teacher training programs, and more. For example, a political decision to increase funding for early childhood education can lead to the establishment of new preschools and the improvement of existing facilities, ultimately benefitting young learners and setting a strong foundation for their academic journey.

Curriculum design is another area heavily influenced by politics. Politicians often have agendas that they seek to implement through educational institutions. They may promote specific values, ideologies, or historical narratives to shape the minds of future generations. For instance, in some countries, political leaders influence the curriculum to emphasize nationalistic sentiments or cultural preservation (Kaya, 2019). These decisions can impact the content taught in schools and shape students' worldviews. Furthermore, politicians play a role in determining the evaluation and accountability mechanisms for educational institutions. Standardized testing and performance evaluations are often politically driven, with policymakers aiming to measure educational outcomes and hold institutions accountable. However, such policies can sometimes restrict teachers' autonomy and narrow the focus of education to test preparation rather than holistic learning experiences.

The development and implementation of curricula are also subject to political influence. Political ideologies often manifest in curricular choices, reflecting the values and narratives that the ruling class seeks to instill in the populace. Changes in curriculum frameworks can be driven by political imperatives, with shifts in emphasis on certain subjects or historical narratives aligning with the prevailing political discourse. For instance, alterations to history curricula may reflect attempts to reinterpret historical events in a way that aligns with the ideologies of the ruling political class. Specific examples of policy changes influenced by political decisions are abundant across various historical and geographical contexts. In the United States, the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001 is a notable example.

Enacted during the George W. Bush administration, NCLB aimed to improve educational outcomes by introducing standardized testing and holding schools accountable for student performance (Ravitch, 2016). The policy reflected a political commitment to addressing perceived deficiencies in the education system, illustrating how political decisions directly translated into sweeping changes in educational policies.

Similarly, in the United Kingdom, the Education Reform Act of 1988 under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher marked a significant departure in educational policies. The act introduced standardized testing and a national curriculum, reflecting the government's desire to centralize control and improve educational standards (Gillard, 2017). This political decision had profound implications for educational institutions, fundamentally altering the landscape of teaching and assessment. In more recent times, the global push for STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics) education is a testament to the influence of political agendas on institutional policies. Governments worldwide, recognizing the economic significance of STEM fields, have championed policies encouraging schools and universities to prioritize STEM education. This emphasis on STEM is a direct result of political decisions seeking to align education with economic and technological priorities.

### **Policy Changes Influenced by Political Decisions**

Policy changes are often driven by political decisions, as elected officials seek to implement their Policy Changes Influenced by agendas and address pressing issues. From healthcare to education to economic policy, decisions made by politicians can have a significant impact on the daily lives of citizens. While the policymaking process is often complex and nuanced, it is important to recognize the influence of political factors. Some of the policy changes that are influenced by political decisions are:

### **Introduction of Universal Basic Education (UBE) Policy**

The Federal Government of Nigeria introduced the Universal Basic Education (UBE) policy in 1999. This policy was intended to ensure that all children in Nigeria have access to basic education. However, it has been argued that the UBE policy was driven by political considerations rather than educational principles. The policy was introduced as a response to international pressure and did not take into account the specific needs of the Nigerian education system (Brock-Utne, 2015).

### **Introducing the National Policy on Education**

The National Policy on Education, which was introduced in 2014. This policy was intended to ensure that the Nigerian education system was aligned with international standards and focused on preparing students for the global economy (Federal Government of Nigeria, 2014). However, critics have argued that the policy was influenced by political interests and did not adequately address the specific needs of the Nigerian education system. Additionally, the implementation of the policy has been hindered by a lack of funding and resources.

### **The National Secondary Education Commission (NSEC)**

It was established in 2004 to oversee the implementation of the UBE policy. However, the NSEC has been accused of being politicized and ineffective. This is because the NSEC is directly under the control of the Federal Ministry of Education, which is a political body. As a result, the NSEC has not been able to operate independently and has been unable to effectively implement the UBE policy (Fabunmi, 2016). The "No-Child-Left-Behind" Policy: was introduced in 2005 and was intended to improve the quality of basic education in Nigeria. However, the policy has been criticized for its lack of clarity and effectiveness. The policy has also been accused of being a political tool that is not aligned with the needs of the education system (Ikejiofor, 2008).

### **Inclusion and Special Education Policies**

Political decisions have also played a crucial role in shaping policies related to inclusive education and special needs students. Many

countries have experienced shifts in these policies over time, driven by political leaders' commitment to equal opportunities and social justice. These policy changes have impacted institutional practices, calling for more inclusive classrooms, specialized support services, and teacher training programs. As a result, educational institutions have become more diverse and accommodating for students with disabilities (Booth & Ainscow, 2002).

### **Bilingual Education Policies**

In Nigeria, bilingual education policies have been shaped by political decisions, aimed at promoting the equal use of English and local languages in educational institutions. For example, the Bilingual Education Policy of 2017 encouraged schools to offer instruction in both English and local languages, to improve literacy and preserve cultural heritage. This has led to the introduction of dual-language programs and the hiring of teachers who are proficient in both English and local languages (Federal Ministry of Education, 2017).

The collaboration between political figures and educational institutions. Political decisions significantly influence institutional policies, ranging from resource allocation to curricula design and accountability measures. By understanding the impact of political influence on education, it becomes crucial to engage in thoughtful dialogue and encourage diversity of perspectives to create inclusive educational environments that cater to the needs of all learners. These would also help in shaping of institutional policies in education by the political class is a dynamic and influential process. Legislative actions, budget allocations, and curricular decisions are all manifestations of political influence, with specific policy changes serving as tangible outcomes of political decisions. Understanding these dynamics is crucial for educators, policymakers, and the public to comprehend the broader forces at play in the educational landscape and the impact of political decisions on institutional policies.

### **Challenges and Controversies**

Political involvement in educational leadership brings forth a myriad of challenges, as well as controversies that often spark intense debates within both academic and political spheres. These challenges and controversies underscore the delicate balance required to navigate the intersection of politics and education. Diem (2013) and Pace (2006) identified some of the challenges as:

#### **The Potential for Politicization to Undermine Educational Autonomy**

When educational leaders are appointed or influenced solely based on political considerations, the risk of prioritizing political objectives over academic principles emerges. This challenge is particularly acute in systems where educational leaders face pressures to conform to political ideologies, limiting their ability to make decisions that are purely in the interest of academic excellence.

#### **The Volatility of Educational Policies Shaped by Political Cycles**

Changes in political leadership often bring about shifts in educational priorities, leading to frequent policy changes. This dynamic environment can disrupt long-term educational planning and implementation, creating instability for both educators and students. The continuous adaptation to new policies may hinder the development of consistent, effective educational strategies.

#### **The Problem of Ideological Clashes**

Political leaders may seek to imprint their ideologies onto educational curricula, sparking debates about the appropriateness of certain content or the exclusion of alternative perspectives. This ideological tug-of-war can result in a curriculum that reflects the biases of the ruling political class, potentially limiting students' exposure to diverse perspectives and critical thinking.

#### **The Issue of Standardized Testing**

Politically-driven initiatives to assess student performance through standardized tests can lead to concerns about overemphasis on test

scores. Critics argue that this approach narrows the educational focus, encouraging "teaching to the test" and neglecting broader aspects of student development such as critical thinking, creativity, and social skills. Equity in education is a persistent concern exacerbated by political decisions: The allocation of resources and funding, often driven by political priorities, can lead to disparities between affluent and marginalized communities. This exacerbates existing inequalities, as schools in disadvantaged areas may struggle with inadequate resources, hindering students' access to quality education. Political interventions that perpetuate or exacerbate these disparities contribute to ongoing debates about educational justice.

Furthermore, controversies arise when political figures attempt to shape educational policies without adequate input from educators and experts in the field. Decisions made without a comprehensive understanding of educational dynamics may result in policies that are impractical or counterproductive. This lack of collaboration can lead to frustration among educators, diminishing their morale and potentially hindering the effective implementation of policies. In essence, the challenges associated with political involvement in educational leadership are multifaceted. From the risk of politicization undermining educational autonomy to controversies stemming from ideological clashes and equity concerns, navigating the intersection of politics and education requires careful consideration. Striking a balance that respects academic principles, promotes stability, and incorporates diverse perspectives is crucial to address these challenges and minimize the controversies arising from political interventions in shaping educational policies.

### 3. Conclusions

The paper concluded that the complex relationship between the political class, educational leadership, and institutional policy is characterized by a multifaceted interplay of influences and challenges. Key points elucidate the profound impact of political decisions on

educational systems. The political class shapes educational leadership through policy formulation, appointment decisions, and external pressures, embedding their values into the very fabric of educational institutions. The historical context reveals pivotal moments where politics and education converged, showcasing the enduring nature of this relationship. From the Renaissance patronage to the contemporary emphasis on STEM education, the political class has consistently moulded educational trajectories in response to societal needs and ideological shifts. Challenges emerge from the potential for politicization to undermine educational autonomy, the volatility of policies tied to political cycles, and disparities in resource allocation that exacerbate educational inequalities. Controversies arise when political ideologies clash, particularly in curriculum development and standardized testing, showcasing the ideological battleground within the educational landscape. Looking forward, the trajectory of this relationship remains dynamic. As societies evolve, political figures will continue to play a pivotal role in steering educational leadership and shaping policies. Striking this balance will be crucial for fostering educational systems that not only reflect the values of the political class but also empower individuals and contribute to the holistic development of societies.

### 4. Suggestions

A few suggestions have been put forth to address the challenges that come with political involvement in education. The implementation of these suggestions often involves several different stakeholders, including educational leaders, such as school administrators and principals. Policymakers, at the local, state, and federal levels, educators, including teachers, counsellors, and other educational professionals, parents and community members, can play an active role in advocating for change. By working together, these stakeholders can make meaningful changes that address the challenges and controversies associated with politics by:

*Advocating for increased local control of*

*education, allows communities to make decisions based on the needs of their students.*

*Encouraging shared governance models, which involve stakeholders such as parents, teachers, and administrators in decision-making.*

*Promoting increased transparency and*

*accountability in the use of public funds.*

*Increasing funding for under-resourced schools is not without its own set of challenges. For example, identifying which schools need additional resources can be difficult, and there may be disagreements over how to allocate funds.*

## References

- Akinbi, O. (2005). General Ibrahim Babangida and the military intervention in politics in Nigeria: 1985-1993. *Africa Development*, 31(2), 45-63.
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2017). *Transformational leadership* (4th ed.). Psychology Press.
- Booth, T.; & Ainscow, M. (2002). *Index for inclusion: Developing learning and participation in schools*. David Fulton.
- Brock-Utne, B. (2015). Unequal education for African children: The consequences of the universal basic education policy. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 45(3), 303-321.
- Brunner, J. R., & Grogan, K. E. (2011). Who chooses our principals? The politics of principal appointment in U.S. schools. *Peahody Journal of Education* 86(3), 487-508.
- Callaghan, J., & Fenno, R. F. (2010). The policy communities approach: Differentiating relationships between policy actors. *Policy Studies Journal*, 38(4), 471-492. <http://doi:10.1111/.1541-0072.2010.00390.x>
- Chisholm, J. (2015). The impact of political systems and politics on educational decision-making. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 45, 118-125.
- Diem, C. M. (2013). A political and practical analysis of the no child left behind act. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 25(3), 279-287.
- Fabunmi, A. A. (2016). Politics of education and its effects on education policy in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Education, Development and Counselling*, 3(1), 13-22.
- Federal Government of Nigeria (2014). *The National Policy on Education*. NEDRC,
- Federal Ministry of Education (Nigeria). (2017). *National Policy on Education (Revised)*. <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pdf0000248847>.
- Gillard, J. (2017). The UK Education Reform Act 1988 and the globalization of education: An appraisal of the Thatcher education revolution. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, 45(1), 3-20.
- Golant, S. M., & McDonald, G. D. (2000). *Politics and the school principal: Negotiating constraints and opportunities*, Teachers College Press.
- Gonsalves, C. (2015). Education budget allocations and the political cycle: A case study of India. *Journal of Public Economics*, 128, 89-100.
- Hatch, T. (2009). The impact of the political class on education. *The Journal of School Public Relations*, 30(4), 20-25.

- Horsford, S. D., & O'Day, J. (2014). Educational leadership and political strategy. *Educational Leadership*, 71(8), 46-51.
- Ikejiofor, N. N. (2008), Education policy analysis and the "no-child-left-behind" policy: A Nigerian case. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 2(4), 25-32.
- Irvine, J. J. (2001). *The politics of educational leadership: A new vision for school leaders and their communities*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Johnson, D. H., Heilig, J. V., & Cosner, A. D. (2012), Principal selection and ideology: Distributed leadership and political drift. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 50(4), 439-464.
- Kaya, E. (2019), The politics of curriculum and the ideology of national education in Turkey. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 49(4), 551-569.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2010). *The leadership challenge: How to make extraordinary things happen in organizations* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- Noor, N. (2017), The interplay between education and politics: An international and historical perspective, *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Education*, 1-26. <http://doi:10.1093/acrefore/9780190264093.013.165>.
- Ololube, N. P. (2014). School leadership: The characteristics and functions of a school leader. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(6), 1028-1038.
- Ololube, N. P. (2014). The impact of leadership behaviour on teachers' job satisfaction: The case of private secondary schools in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(9), 1375-1385.
- Omotola, J. S. (2012). The democratic experiment in Nigeria (1999-2011): A qualitative analysis. *African Journal of Political Science and International Relations*, 6(2), 53-71.
- Oyesanya, B. O., & Mojekwy, D. (2019), Politics, educational reforms, and social change in Rivers State, Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 10(3), 60-65. <http://doi:10.5901/m'ss.2019.10.3.6>.
- Ozga, J., & Lingard, B. (2007). *Education policy: Processes, actors and contexts*. Routledge.
- Pace, D. M. (2006). A critique of the No Child Left Behind Act. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 44(3), 250-267.
- Ravitch, D. (2016). The politics of reform: What we can learn from No Child Left Behind. *Educational Researcher*, 45(6), 343-348.
- Rhodes, S. R. (2008). A critical theory of educational leadership: Authority, the body, and the politics of difference. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 579-610.
- Stoker, G. (2005). The political class: How politicians think and why it matters. In S. Cairney & P. A. Weller (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science* (pp. 148-168). Oxford University Press,
- Urbinati, N. (2014). The mixed regime of opinion. *The Journal of Politics*, 76(3), 746-757. <http://doi:10.1017/s0022381614000782>