Int J Arts Humanit, 2026, 7(1): 513-528
DOI: 10.25082/IJAH.2026.01.011

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Release Them and Let Them Go

Anayochukwu Kingsley Ugwu[1] **Aloysius Uchechukwu Anyanwu**[2*] **Ikechukwu Onah**[3] **Kelechi Mathilda Abone**[3] **Leo Chigozie Ozoemena**[4] **Hilary Chimezie Ngwoke**[3] **Stephen Olisaemeka Chukwunweolu**[5] **Albert Nnaemeka Nwosu**[6] **Tunde Osawu**[7] **Abubakar Yakubu Emeje**[8] **Augustine Chukwunwike Agu**[9] **Chiagoziem Anthony Okoyeuzu**[10] **Benedict Chukuwemeka Ozor**[11] **Destiny Ogechi Odiaka**[1] **Martha Oluebube Nzuteigbo**[12] **Chinecherem Felicia Agu**[10]

[1] Department of Philosophy, Madonna University, Elele, Rivers State, Nigeria
[2] Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria
[3] Department of Philosophy, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria
[4] Department of Philosophy, University of Sussex, Brighton, United Kingdom
[5] Spiritan School of Philosophy, Isienu, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria
[6] Department of Philosophy, University of Benin, Benin City, Edo State, Nigeria
[7] Department of Religion and Philosophy, University of Jos, Jos, Plateau State, Nigeria
[8] Department of Philosophy, Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, Kogi State, Nigeria
[9] FSC. De La Salle Brothers (Nigeria) & Tangaza University, Nairobi, Kenya
[10] Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria
[11] Department of Political Science, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria
[12] Department of Philosophy and Religion, Alex Ekwueme Federal University, Ndufu-Alike Ikwo, Abakaliki, Ebonyi State, Nigeria

Check for updates

Correspondence to: Aloysius Uchechukwu Anyanwu, Department of Educational Foundations, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State, Nigeria;
Email: aloysius20@gmail.com

Received: July 10, 2026;
Accepted: September 9, 2026;
Published: September 15, 2026.

Citation: Ugwu, A. K., Anyanwu, A. U., Onah, I., Abone, K. M., Ozoemena, L. C., Ngwoke, H. C., Chukwunweolu, S. O., Nwosu, A. N., Osawu, T., Emeje, A. Y., Agu, A. C., Okoyeuzu, C. A., Ozor, B. C., Odiaka, D. O., Nzuteigbo, M. O., & Agu, C. F. (2026). Release Them and Let Them Go. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities*, **7**(1), 513-528. https://doi.org/10.25082/IJAH.2026.01.011

Copyright: © 2026 Ugwu et al. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 4.0 International License, which permits all noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Abstract This is neither the usual biblical statement that Jesus Christ would utter to anyone who encountered salvation through Him to the glory of God the Father, nor is it the common African form of prayer in which people command Satan or spiritual forces to release individuals from the stronghold of spiritual captivity. This is a common paraphrase used within the confines of almost all tertiary institutions in Nigeria. It may be used by a concerned teacher-lecturer or non-academic staff member to address another teacher-lecturer or supervisor as an intervention, so that a learner or supervisee who has been pinned down by their supervisor may be released for graduation. The problem here lies in the fact that some lecturers or supervisors, out of bias or wickedness, refuse to release their students and supervisees for graduation. The paper therefore poses two questions: Should a lecturer or supervisor be begged to allow a learner or supervisee to graduate? Should bias exist between a lecturer-supervisor and a learner-supervisee, and if so, to what degree? It was in addressing these questions that the paper argued that bias constitutes one of the factors which impeded progress in innovative discovery and scholarship, as well as a damaging force that victimized students' futures and imposed psychological, financial and economic burdens, raising the rate of suicide-related attempts among students in Nigerian tertiary institutions. The paper found that "bias" was a major factor undermining the ethical teacher-student relationship that ought to prevail within academia. It also proffered solutions to address the threats to these expected ethical values in the teacher-lecturer-student-learner relationship. The paper adopted a descriptive-survey method, in which sampling techniques and philosophical-conceptual analysis formed its central features.

Keywords: supervisor-supervisee relationship, academic bias, sex-for-marks, Nigerian tertiary education, decolonization of education

1 Introduction

There are a number of scholarly writings that aim at questioning the concept of 'education' as to whether to be educated means and implies speaking, reading and writing well, or to have a well-balanced reasoning capability and well-behaved tendency in addition to the aforementioned qualities. As it concerns education in Nigeria, some educationists and non-educationists (sympathizers of the situation of education and how the situation has affected being educated in Nigeria), have raised worries as to what it truly means to be educated and what an ideal

teacher-student relationship ought to be (Okafor, 1984; Ezeani, 2005). It is in the nature of the teacher/student relationship that the whole question of release or allow them so that they will graduate, arises.

The problem that raises the worry and which this paper identifies is the question of how the teacher/student ethical relationship is managed. The teacher/student relationship has both ethical, and rational questions, as well as social, economic and material, psychological, scholarly, professional and emotional considerations. It is from this angle that the paper raises questions that borders on bias in the relationship. What is bias, and should it, at all, play in the relationship, and to which extent? what the core consequences of such a biased relationship are?

The response to these questions that borders on the teacher/student relationship is the ground upon which the paper defends the thesis that this teacher-lecturer-biased relationship has imposed emotional, psychological, financial and material burdens on students, and by extension, parents/guardians. This, as a consequence, has marred educational system and attainment of knowledge and its supposed subsequent implications in life. The paper argues that apart from other factors like economic hardship, social stratification, etc., the teacher/student relationship under questioning here, is a major factor responsible for the frustration that has caused high number of 'out-of-school' or 'drop-out' and high rate of suicidal experiences among Nigerian students of tertiary institutions. Some of the cases of suicidal attempts that are interrupted in Nigeria and among students stand as practical evidence on this position.

2 The Conceptual and Contextual Meaning of 'Release/Allow Them to Go'

This concept 'Release/Allow Them to Go' is a menace, a tumour which many people shy away from exposing in the Nigerian higher academic environments. It is an appealing statement of a concerned individual on behalf of a student/supervisee who has been held down or hostage, for some deduced reasons which shall be given a contextual analysis. the phrase "release/allow them let them go" is invoked when pleading with a teacher or supervisor to set their students or supervisees free from unnecessary and wicked grips. When the resultant attitude of a professor leads to making this statement, other ranking academicians like teachers/lecturers keep quiet on the possible following grounds: one, that it does not concern them; two, that if they criticize such an attitude, that the professor being a senior member in the department, might hinder their academic success and promotions, by 'sitting' on their files and refusing them good recommendations during promotional or appraisal exercise, or any other possible reason. For non-academic members of the department/faculty, they keep quiet being afraid that the 'senior man' may facilitate their expulsion or removal from the department/faculty and subsequently posting them to other departments/faculties that would not be favourable to them, or probably other reasons.

The concept of the statement 'release/allow them let them go' could also arise from an attitude in the teacher-student relationship, when a teacher of primary and/or secondary schools (O-Level (Ordinary Level)) decides to keep failing a pupil or student in a subject he or she teaches, thereby keeping the learner more than the stipulated time s/he should study that very level. In the higher educational level (tertiary institutions) (A-Level (Advanced Level)) - Colleges of Education, Polytechnics and Universities - attitudes that may call for such statement are when a lecturer decides to keep a student at a standstill, by failing him/her unnecessarily; or through a colleague whom s/he could easily approach and connive with, to keep the student in school. At a very close investigation, it could be found out that the constant failing of the student is nothing but an act of bias/wickedness from the teacher/lecturer, not that the student has not done well to score high in that very subject.

Interviews were organized, and questionnaires were also administered to participants totaling 5,500 (students 2,500, lecturers 1,800 and non-academic staff members 1,200) in some major Federal, State and private universities in Nigeria. In the North-East (N-E), the exercise covered 5 federal and state universities respectively but no private school located in the geopolitical zone was covered. In the North-West (N-W), it covered 5, 4 and 7 federal, state and private universities respectively. In the North-Central (N-C), it covered 6, 7 and 7 federal, state and private universities respectively. In the South-East (S-E), the exercise took place in 8, 8 and 10 federal, state and private universities respectively. In the South-West (S-W), it covered 5, 8

and 7 federal, state and private universities respectively. In the South-South (S-S), it covered 5, 7 and 7 federal, state and private universities respectively. Major focus was to determine the ethical efficiency of teacher/lecturer-learner/student relationship and where the factors that could bring about such statement 'release/allow them to go' in such a relationship in Nigerian tertiary institutions, are higher in effect.

Findings showed that the negativity of student/learner-teacher/lecturer relationship that creates influences that could call for such a statement, 'release him/her to go' is real in major Nigerian tertiary institutions. They showed also that, in over all, the effectiveness of the factors that bring about such a statement is higher in tertiary institutions in the Southern than in the Northern parts of the country. There could be many reasons that can explain that: (1) the fact that there is higher number of high schools in the South; (2) interest in education and scholarship is higher in the South than North, and as such, the probability of getting a higher number of victims of such experience will be higher in the South; (3) because North is predominantly Muslim, influences from Islamic religious orientations that undermine literacy and scholarship, human/gender rights, etc., make some Northerners, especially women, uninterested in education, and so, reduce the possibility of getting higher number of victims of such experience. However, the percentage of the factors that cause such a statement 'release him/her to go' is very minimal in the N-E and N-W, but a bit higher in N-C. Probable reasons for this could include the following; (1) there is a higher number of tertiary institutions where such statement could occur in, in the N-C than in the N-E and N-W; (2) Central Northerners are not Muslim-extremists but more of Muslim-converts, compared to others in other northern parts, hence, they have interest in education more than others.

In the South, the percentage of the factors behind such statement 'release him/her to go' is very high. But there are things to note here. (1) While this biased student-lecturer relationship in the S-E has no ethnic basis, it manifests largely as attempts to discipline the students concerned, it is ethnically motivated in the S-W where it is high on non-Yoruba student-indigenes and in the S-S where non-indigenes of the sub-ethnic groups that make up the S-S zone in Nigeria, suffer it more severely. (2) It is true that in the S-E, such relationship is hidden under the auspices of 'drill them to sharpen their brain', but many a times, the process is (or could be) hijacked by biased teachers/lecturers against the involved student(s). More carefulness should, therefore, be observed here. (3) Significantly and from a practical viewpoint, the Southern zone has recorded the production of a high number of academically sounded minds who have recorded huge successes in academics in Nigeria and beyond, more than the Northern zone, yet, has attracted very little funding in education compared to what goes to the North that has fewer high schools and produced less in academics. What an irony! This irony has played out in so many ways. It could answer why the *federal character* would task the Southern candidates aspiring to gain admission into high schools (universities, polytechnics and colleges of education) higher than the Northern counterparts. For instance, a Southern candidate may score 300 in the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (JAMB) entrance examination for tertiary institutions yet fail to gain admission into the Medicine and Surgery programme, but one from the North who can score 200 in the same JAMB can gain admission in the same course. This does not end upon gaining admission into tertiary institutions; it persists throughout one's programme of study. The Southerners have high number of both high schools and educated people, yet, have always been cheated even in the face of the so called *federal character* by the Northerners who have less in both. In managing Nigerian version of federalism of carrying everybody along through the principle of *federal character*, Nigerians miss the best but produce below-average compared to global standard. What it therefore means is that at the altar of the Nigerian *federal character*, Nigerians sacrifice *merit and standard* for *quota representation and sub-standard*. In what follows below are contextual instances/cases/scenarios that facilitate the statement: 'release/allow them to go'. Be that as it may, greater percentage of the attitude of teacher-lecturer from the Southern part while relating with their student-learner calls for such statement more than how such could occur in the northern part.

3 Factors that may Prompt/Nurse Attitudes that may call for 'Release/Allow him/her to go'

There are, of course, factors that may prompt in some people, certain attitudes that may warrant them to react, respond to him/her 'release him/her let him/her go'. The paper shall try

to interrogate these factors as follow:

3.1 Teachers/Supervisors-Caused Factors

Bias: Bias is not always negative. It could be a pre-existing knowledge that one holds about a person or thing, or one's admiration over someone/thing, etc. The ability of a person to manage such bias when formally engaging with the person or thing in question is what matters. But the bias this paper refers to, following the message it intends to communicate, is the negative one. A supervisor once reminded his supervisee that their communities were fighting over communal boundary, yet, the student/supervisee was writing on the African concept of communalism that upholds community unity, love, tolerance, and having a human face when being or interacting with others. That was a sort of defence for the deliberate delay of the supervisee's research. Unfortunately, the lecturer/supervisor is a pastor in one of the popular Christian denominations. Questions that may follow include: what concerns the community affairs, in this context, with the academic supervisory affairs? Who, among the two involved people, is expected to do something significant *vis-a-vis* the land dispute between their two communities: the holy man of God lecturer/supervisor or the student/supervisee? Sometimes, the factor behind the experience of such attitude could be a family-based one. In that, it could be bias for bias against the parent of the student/supervisee; perhaps there had been a time the student/supervisee's parents quarrelled the teacher/lecturer/supervisor or his/her own parents or relatives; or, that there had been an ugly incident that had happened between the two parties or their relatives, and for the teacher/supervisor, the teaching/supervision has become a time to make them pay through unnecessary spending and re-spending on their children student. Many scenarios can better explain what the paper is saying here. One, a student was beaten by a teacher, and the student went home and told his parents and the parents came to school and had a heated quarrel which only the intervention of the school management could quench from metamorphosing into a fight. From the teacher's perspective, the easiest way to retaliate is to keep failing the student and subjecting him or her to unwarranted expenses and unfair circumstances. Two, it could be a quarrel at home between parents of two families whose children are teacher and student respectively in a school and the best way for the teacher to prove the student that their own family can deal with his/her family is to deal with him/her in the school out of bias. These, among other scenarios, are instances where bias could play in schools and in negative to student's experiences.

Still under the effect of bias, some lecturers/supervisors may decide to hold a student for years because s/he dislikes the area the student/supervisee is writing, or a scholar on whom the student/supervisor anchors his/her project writing, and having convinced him/her to write the area s/he the lecturer/supervisor wants/admires, and seeing the student/supervisee insisting on his/her already chosen area. The question now is: why should a lecturer/supervisor impose his/her wish on a student/supervisee? Why should s/he force the supervisee away from his/her desired area of interest to his/her (supervisor's) own area of interest? Unfortunately, the possible response from other lecturers would be 'the student/supervisee is disobedient; why must s/he insist on writing that his/her own, s/he should pretend and write to satisfy his/her supervisor's interest and then get out from the school'. But is this truly academics? Why pretence; and satisfaction of one's desire instead of personal desire? The ethics of the student/lecturer relationship demands that having seen the conceptual incongruity between what the student wants to do and the angle s/he is coming from, and what the desire of the teacher/supervisor is, the teacher/supervisor should gently refer the student to another supervisor who has interest in the student's area and angle, and try as much as possible not to bias the minds of other teachers, and not to spoil things for the student in his/her course of stay in the school. But this is what many Nigerian students pass through. For instance, as it concerns philosophy, if a student writing on African Philosophy is assigned to an anti-African Philosophy lecturer/supervisor for supervision (those who do not believe in what is called 'African Philosophy'), then the student would expect only three things: (1) to be forced to the area of the Western Philosophy which his/her 'Westernized' supervisor likes, or, knows well, or, did his/her own studies; or (2) be frustrated out from the school; or (3) be ready to be tied down (stuck) in school for years. The supervisor would not allow the supervisee to even submit his/her work, and even when he or she allows it, s/he would develop reading apathy towards the work because the interest is not there, yet s/he would keep unfairly criticizing the work which s/he never read. This is the experience many Nigerian students go through today in school.

Another ugly factor that may cause to the reaction with the statement 'release/allow him/her to graduate' is hunger and greed which give the exploitative tendency to materially exploit a student through either material gift or finance. Naturally, human beings are insatiable; they keep seeking for more, especially material acquisitions. The richest man on earth is never tired of seeking for more wealth. Adding to this, as it concerns Nigerians, it is a fact that following the negligence the governments have shown towards the education sector, teachers/lecturers are hungry and the rewards for their commitment are not commensurate with their labour. That is why in the annual budget, the people in government allocate to themselves huge amount of money, for which its one tenth, is what they allocate to the education sector. So, following this, though never a justification, teachers/lecturers try to cover the shortfall from their students, by exploiting them. Sometimes, they get engaged in other endeavours like business, and because their livelihood depends much on the other one, they commit themselves more to, they prioritize it over their engagements in education. They may come to spend just two hours unproductively in school, and write their names for attendance purposes and month-end-salary and then zoom off to their main base. Private academic institutions are not left out; in fact, it is in their capitalist principles to exploit both students and employees humanly and otherwise, for the progress of the schools (Ugwu & Ozoemena, 2019). Following this effect, some teacher/lecturers would decide to hold a student from graduation just because they are trying to exploit him/her materially or financially having seen that s/he is coming from a wealthy family. They may keep the student following their insatiable nature trying to keep exploiting him/her even when they may have exploited enough.

In Nigeria, the saga: 'sex for mark' is a common phrase used to describe an experience in an academic environment. It is a situation where sex is exchanged for academic excellence or performance. While some students are struggling in the system to succeed academically, others are using their bodies for sexual gratification to lecturers to succeed academically. Many a time, it could be a situation where a male lecturer victimizes a female student or a male student (homosexuality). Sometimes, it could be a female lecturer victimizing a male student or female student (lesbianism). But the latter is not so common like the former. Sometimes, it is not even a question of lecturers' 'victimization' of students, but (commonly female) students willingly give their bodies, or even force themselves onto lecturers so that in the end, lecturers would then give them higher scores. Sometimes also, they call it 'an act for fun' without primarily doing it for any academic score. Some students have been held standstill in school, and many lecturers have been queried and or expelled, following this experience. Sex for marks "has stripped many professors, PhD holders, etc. their highly respectable cloaks of intellectuality. Failure to comply is planning to fail and remaining in the school for more years than appropriated" (Ugwu & Ozoemena, 2019). By this, knowledge is reduced to a timely pleasure of the flesh, which is an anomaly and a sign of haphazard understanding of what knowledge truly means. Knowledge is not just metaphysical but also sacred because it is an invisible quality processed into somebody to make him/her better. Socrates conceived knowledge as such which was why he heavily criticized Sophists for material exchange for knowledge. Unfortunately, many Socrates today, no longer see knowledge like that.

Another scenario that may prompt the attitude that may call for a reaction with the statement 'release him/her to go' is when a teacher/supervisor decides to subject the student/supervisee to thorough and critical work; that is, doing a good academic work. A student may lack the concentration and patience to critically come up with an intellectually satisfying work which would make the lecturer supervisor to keep him/her waiting until s/he comes up with a good work before s/he is released, allowed to graduate.

Other possible causes *vis-a-vis* the statement, is weakness of the teacher/lecturer to take on and with the demanded seriousness, students' supervision. Some teachers/lecturers in the four walls of academic environment are too weak to stand up responsibly in their professional duties. That is why some of them are referred to as 'put my name' lecturers/authors who could manage to afford to pay for their own allotted publication fee. They could not make a single paper in years let alone having a Google Scholar profile. In their laziness, the students are delayed into extra years, losing materially, emotionally and physically in age. It may not necessarily mean that they do not know what they do in academics, but they are either too lazy or too disorganized to comport themselves and facilitate their supervisee's graduation.

Still under this terrain, finds another factor that its effects could be cautioned with 'release/allow him/her to go'. It is a factor of those who are too busy for themselves and care less about

the success of others who are still growing scholarly. They are always struggling to attain more, even as professors, and then keep their supervisory responsibilities unattended to. Not even face to face meeting, let alone attending to online submissions made to them. They keep striving for their own academic growth, and neglecting the other person's growth no matter how small and insignificant it could be to them. Lamenting on the decay of teacher-student relationship, authors record that a teacher/supervisor barred his supervisee from calling him, mailing him, sending text to him, chatting to him on WhatsApp, Facebook was omitted because he was not on Facebook, hence the only communication was to put whatever he (supervisee) wanted to discuss with him (supervisor) on his (supervisor's) pigeonhole. Exemplifying what is being said here about some supervisors selfish focusing on their affairs and ignoring a student and his/her research affairs yet not releasing him/her to another who may be interested or merciful enough to look into the research, these authors record that "in fact, the supervisee's Chapters 4 and 5 submitted to him in August 2018 were given back to him on 20/2/2019 but the official date the supervisor wrote he finished reading the work was 15/11/2018" (Ugwu & Ozoemena, 2019).

These factors cannot be all interrogated without pointing out the issue of quackery. The issue of quackery points to the fact of unprofessionalism of some who are workers in many academic environment. This one is as a result of the recruitment process in the academic institution where recruitment is based on 'please get him employed as a teacher'. Major interest is on offering him/her an employment because s/he is our product, or, a relative to one in authority in the academic institutional management or a relative to an influential person in the community. Interest is on where s/he would be getting money to live on, less care is given to his/her capability to plausibly deliver, and the responsibly stand on his/her duties. This very act has filled majority of Nigerian academic institutions with quacks, people who, themselves, graduated under another person's shoulder through malpractices and cheats commonly referred to as 'expo'.

There is another important factor of interest. This issue of interest questions how supervisors are assigned to students, and again, the process of admission and managing students' academic programmes well. But on a comparative note to the system obtainable in other countries, the paper shall interrogate the two riders of the main factor of this paragraph: the question of interest. Supervision is sometimes assigned based on who the to-be-supervisee is; what he or she can offer me materially or financially offer to me to say 'well done supervision' in the end of the whole exercise; or, what is his/her personal or family status and affluence from which I could gain after supervising him/her? Many a time, supervisors are assigned by casting lots and the one you are fated with, becomes yours. Some would be like 'Prof., make your choice' as the most senior, after which the Head of Department or the main managing authority would come and in that seniority order. Of course these are not in the official laid down principles of managing an academic institution, and so, should not be expected to be as clear as certain laid principles, but they are certainly factors that play out in attitude among lecturers. In the process of the whole thing, when the outcome for which the supervisor made choice or fated with the supervisor is not realistic, the supervisor would not have any interest thereby ignoring the student yet not releasing him/her to go and meet another serious minded and interested lecturer for his/her supervision. Some supervisors may be bias about certain perspectives or understanding or trajectory a particular course is going through because the course is not worth it, and especially when compared with the Western counterpart. Assigning students who have interest in that particular course and the perspective it is positioned, is a big problem for the students. For instance, till today, some African scholars with Westernized, or better still, colonized mentality still do not believe there is nothing good from Africa, if there could be at all, certainly not an African philosophy. They do not only argue against the reality of the course on pages of papers, but also defend it orally in conferences, workshops and seminars. Now assigning a student who believes and is convinced about the reality of the African philosophy and believes also s/he has something intellectually positive to contribute in it, is just a big punishment to the student. The bias cannot allow the teacher/supervisor because supervising and approving the research through to success is a contradiction to his/her intellectual stances which may have been defended publicly. The implication is that what s/he has rejected and thrown out through the door, public intellectual gathering is what s/he is accepting, approving and bringing back through the window in the supervisee's research.

This interest-related issue leads to another questionable attitude of lecturers, in aligning, though with fear, with the senior/influential colleague, describing a supervisee as stubborn, when s/he insists on his initial research area. Sometimes, when a supervisee resists forces/pressure

from the supervisor forcing his/her own area of interest on him/her, s/he takes the description of stubborn before other lecturers. And this would amount to asking: what does it mean and imply to be a supervisor? Is it when you force your area of interest on a supervisee or connive with other lecturers to describe and paint the image of a student/supervisee as 'stubborn or disobedience or not humble?' A good supervision must be conscious of what freedom means and implies, respect for, or, fairness to the other's opinion or interest, tolerance for expression, guidance and leadership not forcefulness or destructive criticisms for pressurization. Is arguing out for right, or resisting force to shift ground, or refusing to be used as toy for the interest of the supervisor stubbornness? What is the relationship between good supervision and supervisor's interest vis-a-vis the academic success of the supervisee?

There is this other factor of 'you must do it my own way' or, better still, to put it 'give me what I give you' or 'give me that which I know, like and believe in'. Likening this to a doctorate student challenge, Ezeani captures it as the "disposition of the PhD candidate to satisfy the team that is determined to work on the candidate's mind together with the entire setting turns the PhD candidate away from the need to focus on the problem rather than on the ideology of the supervisor and/or the rest of the doctoring team" (2005, 36). This is because, "under normal... circumstances, the only thing to celebrate is solution to a problem" and "the mind to achieve this feat must think in a specific way," (Ezeani, 2005) not necessarily depending on a supervisor and his/her wishes and specific way of thinking. Such manner of supervision encourages academic or intellectual inauthenticity. This habit in an academic exercise does not help knowledge-diversity, and many students/supervisees have been failed or held stagnant for years because of this habit (Ugwu & Ozoemena, 2019). When the mindset of a teacher or supervisor is all about expressing these things, then the way to knowledge is closed except the one s/he knows, likes and believes in. It does not help knowledge and innovation both epistemologically and scientifically. Even if a student or a supervisee is championing an intellectually commendable course, because it does not go in concordance with his/her lecture's or supervisor's presuppositions or prejudices, then it is not good enough to be accepted in the chronicles of knowledge. For people with this kind of closed mindset, you must be judged and proved accepted in the circle of knowledge by only the principles of their prejudices; that is, the knowledge which they like or know. Before you are described as a fellow in the academia, you must be scrutinized and found faultless by their own belief which has to be the standard to measure whatever you produce as knowledge. The question should be: how would what you know, like and wish every other person to do, be the standard to judge or measure every other body of knowledge one proposes? For knowledge to grow, it must not be from the one you like, wish to encounter, believe in and know. This is the main reason behind the counter criticisms (Ugwu & Abah, 2021) levelled against some scholars and Westernized-Africans or Africans with colonial mentality who argue against the existence or reality of other peoples' philosophy – say the African philosophy. They are strict to the detriment of academics and the collectiveness of research exercise. By this, knowledge is strangled and pigeonholed into a one-way process because "in the predominantly Western-oriented academic circles and investigations, the African voice is either sidelined or suppressed because indigenous knowledge and methods are often ignored or not taken seriously" (Owusu-Ansah & Mji, 2013). Many scholars who have sentiments in favour of indigenous and independent epistemological engagements have criticized this idea of pigeonholing researchers into one predominant epistemic system and strangling of researchers of freedom to invent any epistemic system but their own. They project a problem described as "emphasis on the individual and de-emphasis on community and culture resulted in ideological dissonance" (Ifejola Adebisi, 2016). Condemning such approach in research exercise, Owusu-Ansah and Mji heighten the "awareness about the need to include indigenous knowledge in the design and implementation of research... in Africa" and by this, reaffirming "the suitability of the Afrocentric paradigm in African research and... the necessity for an emancipatory and participatory type of research which values and includes indigenous knowledge and peoples" (Owusu-Ansah & Mji, 2013). Research is an affair for expression of personal opinions and findings, intellectual independence, self-liberation, and a collective exercise that involves two or more scholars to rigorously commit themselves. Researchers really need freedom to explore ideas and ideologies, and come up with some epistemic varieties for the interest of knowledge. Difference does not always imply wrongness, and in comparison to coloization effects, it does not suggest the inferiority of the colonized, to the colonized. To some scholars, this has to do with rights in academics, and calls for decoloization in African education process and researches. Regarding this, Fabisi argues that "un-decolonised education which results in epistemic violence is pedagogically unsound

and violates the right to education" (Ifejola Adebisi, 2016). Conceiving this as a limitation problem, he maintains the view that "reversing this in Africa includes misconceptions about African knowledge systems and African structural inadequacies" (Ifejola Adebisi, 2016). He would go further to posit that "decolonising education can only be done internationally and within the framework of IHRL" which stands for International Human Rights Law. Imminent way out is decolonization following the damage of colonization one of which is the colouring of 'indigenous African thought, classifying it as pre-logical and pre-critical' (Anghie, 2007; Nyamnjoh, 2012; Shizha, 2005).

Consequently, working with this kind of people with a closed set of mind or mentality is difficult to one who is open minded to find another source/root to knowledge, and the value of its variable and equally making attempts to follow it to see what it could offer to the already existing body of knowledge. A student working with such a teacher/supervisor will only end up pitied, and probably being intervened for, by concerned individuals, with such statement in discussion here.

These, and other reasons, explain the undeserved holding down of a student or supervisee by a supervisor or teacher. What have been listed and analyzed above are common experience within academic environments in Nigeria. Giving it a percentage in accordance to the geography of the Nigerian peoples, they are high and rampant in the South-Eastern part of Nigeria. The people of South-East Nigeria are the Igbo, a group whom history records as resisting the Westernization agenda embedded within colonialism, but unfortunately, are the most Nigerian Westernized people who would prove their level of Westernization in their daily lives in schools, offices and social functions more than any other tribe in Nigeria. Meet a Yoruba professor in his/her office and surprisingly be greeted in the Yoruba tongue. Meet a Hausa professor in his/her office and amazingly be greeted in Hausa tongue. But meet an Igbo professor in his/her office and astonishingly be greeted in English. What is the reason: (1) To show you that s/he is educated and probably more than you, and being educated implies leaving off all those attitudinal dispositions that would make him/her look local and uneducated, and one of these is the local tongue. (2) To deny and distance him/herself from being described as local who speak local language. By this, s/he will show you that it is a local one that must not be spoken in an office like his/hers for that implies localizing him/her and bringing to a local level, the dignity and westernized operational level/status of his/her office. (3) To show you that s/he holds mastery in speaking English which has become a huge achievement, and subsequently, ascribes on him/her *oyibo* (English). To be even more precise, this attitude is found in Philosophy as a discipline where the question of indigenous knowledge system has taken the central stage and defence of an indigenous knowledge and epistemic system is higher and has consequently become controversially radicalized among the 'pro' and 'anti' sections. A growing scholar, or student who has taken a stand with the Pro-African Philosophy and to defend the African Philosophy being assigned to a supervisor who has stood in defending the anti-African Philosophy movement tagging it 'ethno-philosophy' or 'folk psychology' or 'no-philosophy' will only be pitied and unfortunately, would be greeted with such statement 'please 'release him/her' to go'. Their reasons include, but may not be limited to the following: (1) that it is a thought of a people, (2) that it is not written down, (3) it is not a thought of an individual but of a people, a community, hence anonymity, instead of being identified by an individual and equally documented. A friend suffered this in both his Master's and PhD programmes in a well known university in the South-Eastern Nigeria where the supervisor would jeer him and make jokes with his dissertation research that he was doing nothing thinking he was truly doing something intellectually worthy. In fact, the one of his PhD, after finally agreed to collect what the student wrote, collected several times, the student's chapters one and two, soft and hard copies. But dumped them for a year in his pigeonhole and email and was proud enough, during their classes, to tell the supervisee, on several occasions, that he (the supervisor) had not read the work. The only reason was that he had no time, and the little time he had, he could not afford to waste it, and reading whatever the supervisee has written all in the name of 'African Philosophy' is a waste of time for him. That was a professor, and the oldest scholar in rank (probably not in age) in the Department speaking! The worst part of this whole scenario is that (1) the Head of the Department, most times, would be afraid to change the supervisee from the supervisor on the ground that (i) it is an indictment or questioning of the intellectual quotient of the professor who, as a professor, is an expert to supervise anyone researching on any field, as believed in Nigerian universities; (ii) that the professor may punish him/her (the Head of Department) as being a central instrumentalist to the indictment of his/her

intellectual quotient, by refraining from approving his/her promotion or benefit which the elders of the department in rank must sign before getting to him/her. (2) Changing the supervisee, sometimes, is very risky following the system of education practised in Nigerian universities which makes it possible for that professor to go after the student for a witch-hunt, to ensure s/he influences, into intimidation, the departmental members to ensure he keeps the student down for years. This explains why some students, out of afraid, would be under such bias minded supervisor just to attract his mercy but being intellectually unproductive because they are under the whims and caprices of the supervisor. Such condition shows succumbing to pressure from the supervisor to change from his/her initial research plan; that is, dancing to the tune of the supervisor, researching in his/her area or where s/he likes or is more comfortable with thereby supplying to the supervisee his/her materials to be quoted as a scholar while still assist as the supervisor; (iii) taking his destiny into his/her own hands thereby changing to another supervisor if the departmental authority will not play along the supervisor's influence, and be ready to face both bias and unbiased criticisms in any defence time in the programme.

This would now introduce us to another big factor of rank-value over process. The Igbo high life musician, Oliver de Coque, in one of his songs says *A na enwe Obodo enwe* (They own the town/city/community). But the question now is: who is this 'they' who owns 'which city'? The 'they' is the man with highest rank, and 'the city' is the Department/Faculty/University. That is the reality in Nigeria. In many Nigerian public/government universities, the Vice Chancellor (VC) owns the university; to sustain this ownership, s/he employs a greater number of people from his/her State, or even kinsmen. This has caused serious problem between the indigenes and these power mongers tagged 'colonizers' by the indigenes. Coming down to the Faculty level, the same experience holds; or if the scenario changes, the Dean of the Faculty would surround him/herself with his/her people, or if his/her own people are not enough, s/he surrounds him/herself with his friends/colleagues like minds to ensure his/her sustenance in the office. Down to the Departmental level, the statesmen or kinsmen trend still holds, but if it does not, the highest in rank would become the owner and the masquerade upon seen, every other one bows to. As such, he does not follow process obtainable in the Department. For instance, when the process says 'discuss a student/supervisee's project title with him/her and then submit to the Departmental Board for more dialogue on the title', s/he approves the title alone in his/her office and no member of the departmental board would dare query him/her. But s/he would be in the Board gathering questioning every title brought forth to the Board. S/he is feared and praised with his/her academic title. Works supervised by him/her are not criticized. All s/he does is good and spotless. Criticizing his/her supervised work implies indicting his/her intelligent quotient, and that amounts to certain consequences like negative plans against the successfulness of your academic career, and subsequently, launching your own supervisee into a heavy attack that may lead to a devastating cancellation, sometimes, even though, undeserved. This has brought about relationship crack among the teachers/lecturers in the Department, of which, as the metaphorical fight between two elephant, the students now representing 'the grasses', have undeservedly suffered. Sometimes, the fight takes tribal shape (between tribes, or one domineering tribe and the rest forming a force against it). Many a time, it takes a religious shape (between two religions, say, Islam and Christianity, or, between denominations in Christianity, say, Catholic and Anglican, or between some people with high religious status (consecrated) and others, say, Reverend Fathers/Sisters and the non-consecrated). This has caused some negative comments like 'these consecrated colleagues (referring to the Reverend Fathers and Sisters, Pastors, etc.) should go to the Seminaries and congregations and tussle for power, not in this 'our' secular universities'. All these are factors rendering the academic exercises passed through in Nigeria, unproductive and laughable, because when it comes to worst, quality would no more matter, but to prove that 'I myself, am also a human being' becomes all that matters.

3.2 Students-Caused Factors

These, on the one hand, are situations where the facilitating factors are identified with the teacher or supervisor. But there are, on the other hand, situations where these facilitating factors are located with the student or supervisee. The following scenarios explain the point.

There are some instances where the student's or supervisee's weakness answers the question as to why the statement: 'release him/her to go'. Some Nigerian students are too lazy to face their academic engagements squarely, at least, within the time frame during which they are still regarded as students. These students would always look for a 'shortcut'; that is loopholes.

They wish to avoid hardship yet crave recognition among scholarly circles. They do not want to stress of any sort, in their academic journey, but they want to be scoring alpha (A). It is these big wishes for academic excellency which demand extra miles of stress and inputs, that push them to engage in sex-marks exchange; and also expose them to other means of material exploitation, because they refuse to explore the will for the 'big way'. They always look for a way to manoeuvre things and processes. They always look for where 'it has been done for them' or 'it is already made'. This explains why some Europeans described the African person/personality as full of emotions, 'unconscious or half-conscious impulses', "emotionalism, illogicality, un-criticality which prop up the view that the African is at a logical conclusion, a being characterized by emotion and not reason and who is bound for critical and illogical fallacies following his appreciation and celebration of, and closeness to nature" (Ugwu, 2020), illogicality, superstition, 'Unhistorical, undeveloped Spirit, still involved in the conditions of mere nature, and which had to be present only as on the threshold of the world's history' (Hegel, 1956). Such derogatory conception was put this way by Carothers (1972):

> The best known trait of the normal psychology of the Africans are above all, the importance of the physical needs (nutrition, sexuality); and a liveliness of the emotions which is counter-balanced by their poor duration. Sensations and movements comprise the chief part of his existence. Intellectual life, evocation of the past, and projects for the future pre-occupy him but little. Separated from these regulating influences, he lives essentially in the present (in the sense like a child), and his conduct submits to influences and impulses of the passing moment and thus appears explosive and chaotic (1972, 93).

These are attitudes of wanting to always manoeuvre processes have today seemed to justify the Western bestowed negative and derogatory personality on Africans almost a century ago now. But reasons for these attitudes are not far-fetched:

(1) Following the impact of the environment on the African mentality, just like the Igbo would say that when a bad attitude is allowed/perpetuated up to a year, it will become a tradition, it is now in the Nigerian mentality, consciousness to always manoeuvre things/processes. This, today, makes Nigerians to appear as, or, has bestowed on Nigerians the personality of a people who hate processes, orderliness. Many Nigerians will not behave maturely enough to queue, be it in the bank, airport, and fuel station; and in school management, processes and schedules through which students are attended to. They would always live in, and for manoeuvring, and playing 'foolish' smartness. This is what they see being perpetuated and allowed, on daily basis, by even their teachers/lecturers, those in government, even at their family level through their Papa, Mama, siblings, uncles and aunties, and generally relatives. To be convinced to follow the footprints of the few good, ordered ones would take them extra mental and psychological, emotional, physical and even spiritual relentless efforts, and from the very beginning of their childhood, for that matter. That is why all we go for, in Nigeria are majorly questionable when the issue of real value is raised. Unlike in the traditional African community, we are, today, born, grown to live in non-value, and valueless environment. But when these Nigerians travel to European countries, because of the orderliness and the due process through which things happen there, they would have no option than to queue in the order and process as obtainable there in.

(2) Another reason, acceptable to an extent but very arguable, is illiteracy. Some engage in some of these obnoxious attitudes because of ignorance. Adding to this, some do not know, or, are not taught, and exposed to the advantages of/in orderliness and processes. They lack the primary knowledge, and the reputation it gives/bestows on one to follow an order and a process. They do not know what orderliness is, and its importance in life. Here, the Socratic-Platonic dictum comes into play that knowledge is virtue for it brings about the awareness about what virtue really means and implies, and the good in being virtuous, but ignorance is vice for it allows one to live, and enjoy vicious actions (Ferrari, 2000). To escape this, wholehearted commitment to good and effective education, and one to be well educated, becomes very imperative. But it then becomes frustrating that even in the education field, unseriousness is a very big negative factor hindering its mental and physical impacts on the people involved. It is indeed regrettable that Nigerians appear to have forgotten the relevance of education and its impacts on the people, through which the people can revolutionize their environment. Seemingly, they have forgotten that "it is the duty of enlightened citizens to lead the way in their discovery and to create an atmosphere conducive to their emergence" (Achebe, 1983a).

(3) It is a famous saying that birds of feathers flock together, and in the Nigerian lives, comes the reality of this saying. Having people whose mentality and attitudinal inclinations have been dominated by these porous actions, living in the same environment, it therefore, becomes easier to flow without obstruction. Like terms attract, unlike terms repel; and so, when they are in the Nigerian environment, and among fellow Nigerians with same mentality, they flow cordially and understandably even more, but when they are separated and now live among other peoples with a restructured and well-ordered mentality who are grown with positive attitudinal inclinations, they will be emotionally, psychologically and physically forced to flow in the same system. Thus, Anaxagoras is right when he opines that everything is in everything and that explains why everything could interrelate in one way or the other. Had it been that everything is not in everything, on this context, that the corruption and value-misconception are not in Nigerians, then Nigerians would not find it easily flowable in the ocean of negative values. The people in the same environment and structure make it flowable and existentially possible according to what is obtainable in their environment. So, just like the position of the social empiricists like J. Locke, J. J. Rousseau, Bishop G. Berkeley, etc., the environment is indeed a big influential factor to the formation of people's attitudinal tendencies. It, therefore, takes a matured and refined mind to come in and revolutionize the people's mentality and tilt it towards positives attitudinal values.

(4) Achebe once stated: "Nigerians are corrupt because the system under which they live today makes corruption easy and profitable; they will cease to be corrupt when corruption is made difficult and inconvenient" (Achebe, 1983b). One of the reasons that give Nigerians guts to live in a steady consciousness of manoeuvring is the manoeuvring or manoeuvrable structure in which they live. The corrupt system in which Nigeria exists, and Nigerians wine and dine, makes corruption, the act of manoeuvring very easy. This becomes clearer when a similar case that happens in Nigeria happens in a country that exists with a system that makes manoeuvring impossible. While that of Nigeria could be twisted and goal posts changed at some time, they do not happen in the other country. How countries with an existing structure that makes corruption or manoeuvring impossible treat some cases that involve Nigerians abroad surprises them (Nigerians). This is because the system does not give preferential treatment to whoever, be it the president, senator or a wealthy man. Unlike in Nigeria where a case would involve a government official like the president, senator, governor, or even ordinary councillor of a Ward, and s/he would be seen going about his/her normal business even when s/he is at fault and should be incarcerated. From a comparative perspective, it could thus be said that the structure that exists in a country identifies the idiosyncrasies of its people, makes it unique and equally portrays the level of intellectual quotient or maturity of the citizens. To be precise in giving an instance for more clarity, if it were in Nigeria that the case involving His Excellency, Sen. Ike Ekweremadu and the organ harvest saga occurred, the case would have been closed. He would be seen going about bribing his ways out in politics and finally be given ticket to be vying for an electoral position in the South-Eastern Nigeria. But today, he is serving a seven-year jail term in the United Kingdom. That is Nigeria for you different from other countries where an organized and ordered system that obstructs the tendencies of manoeuvring exists.

Discussing these factors as they have to do with students/supervisees, their weakness towards effective academic engagements, must not be overlooked. As bad as this could be, it inculcates, and encourages the spirit of 'put my name' in them at that early stage, when it comes to academic achievements – say publications. It is the main factor behind the reality among major Nigerian graduates, that they cannot conduct research or develop a paper publishable in a reputable journal. That explains why it is no longer a surprise that some of them could not even write an undergraduate project that could pass plagiarism test. This very weakness syndrome has diverted their interest from academics to other dubious lifestyles on campus like certificate forgery, yahoo-yahoo (financial cybercrimes), money rituals, theft, engaging in cultism to intimidate fellow students and teachers to get what they want, etc., as seen among Nigerian students of today. This definitely leads to the question of value in Nigeria, especially among students whose primary engagements should be education engagements but which unfortunately have turned to the pursuance of shadow instead of the reality. Value to these students is all about fame, money and material acquisition, and the means through which they are acquired do not matter. The questions of 'how' and 'what' (effects) are totally insignificant. They would wish to grab a high score but would hesitate to defend the grade because they know how truly the grade came to them. This rate of moral decadents and the decay of education system and the entire value system of Nigerians have been pointed out and lamented upon by

Okolo who opines that values to Nigerians today are to include excess love for money, cheap fame or base honours, showmanship, clannishness or ethnicity, among others (Okolo, 1993). To solve this, education must be sought for, and education is not just ordinarily education but philosophy-based education that will reform the people, give a theoretical and practical reasons and perspective of what really value is and the need for its reconstruction through the criticality of philosophy (to education) (Okolo, 1993). Be that as it may, the emphasis here is that at this, when the supervisor or teacher notices this, s/he might be forced to subject him/her to doing the right, critical and thorough academic work expected of him/her. Keeping him/her, such statement may begin to arise in favour of the student.

As an off-shoot to this, the fact of Nigerian system must be brought in. Many parents tell their children, 'just go and get the certificate, even if it is just a pass'. Some would even go to school and bribe their children's way out. These attitudes encourage weakness and unseriousness in students. The worst part is that many of them have jobs bought and waiting for them to just come out with that almost fail-certificate. To show how deep this syndrome has eaten into the Nigerian system, pupils at primary education level are sponsored with malpractice money during the Common Entrance Examination that would usher them into the next (secondary) level. Talking about it at the O'Level and higher institutions is a history for another day. By this, Nigerians are killing themselves and future.

Of course another important undeniable factor concerning this discussion is the facticity of the religiosity of Nigerians as a people of Africa. Africans, Nigerians in this context are too religious to live existentially responsible, and as supposed. Most Nigerians are too religious to be, think, talk and behave rationally. As it concerns school activities and students, is it still a news to see students converting classrooms into prayer grounds, and instead of studying at night, night vigil attendance becomes the priority, and instead of sometimes explaining certain problems biologically, scientifically, psychologically, socially, emotionally or even in accordance with the human nature, they are rather seen, and explained religiously where the shouting of 'holy ghost fire', 'bind and cast' would become the end of the whole experience.

4 Evaluation

It is true that the issue of 'release him/her to graduate' is a menace facing the Nigerian education sector. It is unfortunate that many a time, the causative factors that influence such a statement could, on the one hand, come/arise from teachers/lecturers and their teaching/supervisory attitudes; and on the other hand, those of the students/supervisees. But it is rational, relevant and critically important and demanding to question this concept deeper, in the education sector. When a student/supervisee is held because of not meeting the demanded academic standards, and probably because s/he is too lazy to work, and a concerned individual begins to plead on his/her behalf and the teacher/supervisor releases him/her, what then becomes the image of the academic institution s/he would represent outside? This is important because radical and productive system of education has to be problem-driven: there should be an existential challenge that demands urgent address which motivates a research. This raises questions on so many factors like standard in research, relevance of research to a societal need, and even attitudes of both learners/supervisees and teachers/supervisors in seeing that the concerns of these questions are well integrated. Without this, the system would be producing 'bookish-certified-graduates' with empty brains that cannot offer something tangible, and of intellectual value to the society.

But then a good teacher must be good enough to understand what teaching entails. Examination, they say, is not the true means of checking the intelligibility or actual intelligence of a student/learner. Writing, speaking and reading well, or even knowing the logic and giving it back to the teacher as given, are all not the true means to determine an intelligent student. These are primary qualities of schooling, but they do not explain educatedness, for being educated is a life process. Going further, education can only show the intelligent man, but it is not the main criterion to determine who the wise man really is for wisdom is more a gift of nature than of education. Be that as it may, a good teacher should be able to look out for other qualities in addition to writing, speaking and reading qualities, that when a student/learner exhibits, s/he should be passed. A certain level of intellectual display can be enough hence the student, at least, knows what is being talked about, but unfortunately, may not have the mastery in grammar or writing skill or reading-capability to put it forward.

Adding to this, a good teacher should understand that education, from a pure academic

perspective, is not the only way to survival. Vocational education where training and high professionalized skills is acquired, are parts of education, and can sustain life meaningfully. Skills also have numerous answers to questions of survival in life. The knowledge of technical know-how to carter for oneself in life, can go a long way to give meaning to a student's/learner's life. All must not be academically educated, and succeeded to the level of professorship or doctoral degree holder where the teacher/lecturer/supervisor has reached academically. There are levels and stages, and a professor does not have to expect one who finished from vocational school or a Master's Degree Holder or even a Doctoral degree holder to perform professorially like s/he does in an academic issue. Unfortunately, some lecturers/teachers who keep students/supervisees to a point that their supervisory/teaching attitudes attract 'release him/her to go' forget that they did not just emerge to the level they are today operating on, in one day. The negligence of this fact is an ideal problem in teachers/supervisors that could bring about the statement: 'release him/her to go'.

It must be noted that sometimes, the saga of 'sex for mark' could also be traced to students/-supervisees. Some students/supervisees prefer indulging in sex-for-marks rather than being subjected to critical academic exercise that would cause them 'headache' through cracking their brains. To them, it is moral to use what you have to get what you do not have but you want. Sometimes, these students would willingly lure the lecturer/supervisor into sex mood through their mode of dressing, after which they demand for mark, or even threaten exposure if the lecturer/supervisor attempts resisting. The issue is summarily put this way:

Nonetheless, the issue of sexual engagements in the teachers-students relationship is two-edged. Many a time, it can come from the teachers, while sometimes, it can come from the students who know that they are intellectually incapacitated following their unseriousness and non-commitment towards academic struggle, and having no option as the consequence, go ahead to submit themselves to the lecturers for sexual satisfaction and reward with scores; or tempt the lecturers by their dressing and body-language all to be rewarded with scores after the whole sexual-journey (Ugwu & Ozoemena, 2019). So, it could be seen that the issue of sex-for-mark is a two-edged one which could be a student/supervisee-caused or teacher/supervisor-caused.

It is problematic seeing many Nigerian teachers/lecturers/supervisors defining, and operating according to their understanding of what teaching and supervision mean and imply. Teaching, practically, does not mean the same thing as lecturing. Teaching is an educational process/exercise, an academic engagement being exercised/done by both the learner and the teacher. The two commit themselves to the exercise and go through the experience together. It is in this sense of mutual engagement in academic work that the truism "a good teacher is also a learner" finds its justification. In teaching, both the teacher and the student/learner participate, they do it together, the only difference is that one of the 'learners' guides the other, while the one guided depends on the guidance of the one guiding him/her. The similarity is that both are simply learners. Suffice it to say that even in the teaching process, is learning. That is why a typical scenario of teaching is the one that plays out in the family where Mama and or Papa abide by the stipulations of the curriculum to teach their wards/children, not just intellectually to become intelligent, but also to become morally, emotionally, behaviourally/attitudinally and spiritually wise, well-behaved and organized in whole. This is teaching; and it is different from lecturing. Lecturing is all about putting the student/learner through. The tendency of grabbing what the lecturer means and wants from the students depends on many factors to include mind-set, environmental tranquillity, and cognitive capacity of the learner, among other factors. A lecturer is a judge always judging, criticizing what the learner/student does, or, have come up with, unlike in teaching where the teacher does not judge/criticize the student/learner. Doing this is no more teaching, and is self-contradictory, as the guiding-teacher is an intrinsic participant in the production of what has been presented. The lecturer criticizes, and sometimes, directs or suggests to the student/learner what to do, if s/he is considerate, and if merciful enough, where to source what to do, but not to participate in doing it. This direction must not necessarily be face to face, it could be over on phone, or even social media. Sometimes, s/he expects the student to do the undoable, and when a student becomes frustrated, s/he may resort to copy-and-paste method of which the supervisor may not be vast or smart enough to detect but ends up approving. In the end, his/her identity has been stamped on the research thereby indicting his/her intellectual quotient for approving a plagiarized work without detecting it. The reason behind the possibility of this is clear: being far from the learner to know what his/her intellectual capability could be. It is after this process that a child will truly say 'I am educated' because s/he has been equipped

and fortified mentally and attitudinally to answer an educated person and to transform his/her environment. This position corroborates with what Freire earlier upheld when he argued that reality is always in flux and there is the natural instincts in man to transform his environment, and it is through participatory education that man will acquire the transformation capability. For him, the participatory education will take a unique method/model called 'Problem-Posing' which centrally involves 'dialogues' between the learner and the teacher. In this method and through dialogue, the teacher bodily, mentally and conceptually befriends the learner, integrate with him/her thereby infusing in him/her the relaxed mind and mental and emotional state of 'calm down' to get integrated in the process too, and get the expected end-product of the whole intellectual exercise (Freire, 2000). More on this was elaborated elsewhere (Ngwoke et al, 2025).

Another important question regarding this discourse borders on how-and-what process do university management use in giving admissions, and to assign supervisors to students. Is the Nigerian method of assigning supervisors the best model, or does the method contain certain intrinsic challenges that need a reformation and restructuring? This will certainly lead to a comparative perspective of this discourse to the Western counterpart. In fact, in most Western schools, your research proposal is part and parcel of the requirements for getting an admission into a university. By this, a student is already in know of what to write, the problem s/he wishes to tackle or the contribution s/he will add to the existing body of knowledge. S/he is aware of where to go, what to do and how to go about doing it. By this, s/he will be more focused on the reason for entering the university for studies having known what to do. S/he only needs a teacher to teach him/her more about it and guide him/her on going about it. The reason for this is to find a specialist in the proposed area, or one with full energy and interest to research on that area. With the interest, both the supervisor and the supervisee become learners in the area; while the learner/student learns about the area, the teacher/guardian learns more, and equally directs/guides the student to doing it well, and commendable. Student with his/her interest on a particular area is not just assigned to anybody, but to specialists and teachers/supervisors with keen interest and deeper knowledge to guide one through such a course, or, research area. By that, both the student and the supervisor are predisposed to work with similar interest and academic and research energy and interest to explore and come out with a commendable intellectual product. But this is not the method used in Nigeria.

Finally, this discussion will not be complete without pointing out the possibility of this whole attitude being a product of frustration from government. It is a verifiable fact that the Nigerian system of governing is one of the, if not the most, expensive governments on earth (Ugwu, 2020). The amount of wealth government officials accrue to themselves, is amazingly terrifying and inhuman; and consequently, it has made government a fierce engagement best characterized as 'a do or die affair'. The Nigerian government officers care only for themselves, make policies favourable only to themselves and their relatives, and when situations turn these policies around to their disfavour, they either turn too, to the new normal tune or face to foil it through the legal system. But then, this, in turn, raises a question on legal activities in Nigeria: whether law is all about favouritism or serving the purpose of justice for everybody, at anytime and anywhere. Hence, sometimes, the frustration meted for teachers would provoke them beyond control and they would have no other option than to transfer the aggression to the students by applying most of these attitudes that lead to the feasibility of the statement: 'release him/her to go'. From the attitudinal disposition of the government officials, be it in budgeting where the education sector is given little attention, be it their legislative actions where their self-centeredness is never hidden, and laws are categorized into two: one for the propagation of their welfare and the other for the punishment of the public, be it in the lavish display of their unjustly amassed wealth to only their relatives, and to the inhumanity and insensitivity of the public, and many a time, to the intimidation of those who intellectually make them what they are. When all these accumulate and get to an unbearable level to the teachers, they may resort to cool off on the students possibly leading to actions that may attract such statement from concerned individuals.

Following the nature of this paper, it could be seen that there are differences, both in theory and practice, among some closely associated terms to the central discussion here. The term *school* could be seen as a designated place where buildings are erected to contain learners for curricular academic exercises and under the guidance of teachers/lecturers. *Schooling* is the exercise of, or partaking in the curricular events that happen in in a school. But schooling does not necessarily translate to being a scholar or an educated. It ends in school. When one has

schooled but remain unaffected or unchanged, one remains an *educated illiterate*, but when one is evidently affected, one becomes a *scholar* and specialize in a particular branch of study. A scholar is a literate person. Thus, scholar/literate or scholarship/literacy takes its root from the term 'school', but when school takes a positive implication in a particular school person. *Scholarship* is the state of being a scholar, or the exercise/activity of (as) a scholar. A scholar differs from *an educated*, as being/becoming a scholar relates to school/schooling, but being educated is linked to life as a process. By this, being educated (educatedness) stands as a pointer to the practical lessons and acquisition of intelligence from life-experiences. It could be expressed vocationally, morally/ethically, intelligibly, etc. An educated could be referred to as, in other words, a literate or an intellectual. This is because, being educated has to do with practical expression of an acquired lessons or intelligence which has to do with the person's intellect being able to grasp knowledge when beheld with any knowledgeable/intelligible practical expression/exercise. When one is educated, one becomes knowledgeable. Educatedness implies knowledge, and that is why there types of knowledge. But all of these differ from wisdom which requires no any sort of education as it is a gift of nature unto human beings. More on these terms could be found in another material where they are given more detailed articulation (Ngwoke & Ugwu, 2025).

5 Conclusion

The issue of the attitudes that lead to a condition where a teacher/supervisor would be begged to release a student/supervisee by a concerned individual, is indeed one that demands urgent attention in the Nigerian school sector. The issue has led to a loss of students' lives, emotional, physical and psychological trauma, loss of hope on the education sector and academic system posing a very big question on the image of the Nigerian school system, and potentials of what schools churn out to the public as graduates; and finally, economic loss and unfavourable emotional condition on the parents. It is based on these that the aptness and novelty of this paper lie. The paper is a revolutionary one, and aims at bringing sanitization in the Nigerian education system, to save the future of Nigerian youths, economy and intellectual productivity. It attempted to reawaken moral consciousness thereby reminding Nigerian academics that the issue of morality beyond educatedness should be an urgent one. By this, the paper will lead Nigerian academics to the domain of reality beyond being-educated which is shallowly shown in fluent speaking, reading and writing of different languages, to the domain of values, existence and meanings of life and moral questions. Just like Ezeani puts it: "When we do away with morality, we do away with our human race! That is why education without morality is like a human person without head – meaningless... dangerous" (2005, 34). It attempted to reintegrate existential values with being-educated.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

References

Achebe, C. (1983a). An image of Africa and The trouble with Nigeria. Penguin Books.

Achebe, C. (1983b). The trouble with Nigeria. Fourth Dimension Publishing.

Anghie, A. (2007). Imperialism, sovereignty and the making of international law. Cambridge University Press.

Carothers, J. C. (1972). The mind of man in Africa. Tom Stacey.

Ezeani, E. (2005). Philosophy as intelligent and pragmatic questioning: IQUISM, philosophy for everyone. Veritas Lumen Publications.

Ferrari, G. R. (Ed.). (2000). Plato: The Republic (pp. 220-221). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Freire, P. (2000). Pedagogy of the oppressed. Continuum International Publishing Group.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1956). The philosophy of history. Dover Publications.

Ifejola Adebisi, F. (2016). Decolonising education in Africa: implementing the right to education by re-appropriating culture and indigeneity. Northern Ireland Legal Quarterly, 67(4), 433–451. https://doi.org/10.53386/nilq.v67i4.129

Ngwoke, H. C., Ugwu, A. K., & Anyanwu, A. U. (2025). Promoting Innovation for Development Through A Participatory-Based Pedagogy: The Freirean Model Re-Considered. General Information about JPPSS, 152.

Ngwoke, H. C., & Ugwu, A. K. (2025). The Good vis-à-vis Justice in Plato: A Panacea to Insecurity in Nigeria as based on Misconstrued Class Identity and Induced by Social Mal-Functionality. International Journal of Multidisciplinary on Science and Management, 2(1), 1-17.

Nyamnjoh, F. B. (2012). 'Potted Plants in Greenhouses': A Critical Reflection on the Resilience of Colonial Education in Africa. Journal of Asian and African Studies, 47(2), 129–154. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909611417240

Okafor, F. C. (1984). Philosophy of education and third world perspective. Star Publishing Company.

Okolo, C. B. (1993). Education and Nigerian values: A companion for students. CECTA (NIG) LIMITED.

Owusu-Ansah, F. E., & Mji, G. (2013). African indigenous knowledge and research. African Journal of Disability, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/ajod.v2i1.30

Shizha, E. (2005). Reclaiming Our Memories: The Education Dilemma in Postcolonial African School Curricula. Issues in African Education, 65–83. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403977199_4

Ugwu, A. K. (2020). A critical approach to the problem of Nigeria and the struggle for nation building. Journal of Sociology Study, 10(5), 223-251. https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5526/2020.05.005

Ugwu, A. K., & Abah, G. O. (2021). A discourse on the meaning and implications of philosophy. International Journal of Humanitatis Theoreticus, 5(1), 28-53.

Ugwu, A. K., & Ozoemena, L. C. (2019). African philosophy, cultural conceptions and experiences: A collection of essays. Lambert Academic Publishing.