SCHOOL INPUTS FOR THE DELIVERY OF QUALITY UNIVERSAL BASIC EDUCATION IN RIVERS STATE.

Sergeant-Awuse, V. D
Department of Educational Planning
Faculty of Educaiton
University of Port Harcourt
(vicky_awuse@yahoo.com)
&
Agabi, O. G Ph.D
Senior Lecturer in Educational Planning,
University of Port Harcourt,
(ogargre@yahoo.com)

Abstract
This study investigated school inputs for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State. It is a descriptive survey that involved a stratified random sampling of 156 public basic primary schools (110 primary and 46 J.S.S) and 1730 (primary 933 and J.S.S 267) teachers as respondents, from 1200 public basic schools with a total of 13,294 teachers in Rivers State. The instruments used for this study are observation schedule, a school Inputs Inventory Check list (SIIC) and a questionnaire titled "School Inputs Assessment Questionnaire" (SIAQ). Percentages and mean statistics were used to analyze the data collected to address the research questions, while the z-test statistics was also used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. It was discovered that the physical facilities in primary and junior secondary schools are moderately adequate, there are moderately quality teachers and there is moderate level of instructional supervision in primary and junior secondary schools in Rivers State. No significant differences existed between primary and junior secondary schools on the adequacy of physical facilities provision and level of school instructional supervision. It was concluded that the provision of school inputs both from the qualitative and quantitative dimension are not adequate to achieve quality delivery of the universal basic education in Rivers State. It was recommended among others, that government should allocate more funds to education, be responsive to school physical facilities provision and there should be more regular and functional supervision and monitoring of schools to facilitate regular school facilities maintenance and upgrading.
Key words: School inputs, public school, quality basic education, quality teaching manpower, school physical facilities, functional supervision, primary and junior secondary schools.

Background to the Study
The belief in the role of education in national development has resulted to government improved commitment at different levels to the establishment of educational institutions. The astronomical expansion of educational resources which resulted to increase in school enrolment at different levels of the Nigeria education system is a common phenomenon. A lot of countries round the globe view education as an important investment for national development because of its

capacity to develop the right quantity and quality of manpower for economic growth. This is an important statutory responsibility of the education system.

Basic education is the foundational level upon which the entire education system rests. Going by the Universal Basic Education (UBE) Act (Federal Ministry of Education, FME (2004), it is the education provided in the first nine (9) years of formal school and those of out of school youths, who otherwise should be in school. It consists of six (6) years primary and three (3) years junior secondary education. The programme is free and compulsory for every Nigerian child of school age. The programme which was launched in 1999, is targeted at improving individuals' knowledge, skills and attitudes that will enable them live a life worthy of emulation, contribute to the development of their immediate environment and discharge their civic obligations responsibly. The basic goals of the UBE programme are to make basic education universal and accessible, introduce a conducive learning environment and eradicate illiteracy in the country in a shortest possible time. The specific objective of the scheme was to develop in the citizenry the consciousness for education and a strong commitment to its vigorous promotion.

The quality and performance of any educational system depends largely on the quality of the foundational level of education that is made available essentially at the basic level. It plays a pivotal role in the academic lives of every individual in the society. It is in recognition of these basic facts that basic education has continued to attract attention through various transformation processes and repackaging. However, the objective of any education system can hardly be achieved if there is dearth adequate and functional resource inputs and their optimal utilization to guarantee quality delivery of program. These includes quality teachers, physical facilities, instructional facilities, good planning, reliable school data, school inspection, supervision and monitoring of service delivery, adequate funding and conducive, healthy and safe environment for teaching and learning. A well planned programme can fail at the implementation stage if the necessary school inputs are not supplied. The level of school inputs availability can therefore undermine the future of any school system, just as the quality of what is taught and learning depends fully on the amount of education resources available to schools.

School facilities are the physical and spatial enablers of teaching and learning which will increase positive results in the school system (Emetarom, 2004). The effectiveness and efficiency of a school depends to a great extent on the provision, adequacy and utilization of educational facilities. Akinsolu (2004) asserted that educational curriculum that is not sound cannot be well operated even with well managed school facilities. Thus, school physical facilities are resources that facilitate effective teaching and learning in the school system. To this end, physical resources refer to those palpable educational materials that can be seen, touched and felt, which have the ability to enhance the teaching learning process. They include classroom blocks, teachers' quarters, technical workshops, libraries, equipment, electric power supply, and portable water, audio-visual aids, tables, desks, chairs, play grounds, storage spaces, and toilets. Presently, enrolment of

public primary school is on the increase, which demands an equilibrium increase in school facilities for quality teaching and learning processes.

There have been on-going debates in both developed and developing countries as to whether the educational sector is grossly under-funded, over-funded or if it has been having its fair share of financial resources from the nation, state or local government. The amounts allocated to the education sector have been on the increase over the years but, the percentage allocated to enrolment, dilapidated school buildings and the vital need to uphold standards among other variables has really been insufficient (Amaechina, 2011). The introduction of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme has witnessed an upsurge in pupils' enrolment which necessarily requires a corresponding expansion in facilities, qualified personnel and financial provisions to achieve quality delivery of the educational program.

Statement of the Problem

Despite the huge investments that the state government claims it has made in the basic education programme, a lot of criticisms have continued to trail the programme. Many argue that, more than a decade after the programme came on board, not much has changed in terms of the provision of physical facilities, quality teaching manpower and supervision of schools to achieve quality delivery of education at this level. What therefore bothers the researchers is whether these criticisms are factual or whether there is provision of adequate school inputs such as school physical facilities, quality teaching manpower, school instructional supervision, among many others, for the delivery of quality basic education as claimed by government.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

This study investigated the level of provision of school inputs for the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State. Specifically, the objectives of this study were to investigate the following:

1. The adequacy of school physical facilities for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State.
2. The quality of the teaching manpower for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State.
3. The quality of school instructional supervision for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be of significance to several interests groups in education in general and the UBE program in particular. It has generated vital information on the level of school input provision, which will help the state Ministry of education, as wel as the government to appreciate the level of public commitment to the delivery of the programme. It will also help them in developing a workable framework for improving the funding of the programme.

The findings of this study has also brought to lime-light the physical facilities and teaching manpower resource inputs available in the system. This information will assist the education planners to know the areas to provide and channel more school inputs for quality delivery of Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Rivers State. It will also provide the policy makers with the platform on areas to make policies which will help sustain and improve on resource provision for the quality delivery of Universal Basic Education (UBE) in the state. The result of this study will in addition assist the school administrators in the system to better articulate their resource needs for quality education before a higher funding authority.

Theoretical Framework

This study was based on the theory of efficiency and effectiveness of organizations as propounded by Chester Bernard (1938) in Edem (2004). The theory states that the function of the chief executive of an organization is to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in the organization. However, effectiveness is task oriented while efficiency is employee centred. The principle of effectiveness entails the accomplishment of the organizational objectives while efficiency entails one's preparedness and attitude to work. The achievement of the organization's objectives depend on how the chief executive co-ordinates these principles to achieve balance in the organization. Efficiency and effectiveness of an organization is dependent on the right quality of resource inputs committed into the organization and accompanied by the level of prudential management of such resources to accomplish the organization's objectives.

Efficiency and effectiveness of an organization cannot be achieved without adequate provision of educational resource inputs in schools. These resources include manpower, funds, infrastructure, and facilities such as classrooms, laboratories, libraries and instructional materials. All these broad categories of resources need adequate provision and prudent management for effective and efficient operation of the school. The availability of teachers to handle the physical resources in a proper manner cannot be over emphasized.

However, Ndu, Ocho and Okeke (1997), contended that learning takes place better and faster in schools with better environment, good and qualified teachers, good libraries and laboratories, classrooms and adequate instructional facilities and equipment than when facilities are lacking or inadequate. Okeke (2001) is of the opinion that for efficiency to be achieved in schools, relevant educational resource inputs are absolutely necessary because they act as teaching and learning enhancer. When resources are inadequate, they frustrate any educational policy or programme. Consequently, the requirements for the implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) are highly reflected in the theory of efficiency and effectiveness because without various parameters coming into play, the realization of the goals upon which the programme is based will be unattainable.

Education as a service-oriented organization needs resources (inputs) to attain the predetermined goals and policies. The implication is that the quality and quantity of resources determine to a great extent the quality of output in the school system. In compliance with the above, Agabi (2002) asserted that education is an industry

and therefore an economic good. This gives a clear indication that the provision of education requires some vital quality resources (inputs) which has to undergo some processing (teaching, management) to achieve some desired outcome (output).He identified an industry as economic activity where production of goods and services takes place. He concluded that there is no educational activity that does not make use of inputs such as teachers, students, land, building, furniture, equipment and finances. It thus means, there must be corresponding inputs to attain the desired results (output). Agabi's assertion goes beyond some of the writers before him on input–output production function as regards feedback. The society, stake-holders in education expect feedback from the educational programme at any given period, which in themselves are forms of input into the system.

Fabunmi (2004) concluded that production function relates output to different types of inputs. This in a given technology they say describes the way societies provide their materials needed in the field of technical engineering. They reiterated that inputs go beyond the conventional inputs to include managerial competence, access to information, workers' motivation, institutional motivation and institutional flexibility. They further opined that low levels of labour productivity is as a result of poor "complementary" factor inputs such as physical capital or experienced management. Furthermore, domestic savings and foreign finance can be used to establish new investment in physical capital goods and stock of human capital such as managerial skills through investment in education and training.

Concept of Quality Basic Education

Quality can be viewed as the worth of something. Babalola (2004) stated that quality of education refers to the worth of education with reference to its input, the teaching- learning process and the output/ outcome. He went further to explain that, the quality could be poor, excellent or exceptional. Quality of input refers to the worth of teachers, trainees, textbooks, technology of delivery, and tasks or curriculum. Quality of environment involves the work of all environmental factors and sanitation. Since education is seen and regarded as service to the society and as such a predominant force in our society. Maduewesi (2005) described quality in education as multi-faceted and encompassing how learning is organized and managed and the totality of the surroundings where education takes place.

In addition, Afenikhe (2007) was of the view that quality is the basic and indispensable feature of a thing that makes it different from other things. It is about the standard of something when compared with other things. Ekundayo (2010) posited that quality is synonymous with standard, efficiency, excellence, relevance and worthiness. When it is applied to education, it is the success through which the environment enables students to effectively achieve worthwhile learning goals and academic standard.

Aigboje (2007) in Ekundayo (2010) referred quality to excellence or more of societal values embodied in the school curricula. These are the stages and activities that take place before certificates are issued. However, quality cuts across every element of the activities undertaken in the process of educating the

learner and the wider society. Jaiyeoba and Atanda (2005) posited that quality is synonymous with standard, efficiency, excellence, relevance and worthiness. When applied to education, it is the success with which an institution provides educational environment which enables students to effectively achieve academic standard. In addition, a number of policy statements have also been documented in the National policy on Education (FGN 2004) to ensure quality control in schools, through effective school supervision. The supervisors are responsible for maintaining high standards and ensure that schools are run in accordance with laid down regulations.

The concern for quality has been the main motivating force for reforms in education. However, quality delivery encompasses attitudes, objectives, actions and procedures which through their existence and use, together with quality control activities ensure that appropriate academic standards are maintained and achieved in each programme. Thus, education of high quality should have quality students, quality teachers, quality facilities, and quality school curriculum and quality government policies as inputs. The manner in which the inputs are processed from the beginning to the final years of an educational programme and the quality of assessment of the entire teaching-learning activities also constitutes important aspects of quality delivery (Adegbile & Adeyemi, 2008). However, at the entry point of educational system, the students are expected to be of high quality. They should meet the expected standard of the class in which they are to be enrolled.

On the contrary, students of poor ability have been admitted and promoted into higher classes in our educational institutions. Quality delivery demands that students should be of required standard before they are admitted into schools or promoted when in school. It is in the light of these that Ebenebe (2012) views admission of children with very poor academic standards into secondary schools as a way of laying the foundation for indiscipline and cheating in examinations. According to Ijaiya (2001), examination malpractice shows a decline in quality of education and those who engage in cheating at a lower level are likely to continue at higher level of education. When they graduate into the society, their previous attitudes can easily lead them into corrupt practices. In other word, students who possess certificates through cheating could use the certificates to secure jobs and they would not be able to perform, leading to poor productivity.

As noted by Adegbile and Adeyemi (2008), quality or standards for educational sector warrants establishment of a set of quality indicators, measuring instruments and time frame indicators. They are of the view that for there to be quality delivery in our secondary schools, there is need for quality learners, quality teaching, quality facilities, quality learning environment and quality outcomes. Afemikhe (2007) observed that secondary education is experiencing a lot of problems in the area of instructional materials, shortage of teachers and poor funding. These and other factors have been found to hinder the performance of learners and attainment of quality delivery at the secondary school level in Nigeria.

Katz (2008), Reiger and Stang (2000) argued that teachers need to be friendly and hardworking so as to create a learning environment that would improve the learning habits of the students. The internal efficiency of an educational system can be seen on how well the educational system is doing in terms of quality outcomes. Students enrol in primary one and move up each year through the different school classes and finally they pass out into the economy. An efficient educational system will have less wastage in terms of dropout rates. According to Babalola (2004), the following indices can be used to determine the efficiency of educational system. The MDGs report 2010 indicates that Nigeria has made progress in net enrolment of primary schoolchildren. For example there is increase in the net enrolment of primary school in Nigeria from 68% in the year 2000 to 88.8% in 2008. This indicates greater access to primary education with probability of reaching the target by 2015. However, Babalola also noted that, the survival rate, that is, the number of pupils starting primary one who reached primary 5 in the years 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003 were, 97% 97% 96% and 84%respectively. These year's show good progress but subsequent years 2004, 2005,2006,2007,2008,showed steady decline of 74% 74% 74% 74% and 72% respectively (Fafunwa, 2010).

This is quite interesting as these years of decline coincides with the period when more teachers have been recruited and trained, more school buildings have been provided and so on. This shows that more emphasis is on the quantity of pupils enrolling in primary school than in the quality of the outcomes. Thus as more children are enrolling in primary school, more are also dropping. In addition, the completion rate as indicated in the 2010 MDGs report also shows a steady decline. The completion rate shows the number of pupils who enrolled in primary one and were able to complete primary 6. In the year 2000, the completion rate was 76.7%, it progressed to 82% in the year 2004 and then progressively declined to 67.5% in 2007 (Fafunwa, 2010).

Reviews of Empirical Studies

There was a study carried out by Adeyanju, Ajayi and Salomi (2011) on the Status of Human and Material Resources in Public Primary Schools in Ogun State. The descriptive design was adopted with forty (40) teachers randomly selected as the respondents. The study revealed that adequate training of manpower in the uses of material resources has a significant role in the effectiveness of output, and there should be adequate continuous supply of material resource which may have significant role in primary education. It was concluded that, the qualities of human and material resources in public primary schools are indeed relatively high. The major challenge is poor commitment on the part of the teachers. At least, the recent promulgated act that the minimum qualification required for teachers in primary schools should be Nigeria Certificate of Education (N.C.E) is enough to boost the output and performance of public primary schools. However, when there is no dedication, no meaningful progress could be achieved. The focus of this study is Ogun state and the scope is limited because of the use of only 40 teachers, whose spread is not defined.

A study on assessment of Resources for the implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme in Junior Secondary Schools in Rivers State was carried out by Harrison (2008). The descriptive design was adopted with 1200 teachers randomly selected as the respondents. Document analysis and a twenty items questionnaire were used for the study with frequency, mean, standard deviation and t-test statistics used to analyze the study. The study revealed that, there is a significant difference between teachers in urban schools and those in rural schools on quality of infrastructure for effective UBE implementation. There is no significant difference between teachers in urban and rural schools on the adequacy of qualified teachers for the UBE implementation. Although this study is on Rivers State, it only focused on Junior Secondary Schools, which is an aspect of the UBE. The fact that this study was conducted nine (9) years ago makes it even imperative that it should be revalidated.

As reiterated by Ajeke (2008), resources in the school have dual purposes or roles to play, enabling teachers to provide a greater variety of learning experiences and enabling pupils to take some responsibilities for their own learning. It is imperative to note that the physical resources coupled with human resources (qualified staff) will elevate pupils' performance in their academic endeavour. According to Coombs (2006), the absence of resources will militate against the achievement of high standard of any educational programme.

Another study was carried out by Asiabaka and Mbakwem (2007) on the assessment of facility needs of government primary schools in Imo state, Nigeria. The population of the study was made up of all the twenty seven Local Government Councils in the State. Five schools from each local government area were selected and this gave a sample size of one hundred and twenty five schools. The findings revealed that there is shortage of instructional facilities in most of the schools and there were no laboratories and libraries. Rain harvesting was the major source of water supply and toilet facilities were not available in almost all the schools. Although, the communities benefited from rural electrification, the primary schools were not supplied with electricity. Furthermore, findings showed that only football fields were the sporting facility available in the schools. There was no school transport system in any of the primary schools and the primary schools were dilapidated. The study concluded that there facilities in the primary schools in the State were inadequate. Beside the fact that this study was based on another state, it covered only the primary level of education, which is just an aspect of the UBE programme.

Another study was carried out by Agabi (2003) on resourcing of critical inputs in secondary school management in Cross Rivers State. Five research questions and 12 hypotheses were used for the study. A total of 46 schools were randomly selected from 108 public and private secondary schools in Cross River State. The findings showed that, secondary school managers in Cross River State have just moderate resource sourcing and utilization ability, very low ability in resource distribution efficacy and very poor resource maintenance ability. The resourcing ability of the school management in the state is inhibited by political instability, poor funding, obsolete knowledge of school resources, poor human relations and

poor knowledge of sources or resources. The results therefore conclude that the problem of resourcing in secondary school management in Cross River State is the same for public and private secondary schools irrespective of age, location and sex of the school manager. This study was focused on assessing the resourcing abilities of school heads, which is needed in the era of underf-unding of public schools.

It has been observed severally that poor planning is a major problem to the school administration when it comes to facility provision. They are of the view that for there to be quality delivery in our secondary schools, there is need for quality learners, quality teaching, quality facilities, quality learning environment and quality outcomes. Afemikhe, (2007) observes that secondary education is experiencing a lot of problems in the area of instructional materials, shortage of teachers and poor funding. These and other factors have been found to hinder the performance of learners and attainment of quality delivery at the secondary school level in Nigeria.

Methodology

This study was a descriptive survey, as the researchers examined and described existing state of affairs with regards to the provision of school inputs for the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State without manipulating any research variables. The population consisted of the 1,200 public basic schools (933 primary and 267 JSS) in Rivers State. The respondents were the 13,294 teachers (8,319 Primary and 4,975 J.S.S) in the 1200 public basic schools in Rivers State (SUBEB, Rivers State, 2014). The sample size of the study was 156 basic schools with 1730 teachers spread across six (6) LGAs of Rivers State. A stratified random sampling technique was adopted in sampling local governments (25%), schools (50%) and teachers (50%) within sampled schools for the study. This gave a total of 1730 teacher from 156 schools spread across six (6) LGAs.

The instruments that were used for the study are observation schedule, document analysis, questionnaire and structured interview. The observation schedule was titled “School Inputs Inventory Check List” (SIIC) and the questionnaire titled “School Inputs Assessment Questionnaire” (SIAQ) was structured on a four point modified Likert type rating scale. The research questionnaire was validated with the assistance of the research supervisors and four other experts in the Department of Educational Management in terms of appropriateness of content, clarity of words and relevance to the objective of the work. The reliability of the questionnaire was achieved using the Cronbach’s alpha reliability statistics, which yielded a reliability co-efficient of 0.87.

The researcher personally administered the instruments on the various schools with the help of three trained research assistants who were briefed before the commencement of the exercise. Repeated visits were made by the researcher and the trained research assistants to ensure high response rate. The data collected from the field of study were tallied and organized in tables in line with the research questions and hypotheses. The percentages, mean (X) and standard

deviation (SD) were used to analyze the data to address the research questions, while the z-test statistics was also used to test the hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. A criterion percentage (%) 0f 50 or mean of 2.50 was adopted. Therefore items whose percentage falls below 50% or their mean fall below 2.50 were assumed to be Not adequate (NA) or not agreed.

Results and Discussion

Research Question 1: How adequate are the school physical facilities for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State?

The question was meant to find out the adequacy of facilities available in basic primary schools in Rivers State. The survey is based on the facility inventory in sampled basic primary schools in Rivers State. The result of data analysis which addressed this question is shown in Table 4.1.

Table 1: Physical facilities available in basic primary schools in Rivers State.

S/N	Facilities	Primary schools			Junior secondary schools		
		Adequate (%)	Not adequate (%)	Total (%)	Adequate (%)	Not Adequate (%)	Total (%)
1	Classrooms	84	16	100	85	15	100
2	Teachers office	87	13	100	81	19	100
3	Teachers quarters	13	87	100	07	93	100
4	Football field	70	30	100	81	19	100
5	Assembly hall	94	06	100	85	15	100
6	Music room	13	87	100	11	89	100
7	Library	44	56	100	31	69	100
8	Basic science laboratory	40	60	100	35	65	100
9	Computer studio	36	64	100	31	69	100
10	Creative arts studio	16	84	100	38	62	100
11	Home Economics laboratory	06	94	100	37	63	100
	Grand mean (%)	**46.0**	**54.0**	**100.0**	**47.0**	**53.0**	**100.0**

The result of the analysis in Table 1 shows that classrooms are 84% adequate in primary schools and 85% adequate in junior secondary school in Rivers State. It also reveals that in primary and junior secondary schools, teachers' offices are 87% and 81% adequate respectively. However, in primary schools, teachers' quarters, football field, assembly hall, music room and library are 13%, 70%, 94%, 13% and 44% adequate respectively. In junior secondary schools, teachers' quarters, football field, assembly hall, music room and library are 7%, 81%, 85%, 11% and 31% available respectively. From the evidences in Table 1, there are also indications that in primary schools, basic science laboratory, computer studio, creative arts studio and home economics laboratory are respectively 40%, 36%, 16% and 6% adequate. In junior secondary schools, basic science laboratory, computer studio, creative arts studio and home economics laboratory are 35%, 31%, 38% and 37% adequate respectively. However, the grand mean (%) for physical facilities adequacy in primary schools is 46% adequate, while physical facilities adequacy in junior secondary schools is 47% adequate, giving an aggregate mean of 46.5%. This means physical facilities are not adequate in basic schools in Rivers State, as the percentage adequacy falls below the 50% mark.

Where classroom facilities are inadequate, the available classroom spaces are usually overcrowded, result in a teacher handling more children than can be effectively controlled as clearly revealed in the photo clips in Figure 1.

Figure 1: A teacher teaching Pupils in overcrowded primary school classroom

The situation is different in model schools, where the classrooms are built to specified standards to house the specified class size. Unfortunately, the model schools are too few to make any impact on the state of facilities in public schools. Even at the Junior secondary schools, there are few schools that standard classroom facilities are provided to accommodate the standard class size as can be seen in Figure 2. Here, the classroom facilities are not even fully occupied.

Figure 2: Junior secondary school students learning in a classroom.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the primary schools and the junior secondary schools with respect to the adequacy of school physical facilities for the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State.
Data analysis testing this hypothesis is summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Mean, standard deviation (SD) and Z-test statistics of primary and junior secondary schools on the adequacy of school physical facilities.

	N	Mean	SD	z-Cal.	z-Crit.	DF	Level of Sig.	Decision
Primary	110	2.81	0.89	0.72				Not sig.
JSS	46	2.76	0.91		1.96	154	0.05	Ho not rejected

The result of the analysis in table 2 using z-test shows that there is no significant difference between the primary schools and junior secondary schools with respect to the adequacy of school physical facilities. This is because the calculated z-value of 0.72 is less than the z-critical value of 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and 154 degree of freedom. Consequently, the hypothesis was not rejected at 0.05 level of significance. This means there is no significant difference between the primary schools and the junior secondary schools with respect to the adequacy of school physical facilities for the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State.

Research Question 2: What is the quality of the teaching manpower provision for the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State?

The quality of teaching manpower provision was assessed using the qualification of teachers and the result of the survey data analysis is presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Quality of teaching manpower in basic primary schools in Rivers State.

s/no	Primary school teachers			Junior secondary school teacher	
	Qualification	Sampled teachers	% of teachers qualified	Sampled teachers	% of qualified teachers
1	B.ED	224	22%	398	56%
2	HND	388	38%	312	44%
3	NCE	408	40%	0	0%
4	TCII	0	0%	0 0%	0%
	Grand Total	1,0	100%	710	100%

This is judged by the minimum qualification of teachers in primary schools and secondary schools as stipulated in the National policy on Education (FGN, 2004).

Table 3 shows that 22% of teachers in primary schools have bachelor of education (B.ED) certificate, 38% have higher National Diploma (HND) and 40% have National certificate of Education (NCE) as their least qualification. In junior secondary schools, 56% of teachers have bachelor of education (B.ED) certificate, 44% have higher National Diploma (HND) certificates and 0% have teachers grade II certificate (TCII) as their least qualification. Considering that 38% of teachers in primary schools and 44% in secondary schools have HND (which is not a professional teaching qualification), they are considered as poor quality teachers. That means only 62% of teachers in primary and 56% in secondary schools are professionally trained and qualified teachers. This means the schools have moderately quality teachers.

Research Question 3: What is the level of school instructional supervision for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State?

This question examined the level of instructional supervision provided in primary and JSS in Rivers State. The result of the data analysis addressing this is shown in Table 4.

Table 4 Level of school instructional supervision

S/N	Supervisory activities	Mean		Mean set	Remarks
		Prim. Schools N=1020	JSS N=710		
1	Teachers are supervised by the ministry of education occasionally.	3.17	3.25	3.21	Moderate extent
2	The headmaster/headmistress supervises the teachers from time to time.	3.37	2.81	3.09	Moderate extent
3	Teachers cover their scheme of work before the end of term.	2.99	2.88	2.94	Moderate extent
4	Teachers write their lesson notes regularly.	2.95	2.99	2.97	Moderate extent
5	Head teachers carry out routine check on facilities in the school regularly.	2.92	2.80	2.86	Moderate extent
6	Workshops are organised for teachers occasionally.	2.32	2.49	2.41	Minimal extent
7	Students perform excellently in their take home assignments.	2.79	2.73	2.75	Moderate extent
8	All students in your class pass their promotion exams.	2.56	2.31	2.44	Minimal extent
Aggregate mean		**2.88**	**2.78**	**2.83**	**Moderate**

The mean scores in table 4 ranges between 3.21 and 2.41. The mean scores from item 1 to 5 and 7 are higher than the criterion mean score of 2.50 while item 6 and 8 are below the criterion mean. Therefore, item 1 to 5 and 7 indicate moderate level of school instructional supervision, while items 6 and 8 shows minimal level of school instructional supervision in the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State. Thus, teachers are supervised by the ministry of education occasionally, while workshops are organised for teachers occasionally. However, the grand mean is 2.83; which is an indication of moderate, meaning there is moderate level of school instructional supervision in basic schools (see the mean set and the associated remarks in Table 4).

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the primary school teachers and the junior secondary school teachers on the level of school

instructional supervision for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State.

The result of statistical test for this hypothesis is presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Mean(x), standard deviation (SD) and z-test of differences between the mean opinion of primary and junior secondary school teachers on the level of school instructional supervision.

	N	Mean	SD	z-cal.	z-rit.	DF	Level of Sig.	Decision
Primary	1,020	2.84	0.90					Not sig.
JSS	710	2.78	0.93	0.78	1.96	1728	0.05	Ho not rejected

The result of the analysis in Table 5 using z-test shows that there is no significant difference between the rating of teachers in primary and junior secondary schools on the level of school instructional supervision. This is evident in the fact that the calculated z-value of 0.78 is less than the z-critical value of 1.96 at 0.05 level of significance and 1728 degree of freedom. Consequently, the hypothesis was not rejected at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there is no significant difference between the mean rating of primary and junior secondary school teachers on the level of school instructional supervision for the delivery of quality universal basic education in Rivers State.

Discussion of findings/Implications

Physical facility adequacy

This study has established that there is inadequate provision of facilities in primary and junior secondary schools for the delivery of quality basic education. There is no significant difference between the mean rating of primary and junior secondary school teachers with respect to the adequacy of school physical facilities for the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State. This result is very revealing with regards to the physical facilities status in basic schools in Rivers State.

Physical facilities in education include such items as classroom blocks, library, offices, refectories, laboratories, toilet facilities and open grounds for agricultural practices and extracurricular activities (Okeke, 2007). For effective implementation of the UBE programme, the physical facilities must be present and have to be of appropriate quality, size and quantity to meet the minimum standard for promoting any meaningful teaching and learning (Nwafor, 2006). Scholars agreed that teaching and learning cannot take place in an academic environment devoid of the basic and necessary infrastructure and facilities (Okeke, 2007). Agabi (1999) revealed that the teaching and learning conditions for many of the less developed countries can best be described as deplorable, yet research report indicate that children learn best when they can actively explore and dominate their environment through the use of material resources (Castaldi, 1982).

It was envisaged in the implementation, guidelines for the UBE that for any meaningful teaching and learning that will meet the minimum standards for the UBE programme to take place, infrastructure and facilities have to be available in

appropriate quantity, size and quality. Scholars are in agreement that the school system in Nigeria has witnessed a steady growth in student's enrolment without corresponding growth in facilities provision (Agabi, 2005, Adiele, 2004). These research reports reveal that facilities were scarcely available in all categories of schools, yet study by Adesina (2004) agreed that the quality of education children receive has direct relevance to the availability or lack of physical facilities. If the enabling infrastructure, furniture and facilities are not in place, for the country to achieve any meaningful success in the implementation of the UBE programme, the corresponding and appropriate facilities must be put in place in all primary schools across the country.

Quality of teaching manpower in basic primary schools

The quality teaching manpower remains one of the key issues in the quality delivery of basic primary education. This survey has revealed that the public and primary schools have moderately quality teachers evidenced by 62% of teachers in primary and 56% in JSS being professionally trained and qualified teachers. Teachers are the main operators in the school system; pupils cannot succeed without the guidance and expert advice of teachers. Dike (1989) therefore stressed on the importance of trained personnel for the use of instructional materials in effective teaching-learning process. He observed that a school may purchase the best audio-visual equipment in the world, but if it lacks the trained personnel to direct their usage, such equipment will end up being objects of classroom decoration. Okeke and Uwazurike (1997) observed that there is a problem of inadequate supply of trained and qualified manpower. The general impression is that there seems to be a proliferation of people with teaching qualification than the labour force can absorb. Obaje (2003) identified the teacher as an important agent that has the capacity to make or mar a smooth and successful learning with the formal system of education. The qualified teacher is the greatest factor in educating students.

As observed by Okpala (1990) in Adesina (2008), some teachers do not know how to use the available instructional materials because they are either inadequately trained or untrained, which causes problems to the educational system. An adequate supply of suitable qualified teacher is fundamental to building successful schools. Teacher education and training are very important to equip the teacher for immediate needs as well as long term professional needs. The programmes are intended to properly equip the teacher as agent for the dissemination of certain kinds of socially approved knowledge, skills and attitudes to rising generations, innovators in the modernization process and agent of community uplift. In essence, teacher education programme should be viewed as lifetime development plan of the teacher, Okeke (2004). Adesina (2008) described it as quantitative contributions of human resources to the overall goals of the system adding that it enables the individuals to be more efficient in performing their work or at preparing individuals for greater responsibility. Edem (2004) noted that professional training entails the inculcation of the right professional attitudes and this is difficult to do without instruction-trainee contact. The UBE implementation guidelines provide the efforts to raise the level of teachers initiate professional preparation will be pursed broadened and intensified. This low rating on the

quality of teachers in public schools could be attributed to the fact that the recent massive recruitment of about 10,00 teachers by the government for public schools did not discriminate against those without professional training in education. They were rather asked to ensure they get professionalize within a given time frame.

Level of school instructional supervision

The level of school instructional supervision is vital to achieving quality delivery of basic education in Rivers State. The result of this study has shown that there is moderate level of school instructional supervision in primary and JSS. It is clear from the individual item ratings that teachers are supervised by the ministry of education occasionally and by headmaster/principal from time to time. Teachers cover their scheme of work before the end of term, head teachers carry out routine check on facilities in the school regularly and Students perform excellently in their take home assignments.

Quality education is supported and informed by sound management practices. Close and continuous monitoring of the programme will show if the stated objectives of the programme have been really been achieved. Abimbade (2008) noted that, school supervision and classroom management should account for and be responsible towards making sure that quality is enshrined within the school. It is the responsibility of the school administrators to make sure that their schools achieve their objectives as planned. The success of a school is dependent upon its success in creating a supportive environment for curriculum change.

Conclusion

Based on the result of this study as presented and discussed, it is evident that the provision of school inputs both from the qualitative and quantitative dimension are not adequate to achieve quality delivery of the universal basic education in primary and JSS in Rivers State. The challenges of under-funding of schools and poor data base for effective planning as well as the high cost of facilities is even worsening the status of provision of inputs for quality delivery of the UBE programme.

Recommendations

On the strength of the results of the study, the researcher recommended some actions to mitigate the negative effect of these challenges. Firstly, it is recommended that government should be more responsive to schools' physical facilities provision without delay. This can be achieved by conducting regular school input inventory to gather the needed information to guide actions on school input distribution.

Secondly, school supervision should be more regular and comprehensive to provide adequate information on school needs, the result of school exercise should be fully implemented to achieve the desired effect on the delivery of quality basic education in Rivers State. It is imperative that the government should allocate more funds to the education sector in order to take care of the rise in cost of facilities and equipment used to bring about meaningful teaching and learning in schools. This can be made more functional by providing adequate running imprest

for each school based on school size. This would facilitate routine facility maintenance by school heads to enhance their longevity.

References

Abimbade, A. (2008). *Computer application to teaching and learning in Nigerian schools*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan Press.

Adegbile, J.A & Adeyemi, B.A (2008). Enhancing quality assurance through teachers' effectiveness. *Educational Research and Review*. 3(2), 61-65.

Adesina, S. (2004). *Universal Basic Education and the problem of qualified teachers*. Ibadan: Educational press.

Adesina, S. (2008). *Introduction to Educational Planning.* Ile Ife: University of Ife Press.

Adeyanju, H. I, Ajayi, K. O. & Salomi, M. O. (2011). Status of Human and Material Resources in Public Primary Schools in Ogun State: Implication for Curriculum Development. *Journal of Basic Applied Science Research.* 1(7) 634-637.

Adiele, E.E. (2004). *Teaching Manpower Inventory in Secondary Schools in Ikwerre land.* Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. University of Port Harcourt.

Afemikhe, O.A. (2007). Assessment and educational standard improvement: Reflections from Nigeria. *A paper presented at the 33rd annual conference of the international association for educational assessment held at Baku.* (16th-21st September).

Agabi, O.G. (1999). *Introduction to Educational Planning*. Port Harcourt: International Centre for Education Services.

Agabi, O.G. (2002). *Finance and Economic of Public for Education*. Port Harcourt: International Centre for Educational services.

Agabi, C.O. (2005) Achieving Efficient Resource Management in Primary Education. *Education Journal of Association of Teachers in Childhood Education (Maiden Issue)* 1; 19-23.

Ajeke, J. (2008). *Resourcing the Educational System in the challenge of Nigeria.* Ile- Ife: University of Ife Press.

Akinsolu, R.A. (2004*).* Provision and Management of Facilities in Nigerian Primary Schools. *Management of Primary and Secondary Education in Nigeria*. Ibadan: LEAP publications.

Amaechina, U.O. (2011). Trends in Funding Secondary Schools for free education in Anambra State. *African Journal of Educational Research and Development (AJERD).4(1),10-16.*

Asiabaka, P. & Mbakwem, J. (2007). Assessment of Facility Needs of Government Primary Schools in Imo State. *York Science Journal. New* 1(1), 22-29.

Babalola, J.B. (2003). *Basic Text in Educational planning*. Ibadan University Press.

Castaldi, B. (1997). *Educational Facilities: Planning, Modernization and Management (2nd ed.).* London: Allyn and Bacon.

Castaldi, B. (1982). *Educational Facilities: Planning, Modernization and Management*. London: Allyn and Bacon.

Coombs, P. H. (2006). *The World Education Crisis: A System Analysis*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ebenebe, R.C. (2008). *Discipline and education*: *The Nigerian secondary school case*. Owerri: Total publishers Ltd.

Edem, D.A. (2004*). Introduction to Educational Administration in Nigeria*. Lagos: The Macmillan Press Ltd.

Ekundayo, H.T. (2010). Administering secondary schools in Nigeria for quality output in the 21st century: The principals' challenge. *European journal of education studies.* 2(3), 187- 192.

Emetarom, U. G. (2004). Provision and Management of Facilities in Primary Schools in Nigeria: Implications for Policy Formulation. *Paper presented at the Annual National Conference of NAEAP,* University of Ibadan, October 28th – 31st.

Fabumi, M. (2004). *Perspective in Educational planning.* Odum Press: Ibadan.

Fafunwa, K.N. (2010). *Educating for Values*. Ibadan: Tope Press.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). The Universal Basic Education Act. Abuja: NERDC Press

Federal Ministry of Education (2004) *National Policy on Education.* NERDC Press: Lagos.

Harrison, Z. (2008). *Assessment of resources for the implementation of Universal Basic Education in junior secondary schools in Rivers State.* Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, University of Port Harcourt.

Ijaiya, Y. (2001). From quality control to quality assurance: A panacea for quality education in Nigerian schools. *Current issues in Educational Management in Nigeria*. Benin City: NAEAP.

Jaiyeoba, A.O. and Atanda, A.I. (2005). Community participation in the provision of facilities in secondary schools in Nigeria. *Being a paper presented at the Conference of Nigerian Association of Educational Administration and Planning* (NAEAP). University of Ibadan, Ibadan, 29th-31st October.

Katz, L. G. (2008). *Quality in Teaching.* New York Times, Retrieved,June2013from http://www.worldbank.org/fandd/english/pdfs/0398/0110398.pdf

Kpee, G. G. (2006). *Administering UBE in Nigeria: Lessons from the UPE. Administration of universal basic education: The basic facts*.(95-111). Owerri: Springfield.

Maduagwu, S.N. (2006) *Administration of Universal Basic Education*: The Basic Facts. Owerri: Springfield.

Maduewesi, E.J. (2005). Quality of education in 21st century. *Journal on Educational standard in the 21st century in Nigeria*. 1(1), 41-47.

Ndu, A.N., Ocho, L.O. & Okeke, B.S. (1997). *Dynamics of Educational Management*. The Nigerian Perspective. Awka: Meks Press.

Nwafor, S. O. (2006). *The concept of compulsory, free, universal basic education in Nigeria. Administration of universal basic education: The basic facts*. (58-77). Owerri: Springfield.

Obaje, R.I. (2003). *Resource Utilization for Quality Delivery of Secondary Education in Kogi State. Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis, Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt.*

Okeke, B. S. (2001). *Quality Management and National Goal Attainment.* Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt Press.

Okeke, B.S. (2004). *Qualitative Research in Education: Supervisors Perspective.* Port Harcourt: Pam Unique Publishers.

Okeke, B.S. (2007).*Politics of Education*: The Nigerian Experience. Awka: Dome Printing press.

Reiger, D. K. & Stang, B. M. (2000). *Changing our Schools: Linking School effectiveness and School Improvement.* Buckingham: Open University Press.