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ABSTRACT
A case study of Nigeria was conducted to ascertain the impact of social work on the country’s ethno-cultural diversity and its impartation of local knowledge to the profession via a triangulation technique, which involved searching for evidence of multicultural social work, culturally rooted social development, indigenous social work, and/or related terms. The document analysis showed an inadequate connection between the governed and the government regarding the conceptual ambiguity in Nigeria’s welfare regimes, particularly in relation to the country’s ethno-cultural diversity and social work. The Systematic Literature Review (SLR) revealed a quite limited focus (2.17% of articles from an average of 69, \(s=57.8\)) on social work related to ethno-cultural diversity due to basic constitutional inadequacies, vacillating social policies and a lack of statutory basis for social work. A replication of the substantive aim of this study is recommended, either in Nigeria (for models and theories) or other multicultural societies, to enrich the social work profession scientifically amid the increasing global ethno-cultural diversity.
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INTRODUCTION

This study explored the implementation and impact of social work on Nigeria’s ethno-cultural diversity — also considered the country’s multiculturalism (Kalejaiye & Alliyu, 2013; Ugiagbe, 2014) — and its possibility of imparting local knowledge to the profession. The study was based on the increased advocacy for culturally relevant social development (Jinadu, 1985) and/or indigenous social work in Nigeria (Anucha, 2008; Olaleye, 2013; Ugiagbe, 2014), and the increasing features of global cultural differences that affect the social work profession were examined. Hence, the purpose of the study was to ascertain the features of Nigeria’s ethno-cultural diversity and the legal status of social work in the country. In addition, evidence was obtained of a focus on culturally relevant, indigenous or multicultural social work, ethnic sensitive practices, and/or related terms (RTs) in the country’s legislation and social policy documents, particularly the Nigerian journals of social work, which serve as the national corpora of scientific knowledge for the profession.

Invariably, social work across the world is being implemented on the bases of country specific traditions (Shardlow & Hämäläinen, 2015). That is, socio-cultural norms and values are inclusive determinants of states’ welfare systems. Paradoxically, the crises that have resulted from Nigeria’s ethno-cultural diversity are viewed as substantive factors for the country’s underdevelopment (Olufayo, 2014; Osinubi & Osinubi, 2006), and Jinadu (1985, p. 850) posited that poverty persists in the country due to “efforts to check this deterioration and ensure development are hindered by the lack of culturally rooted structural and conceptual supports in the social development sector.” Hence, this study is significant because it contributes empirically to the advocacy for culturally rooted social work in Nigeria. It is a case study in which “its chief purpose is description” (Rubin & Babbie, 2008, p. 422), which allows for the use of multiple sources of data and methods (Denscombe, 2003).

AN OVERVIEW OF NIGERIA’s DIVERSITY AND WELFARE PRACTICES

Nigeria’s ethno-cultural diversity

According to the Federal Research Division/Library of Congress (1991), the pre-colonial geography of Nigeria was dotted with human settlements millennia before the spread of agriculture 3,000 years ago, as the earliest fossil skeleton with Negroid features of about 10,000 years old was found in Ileru, Western Nigeria. These settlements developed into independent chiefdoms, city states, kingdoms, and empires with distinctive indigenous social welfare practices prior to European imperialism in Africa. Hence, Olufayo (2014, p. 216) contended that Nigeria as a nation emerged in 1914 from a “fusion of several nations of different cultural backgrounds into one nation.” This is in agreement with Osinubi and Osinubi (2006), who quoted the late sage of Nigerian politics, Chief Obafemi Awolowo (1909-1987), as saying that:

*Nigeria is not a nation, it is a mere geographical expression. There are no ‘Nigerians’ in the same sense as there are ‘English’ or ‘Welsh’ or ‘French,’ the word Nigeria is only a distinctive appellation to distinguish those who live within the boundaries of Nigeria from those who do not” (p.108).

In the final quarter of 2016, the Director General of Nigeria’s National Population Commission re-estimated the country’s population as 182 million (Financial Nigeria International, 2016). While the NBS (2012) documented Nigeria as Africa’s most populous country with about 250 ethnic groups and over 200 languages, Ezenma (2012) identified 390 indigenous languages based on the 2006 census figures. These figures had initially been argued to include 400 ethnic groups and 500 languages (see Simpson & Oyetade, 2008). Figure 1 illustrates the percentages of the country’s ethnic groups.

*Figure 1: Percentages of Nigeria’s ethnic groups (source: Simpson & Oyetade, 2008)*
Other documented elements of Nigeria’s diversity are religions: Christianity, Islam, and indigenous religions (Sampson, 2014); laws: English law, Sharia law, and customary law (Alkali et al., 2014; Sampson, 2014), and education: Christian/Western education, Islamic/Koranic education, and indigenous education (Labo-Popoola et al., 2009).

Welfare practices among the ethno-cultural groups of pre-colonial and post-colonial Nigeria

The pre-colonial ethnic-related indigenous welfare practices (mutual-aid) that have existed in Nigeria since ancient times are known as Owe and Aro among the Yorubas of south-western Nigeria and are known as Gwandu and Adashi among the Hausas and Nupes in the north and central parts of the country, respectively (Okunola, 2002). Within the pre-colonial Igboland social structure, there were familial, kinship, and filial organizations and networks of welfare practices (Okye, 2013). These indigenous welfare practices were in existence in the ancient chiefdoms, city states, kingdoms, and empires before the arrival of Islam (Kazeem, 2011), Christianity, and European colonization (Okunola, 2002).

The arrival of these civilizations initiated the enforcement of Zakat—giving to the needy—and the founding of Almajiris or Koranic schools in Bornu (ca 1440) and Sokoto (ca 1804), both in the north of present day Nigeria, and traditional governments were replaced with Caliphates, Emirates, and Sultanates. Also, Christianity arrived in the south of present day Nigeria beginning in 1550 AD (Ogundipe & Edewor, 2012; Okunola, 2002; Irele, 2011). Christian missionary work included the first primary school opened by Thomas B. Freeman (1842); dispensaries and clinics opened by E.C. van Cooten (1850), W. Henshaw (1815-1853), and Dr. Irvin (1853-1855); a leprosy asylum opened by Mother Veronique and Father Conquard (1886-1933); hospitals opened by the Methodist Mission (1912); tuberculosis control and child welfare founded by the American Baptist Mission; and homes for maladjusted children opened by the Salvation Army (1920s). Okunola (2002, p. 12) stated that “the advent of Christian Missionaries set in motion the establishment of a number of social services institutions”; however, the Islamic and Christian approaches apparently subserved the interests of each of the two new civilizations respectively, particularly in social welfare models, to the detriment of the ethno-cultural models unique to the indigenous groups.

Invariably, the Arabian Trans-Saharan slave trade (ca. 650-1900) and the European Transatlantic slave trade (ca. 1562-1887) disrupted familial and communal welfare systems indigenous to Nigerian (African) societies and instilled a culture of mistrust among the people (Nunn & Wantchekon, 2011), just as pre-colonial internecine rivalries and wars disrupted communal modes of social welfare practices and produced orphans, widows, and many slaves (Ogundipe & Edewor, 2012). Similarly, as the colonization of Africa brought people of diverse cultures together in one country (Osinubi & Osinubi, 2006), subsequent urbanization prompted a movement away from the traditional family settings and a decline in the traditional control of individuals and families (Irele, 2011). Hence, urbanization further prompted the emergence of organized public social services (or formal social work) in Nigeria from the institutions founded by the Christian missionaries and the British model (Anucha, 2008) because Nigeria was a British colony, although it gained independence in 1960.

About twenty-five years after its independence, the level of poverty in Nigeria was still considerably high. Hence, Jinadu (1985) asserted that poverty persisted in the country due to efforts to ensure developments were hindered by the lack of a culturally rooted social development sector. Moreover, at the beginning of the 21st century, Nigeria was still in a state of underdevelopment (Anugwom, 2000; Olufayo, 2014; Osinubi & Osinubi, 2006; Ugiabe, 2014), and Nigerian social work scholars have advocated for indigenous social work (Anucha, 2008; Olaleye, 2013). Thus, there is a need to explore the nature of Nigeria’s social work practices vis-à-vis the country’s ethno-cultural diversity.

METHODOLOGY

A case study research design was implemented to investigate Nigeria’s social work practices and ethno-cultural diversity. The design permitted the use of methodological triangulation, which is “two or more different research methods” (Shadow & Walli, 2003, p. 932), to attain a comprehensive understanding of the country’s social work practices and to increase the study’s validity. In other words, sources of information included online materials and field work in Nigeria.

Data collection

First, field work was conducted in Nigeria to examine government macro documents on social policy and social legislation. This yielded the 1989 Social Development Policy for Nigeria (hereafter referred to as the 1989 SDPN), the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended and hereafter referred to as the 1999 Constitution), and to ascertain the status and focus of social work practices and their impact on the country.
Second, the field work in Nigeria involved collecting indigenous articles (in booklet journals): the Nigerian Journal of Social Work (Volumes I–XIV), the Nigerian Journal of Social Work Education (Volumes I–XV), the Social Work Horizon: A Journal of Medical Social Work (Volume I, the only edition to date), and the Journal of Nigerian Social Work Educators (Volume I, the only edition to date). Third, an online survey was conducted to obtain first-hand information from Nigerian social work educators, practitioners, and students of their experiences related to social work regarding Nigeria’s diversity, while the fourth group of data was collected from a field survey of Nigerian legislatures to ascertain their familiarity with social work in Nigeria through its statutory provisions.

**Data analysis**

First, a Conventional Content Analysis (CCA), which is used to categorize the text of a phenomenon where theory, research, and literature are limited (Spolander et al., 2011), guided in highlighting the philosophy, purpose, and focuses on social welfare in relation to ethno-cultural diversity and RTs in both the 1999 Constitution and 1989 SDPN.

Second, to obtain evidence of a focus on ethno-cultural diversity and/or RTs in Nigeria’s social work research studies, a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) was conducted for articles published in the four indigenous journals, which are listed in the modified Suitt et al.’s (2016) SLR selection process shown in Table 1. Eligible articles must have been published in one of the four journals and must have included a focus on indigenous social work, multiculturalism, and/or ethnicity as inclusion criteria.

**Table 1: Modified Suitt et al.’s (2016) illustration of sources and articles in the SLR selection**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IDENTIFICATION</th>
<th>Records screened n=15</th>
<th>Records excluded n=261</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCREENING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELIGIBILITY</td>
<td>Articles assessed for eligibility n=11</td>
<td>Articles excluded for not meeting inclusion criteria n=5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCLUDED</td>
<td>Full-text articles included in this SLR n=6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: *1: Volume I is missing from the Nigerian Journal of Social Work published by the Nigeria Association of Social Workers (NASOW).*

*2: Volumes I and III are missing from NJSWE.*

Furthermore, few responses to the online survey and field survey (the third and fourth data groups, respectively) were submitted, which was likely due to a lack of infrastructure (Internet, stable energy supply, and information technology) for social work educators, practitioners, and students in Nigeria. Nevertheless, a summary of the outcomes of these attempts and their subsequent limitation on this study’s findings are discussed below. Finally, the themes that emerged from the focus and intentions of both the 1999 Constitution and 1989 SDPN as well as from the SLR were used to posit a theoretical framework for the Nigerian social work profession.

**Limitation of the study**

The low response rates for both the online and field surveys prevented the researchers from processing the survey data, which reduced the study’s validity; however, the survey questionnaire distributed among Nigerian legislatures increased their familiarity with social work in the country vis-à-vis its statutory provisions, and thus the social work professionalization bill was passed by both the lower and upper houses in 2016. It is now awaiting presidential approval.
FINDINGS

The focus of Nigeria’s constitution and the 1989 SDPN vis-à-vis social welfare and ethno cultural diversity

The 1999 Constitution

In addition to the three major languages (Hausa, Ibo, and Yoruba), the 1999 Constitution includes several universal semantics in its proclamations regarding the country’s ethno-cultural diversity in relation to social welfare provisions, as shown in Table 2.

Table 2: The focus on Nigeria’s diversity and welfare in the 1999 Constitution (as amended)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The opening statement.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;WE THE PEOPLE of the Federal Republic of Nigeria: HAVING firmly and solemnly resolved: TO LIVE in unity and harmony as one individual and indissoluble sovereign nation under God dedicated to the promotion of inter-African solidarity, world peace, international cooperation and understanding: AND TO PROVIDE for a Constitution for the purpose of promoting the good government and welfare of all persons in our country on the principles of Freedom, Equality and Justice, and for the purpose of consolidating the Unity of our people: DO HEREBY MAKE AND GIVE OURSELVES the following Constitution:&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Federal Government:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 14 (2) (b): “The security and welfare of the people shall be the primary concern of government;”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 15 (3) (c): “Encourage inter-marriage among persons from different places of origin, or of different religious, ethnic or linguistic, association or ties;” (3d) “promote or encourage the formation of associations that cut across ethnic, linguistic, religious or other sectional barriers.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 17 (1): “The state social order is founded on the ideals of Freedom, Equality and Justice.” (1) (a): “every citizen shall have equality of rights, obligations and opportunities before the law.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 21: “The state shall - (a) protect, preserve and promote the Nigerian cultures which enhance human dignity and are consistent with the fundamental objectives as provided in this chapter, and (b) encourage development of technological and scientific studies which enhance cultural values.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 55: “The business of the National Assembly shall be conducted in English, and in Hausa, Ibo and Yoruba when adequate arrangements have been made therefore.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Government:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 97: “The business of a House of Assembly shall be conducted in English, but the House may in addition to English conduct the business of the House in one or more other languages spoken in the State as the House may by resolution approve.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not stated, but possibly the same as in section 97.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sections on ethno-cultural diversity.

Based on these universal semantics in the social welfare-related sections of the constitution, there is a tendency to assume that Nigeria’s welfare regime is similar to the Northern European model of universal social policy; however, the 1989 SDPN is the only social policy document illustrative of social work’s role in Nigeria since its independence, and it was not mentioned in previous Nigerian constitutions (Okunola, 2002) or in any welfare regime typology mentioned in the current 1999 Constitution. In particular, a lack of ethno-cultural specific references to social welfare make the document susceptible to subjective interpretations and conceptual ambiguities.

The 1989 SDPN

References to Nigerian ethnic groups in the 1989 SDPN’s philosophy, main components, and principal sub-functions are also expressed in universal semantics (see Table 3).
Moreover, a lack of ethno-cultural specific references related to social welfare make the document susceptible to subjective ambiguities in interpretations. Currently, Nigeria has a Social Development Department in the Federal Ministry of Budget and National Planning (see: http://www.nationalplanning.gov.ng/index.php/78-featured/105-article-d) and another Ministry of Women Affairs and Social Development branch (see: http://www.womenaffairs.gov.ng/), where the social welfare department (or social work) is located. There is no record of how the 1989 SDPN was implemented and evaluated, and it has not been republished in government records or revised in scholarly studies recently. Jinadu (1985) argued that the earliest attempt to operationalize “social development” in Nigeria was established in the economic development plan of the country, and references have often been made to the five National Development Plans of 1962–1969, 1970–74, 1975–1985, and 1986–1990 since its independence as well as to contemporary development blueprints, such as Vision 2010 (Gofwen, 2000) and Vision 20: 2020 (Holmes et al., 2011).

Notably, the 1999 Constitution and the 1989 SDPN did not indicate the chartered status of the social work profession in Nigeria, but the attempted survey among Nigerian legislatures to ascertain their familiarity with social work in Nigeria based on its statutory provisions revealed that Nigeria Association of Social Workers (NASOW), which was established in 1975 (http://nasow.org/about/) and currently has about 10,053 members, has been advocating for social work professionalization bill at the legislative assembly. NASOW has the support of the International Federation of Social workers (IFSW) as an active member.

Evidence from a systematic literature review for focus on ethno-cultural diversity and/or related terms in Nigeria’s social work research

With the exception of volume II and III in the NJSWE and volume I in the publication of NASOW, which were missing, there was a total of n=276 articles with an average of 69 (s=57.8) articles from the four indigenous Nigerian journals of social work. A sum of n=261, representing 94.57% of the articles, did not discuss the issue of ethno-cultural diversity or RTs in the substantive issues of concern. The remaining (n=15) articles were subjected to further review, and (n=9) were concerned with general or universal cultural issues. Only (n=6) full-text articles, representing 2.17% of all articles, met the criteria for inclusion in this study’s SLR. The summary is provided in Table 4.

Table 4: A summary of SLR for evidence of a focus on ethno-cultural diversity and/or RTs in Nigeria's social work research
Despite the low percentage of articles that focused on ethno-cultural diversity, the summary of the SLR revealed a tenable pattern of social work research on ethno-cultural diversity in Nigeria applicable to multicultural societies. The first article explored a possible common interest among ethnic groups from the point of view of the Tiv group. Its findings produced a model of self-help in social welfare and social work for ethnic groups when the government fails to perform its responsibilities. The second article explored the perception of the Yorubas of a universal phenomenon and recommended a tested universal intervention approach (psychosocial care). The third article highlighted a unique familial practice among the Tiv, and the information is useful for all social workers to practice in a culturally sensitive manner. Articles four and five emphasized the importance of culturally relevant social work practices, while the sixth article investigated the causes of another universal phenomenon among the Yoruba and identified universal (socio-economic) factors as the cause rather than ethno-cultural factors.

**DISCUSSION**

The current status of Nigeria’s social work, which has social development departments that operate from two different ministries with implications on social programs management, demonstrates that successive governments in Nigeria since its independence are seemingly myopic regarding the mission, goals, and macro vis-à-vis micro tendencies of social work’s roles and functions in society. Idyorough (1999), who discussed the depth of coverage and breadth of the profession, apparently agreed with Tillich (1963) that the basis of social work is the deficiency of every social system; hence, social work is a body of knowledge, skills, and ethics applied in the delivery, administration, and evaluation of social services and in the development of innovative or renewable social programs for effective social wellbeing attainment in any society.

The first major contribution of this study is that the impact of failed social work on Nigeria is currently traceable to the problems rooted in the two main macro documents of the Nigerian government. Of foremost importance is the inadequate culturally rooted expressions in the 1999 Constitution, which Okpanachi and Garba (2010) have argued is an embodiment of constitutional flaws and inadequacies due to the lack of a direct link between the Nigerian populace and its constitution making processes. Similarly, there has been no social research associated...
with the 1989 SDPN, and Gofwen (2000) asserted that there has been no connection between social research and social policy in Nigeria, whereas in developed countries, social work’s “theoretical orientation and organizational arrangements are influenced by national social polices (Niemelä & Hämäläinen, 2001, p. 5), and “the social landscape and policy formulation are shaped by the direction of research” (Gofwen, 2000: 65).

Second, the quite limited focus (2.17%) on social work related to ethno-cultural diversity in this study supports previous assertions that a lack of adequate culturally rooted social work is one of the major factors responsible for the persistence of poverty (Jinadu, 1985) and the underdevelopment of the country (Anugwom, 2000; Olufayo, 2014; Osinubi & Osinubi, 2006). In other words, depriving social work of relevant social legislations and culturally relevant social policies and programs has inhibited the development of social work in Nigeria, particularly its focus on the country’s ethno-cultural diversity, as demonstrated by the findings of the SLR. In view of this study’s findings, and most importantly, the principle of cultural relativity in any case study (Alasuutari, 1996), this study posits that: the lack of focus of Nigeria’s social work on its ethno-cultural diversity and vice versa is due to basic constitutional inadequacies, vacillating social policies and a lack of statutory basis for social work, thereby hindering the structure and (infrastructural) function of the profession in Nigeria.

The implication of this study for other multicultural societies is that social work is an indispensable tool of social policy implementation in a democratic dispensation (Akintayo, 2006), particularly in multicultural contexts, as it does not only allow for peaceful integration but also for ethno-cultural cooperation, accommodation, and assimilation. A digression from these benefits of social work will lead to unnecessary conflicts. Therefore, unambiguous statutory provisions, ethno-culturally relevant social policies, programs, research, and a strict adherence to professional ethics in multicultural social work interventions are necessary to prevent the whims and caprices embedded in individual or ethnic idiosyncrasies.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, The exploration of Nigerian social work in this study has not only revealed a disconnection between governance and the complexity of Nigeria’s diversity but has also encapsulated a hindered social work impact on the country’s ethno-cultural diversity and its possibility of imparting local knowledge to the profession. Finally, a replication of this research is recommended to further the substantive aims of this study, either in Nigeria or other multicultural contexts, for the scientific enrichment of social work knowledge, methods and practices amid the increasing global ethno-cultural diversity.
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