

Influence of Universal Basic Education (UBE) Facilities on School Learning Environment in Lagos State, Nigeria

Adeyemi Muyiwa * A, Quadri

Faculty of Education, Olabisi Onabanjo University, P O Box 2002, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State, Nigeria, Africa.

*E – mail: adeyemiaristotle@yahoo.com. 234-8059906505

Abstract

This study focused on the influence of Universal Basic Education (UBE) facilities on Junior Secondary School (JSS) learning environment in Epe division of Lagos State of Nigeria. To carry out this research work, five hypotheses were raised and tested and the descriptive design was used to provide information on the existing situation regarding the variables of concern in the study. Two hundred teacher respondents were selected using purposive and simple random sampling methods. Data gathered was analysed using descriptive statistics and inferential statistics of t-test. Recommendations were provided based on the findings of the study.

Key Words: Influence, Universal Basic Education, Learning Environment and Academic Achievement.

1. Introduction

The Universal Basic education (UBE) Programme could not have been introduced at a better time than now that the nation is in urgent need of all round national development. The major objective of the UBE programme is to provide free, universal and compulsory basic education for every Nigerian child aged 6 - 15 years. However, for the Universal Basic Education programme to be truly free and universal, efforts must be made to check those factors that are known to have hindered the success of similar programmes in the past.

The UBE programme is an expression of the strong desire of the government of Nigeria to reinforce participatory democracy by raising the level of awareness and general education of the entire citizenry. There have not been records of successful free education programmes in Nigeria. Therefore, for the successful implementation of the UBE programme, all hands should be on deck.

Adequate fund must be put into the programme, the required level of participation needed from the state government, local government and other agencies in terms of funding must be clearly specified. The Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC) therefore, must devise a way of combating these ills; otherwise the hope of Nigeria implementing UBE as an instrument for national development may remain a myth.

The most important investment under the educational enterprise is human development. Investing in people of course means training, and training should be a career-long process. Individual teachers at the school level will need to be empowered to interpret UBE appropriately. The state and local governments will be required to progressively improve on the conditions of teaching and learning in primary and secondary school through teacher quality development programmes. This can be accomplished through training and retraining of teachers to meet the challenges of the UBE. In order to offer every teacher the opportunity of meaningful participation in actualizing the ideals and intents of the Universal Basic Education in Nigeria, in-service training programme therefore should be part of the human development scheme. By investing in people, developing their talents and potentials for the benefit of all employees and employers, a highly motivated and productive workforce is created (Obanyan, 2002 & Adeyemi, 2009)

A review of related literature has revealed that attempt in the past to provide free education (i.e. Universal Primary education, UPE programme) whether at the federal or state levels has never been successful due to poor planning and implementation which eventually affects the quality of classroom provisions,

infrastructural facilities teachers' provisions, instructional materials and the other factors of learning environments. These views were supported by Nwagwu (2000) and Maduewesi (2005) who saw poor planning as one of the problems responsible for the unsuccessful implementation of the UPE programmes. In their own contributions Adamaechi and Romaine (1991) also saw poor planning as one of the problems responsible for the unsuccessful implementation of the former UPE programme. They remarked that the planners of the programme were unable to project accurate number of children that would gain from the scheme and the facilities/manpower required. According to Odo, (2000) the UPE programme also failed because of inadequate funding and poor monitoring of the programme.

Oyekan (2007) posits that the current UBE scheme in Nigeria can be said to be the product of earlier educational scheme, programmes and educational decisions. It is the offshoot of previous scheme, which could be said to have been bedeviled by problems of human, physical and infrastructural facilities, which the current scheme is expected to offset. These problems have their influence on the learning environment (Adeyemi, 2005). This is the area of facilities provision which specifically are blocks of classrooms, furniture and instructional facilities which are chalkboard and bills.

Nwagwu (1976), Obanya (2000) and Adeyemi (2007) reports that to achieve strong educational foundation, the Nigeria primary education system therefore needs adequate facilities such as blocks of classroom, furniture, instructional materials, libraries and other school equipment in order to enhance learning environment. These are expected to be provided for conducive classroom, effective classroom communication climate, conducive teaching-learning atmosphere, etc. To this extent therefore, the current study focuses on the influence of Universal Basic Education (UBE) facilities on school learning environment.

2. Statement of the Problem

Various studies had been conducted on impact evaluation of the effectiveness of the Universal Basic Educational programme and how efficiently allocated resources had been utilized towards ensuring qualitative and quantitative functional basic education in Nigeria (Ojele, 1998; Obanya, 2000; UBEC, 2000; 2001; Adeyemi, 2007). However, there are still areas to be investigated in terms of provision of physical and infrastructural facilities.

In view of this, the current study is designed to review the UBE scheme in order to determine whether or not the provision of available physical and infrastructural facilities has fostered the required learning environment desirable in Epe division of Lagos State.

3. Research Hypotheses

1. Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of classroom control in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.
2. Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of teacher-students classroom interaction in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.
3. Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of students' sitting arrangement in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.
4. Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the students' level of co-operative learning habit in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.
5. Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of students' stimulation to learning in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

4. Research Methods

This research investigated the influence of UBE (Universal Basic Education) on schools' learning environment in Epe Division of Lagos State. This chapter therefore presents the methodology employed for the study; which is research design, population, samples and sampling techniques, research instrument, validity and reliability of the instrument, procedures for data collection and procedures for data analysis.

4.1 Research Design

The descriptive research design of ex-post facto type was used in carrying out this research work as it allows for assessment of certain attributes, properties, characteristics in a situation at one or more point in time. It also permits the researcher to meaningfully describe large number of scores with a small number or indices.

4.2 Population

The population for this study consists of all male and female Junior Secondary School (JSS) teachers in Epe Division of Lagos State.

4.3 Sample and Sampling Technique

There are at present six educational districts in Epe Division of Lagos State. These districts are Agbowo, Eredo, Epe, Ibeju-Lekki, Ejinrin and Riverine. A purposive sampling technique was used to select twenty (20) secondary schools from all the educational districts and a random sampling technique was used to select the two hundred (200) teachers from the twenty junior sampled secondary schools in Epe Division of Lagos State.

4.4 Research Instrument

The main instrument for this research was a structured questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of three sections A, B and C. Section A elicited the demographic information of the respondents such as the sex, age, educational qualification, religion, educational district, and years of working experience. Section B sought information about availability or otherwise of UBE facilities in Epe Divisional Schools. Section C however contained Likert model of 4 scale statements where the respondents are to indicate the level of their agreement or disagreement to the tested hypotheses accordingly.

4.5 Validity of the Instrument

For the face validity, it was ensured that the instrument was made with right formalities and the draft of the instrument was scrutinized by the project supervisor and other experts in the Department. For content validity, it was ensured that all the items pertaining to the cost and financing of senior secondary education based on table of specification.

4.6 Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability is the degree of consistency of an instrument over a period of time. Therefore, the result obtained through the instrument is expected to be constant, even at different occasions. To ascertain the reliability of the research instrument a test-retest method was employed with two week interval. The obtained scores were correlated using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC) coefficient and a coefficient of 0.86 was obtained. Thus, the reliability of the instrument was ascertained.

4.7 Method of Data Collection

The questionnaires were administered personally to the respondents. The researcher was on ground to interpret and guide the respondents. The questionnaires were be collected back immediately after completion in order to ensure a substantial return of the forms.

4.8 Data Analysis

The responses of the respondents were coded and scored. Descriptive statistics of percentages and frequencies were used for the demographic information of the respondents and availability of UBE facilities. However, an inferential statistics of t-test analysis was used to test the research hypotheses, raised in the study.

5. Results

The results of the analysis of data collected on the influence of UBE (Universal Basic Education) on schools' learning environment in Epe Division of Lagos State are presented below. This section discussed inferential statistics of t-test analysis on the influence of UBE facilities on classroom control, teachers-students' classroom interaction, students' sitting arrangement, students' level of co-operative learning habit, and students' stimulation to learning.

Analysis of the Research Hypotheses

Ho1: Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of classroom control in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Table 2: t-test analysis of level of classroom control

Groups	N	X	SD	Df	t-cal	t-tab	P	Decision
Schools with UBE facilities	135	2.473	0.891	199	9.25	1.645	0.05	Ho: Rejected
Schools without UBE facilities	65	1.597	0.499					

$$t\text{-cal} = 9.25, t\text{-tab} = 1.645$$

$$df = 199, 0.05 \text{ level of significance}$$

From the analysis in table 2 above, there is significant mean difference in classroom control between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 2.473, SD = 0.891) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 1.597, SD = 0.499). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 9.25 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance.

Since the calculated value (9.25) is greater than the table value (1.645), the null hypothesis which stated that "There is no significant difference in the level of classroom control in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities", is hereby rejected. Consequently therefore, this means that states provisions of UBE facilities significantly influences the level of classroom control in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Ho2: Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of teacher-students classroom interaction in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Table 3: t-test analysis of the level of teacher-students classroom interactions.

Groups	N	X	SD	df	t-cal	t-tab	P	Decision
Schools with UBE facilities	135	1.962	0.773	199	8.02	1.645	0.05	Ho: Rejected
Schools without UBE facilities	65	0.678	0.578					

$$t\text{-cal} = 8.02, t\text{-tab} = 1.645$$

$$df = 199, 0.05 \text{ level of significance}$$

From the analysis in table 3 above, there is significant mean difference in the level of teachers-students classroom interactions between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 1.962, SD = 0.773) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 0.678, SD = 0.578). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 8.02 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance.

Since the calculated value (8.02) is greater than the table value (1.645), the null hypothesis which stated that "There is no significant difference in the level of teacher-students classroom interaction in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities", is hereby rejected. Consequently therefore, this

means that states “provisions of UBE facilities significantly influences the level of teacher–students classroom interaction in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Ho3: Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of students’ sitting arrangement in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Table 4: t-test analysis of students’ sitting arrangement

Groups	N	X	SD	df	t-cal	t-tab	P	Decision
Schools with UBE facilities	135	1.975	0.814	199	12.95	1.645	0.05	Ho: Rejected
Schools without UBE facilities	65	1.204	0.326					

$$t\text{-cal} = 12.95, t\text{-tab} = 1.645$$

$$df = 199, 0.05 \text{ level of significance}$$

From the analysis in table 4 above, there is a significant mean difference in the students’ sitting arrangement between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 1.975, SD = 0.814) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 1.204, SD = 0.326). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 12.95 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance.

Since the calculated value (12.95) is greater than the table value (1.645), the null hypothesis which stated that “There is no significance difference in students’ sitting arrangement in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities”, is hereby rejected. Consequently therefore, this means that states “provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of students’ sitting arrangement in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Ho4: Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the students’ level of co-operative learning habit in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Table 5: t-test analysis of students’ level of cooperative learning habit

Groups	N	X	SD	df	t-cal	t-tab	P	Decision
Schools with UBE facilities	135	2.112	0.743	199	10.77	1.645	0.05	Ho: Rejected
Schools without UBE facilities	6 5	0.678	0.310					

$$t\text{-cal} = 10.77, t\text{-tab} = 1.645$$

$$df = 199, 0.05 \text{ level of significance}$$

From the analysis in table 5 above, there is a significant mean difference in the students’ level of cooperative learning habit between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 2.112, SD = 0.743) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 0.678, SD = 0.310). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 10.77 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance.

Since the calculated value (10.77) is greater than the table value (1.645), the null hypothesis which stated that “There is no significant difference in students’ level of co-operative learning habit in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities”, is hereby rejected. Consequently therefore, this means that states provisions of UBE facilities significantly influences the students’ level of co-operative learning habit in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Ho5: Provisions of UBE facilities would not significantly influence the level of students’ stimulation to learning in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

Table 6: t-test analysis of the level of students’ stimulation to learning.

Groups	N	X	SD	df	t-cal	t-tab	P	Decision
Schools with UBE facilities	135	1.528	0.912	199	22.04	1.645	0.05	Ho:

Schools without UBE facilities	65	0.725	0.677						Rejected
--------------------------------	----	-------	-------	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------

t-cal = 22.04, t-tab = 1.645
 df = 199, 0.05 level of significance

From the analysis in table 6 above, there is a significant mean difference in the level of students' stimulation to learning between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 1.528, SD = 0.912) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 0.725, SD = 0.677). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 10.77 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance.

Since the calculated value (22.04) is greater than the table value (1.645), the null hypothesis which stated that "There is no significant difference in the level of students' stimulation to learning in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities", is hereby rejected. Consequently therefore, this means that states provisions of UBE facilities significantly influences the level of students' stimulation to learning in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities.

6. Discussion of Findings

The study investigated the influence of Universal Basic Education (UBE) facilities on schools' learning environment in Epe Division of Lagos State. From the study it is apparent that with UBE, citizens would have easy access to it and it should be free. UBE is also expected to provide basic education which is expected to be terminal. Such education (UBE) is not meant for school age children alone, it is also designed to take care of the educational needs of young people and adults who have not had the opportunity to receive adequate schooling. Thus the UBE programme will include: nomadic education, education of migrant fishermen, school drop outs, out of school children and adult education. This programme is expected to be a continuation of the UPE programme, which was abandoned in 1976.

The analysis of hypothesis one sought to examine the influence of provisions of UBE facilities on the level of classroom control in schools with UBE facilities and schools without these facilities. The results of the analysis of hypothesis one showed a significant mean difference in classroom control between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 2.473, SD = 0.891) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 1.597, SD = 0.499). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 9.25 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance. This result lent supports for the earlier study by Ogunu (2000) and Maduawesi (2005) who at different studies showed the impact of resources on classroom control. It thus shows that availability of learning facilities would foster efficient classroom control in the school setting.

The results of the Analysis of hypothesis two showed a significant mean difference in the level of teachers-students classroom interactions between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 1.962, SD = 0.0.773) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 0.678, SD = 0.578). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 8.02 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance. It thus confirmed that provisions of UBE facilities significantly influenced the level of teacher-students classroom interaction in schools with UBE facilities than in schools without these facilities. The findings of this study corroborated the opinion of Obayan (2000) who asserted earlier that availability of learning facilities increases the mutual interactions between teachers and students. It is expected that when teachers-students classroom interaction is strengthened, it fosters higher academic achievements among learners.

From the results of the analysis of hypothesis three, it was established that provisions of UBE facilities significantly influenced the level of students' sitting arrangement in schools with UBE facilities than those schools without these facilities. The t-test analysis showed a significant mean difference in the students' sitting arrangement between the schools with UBE facilities (N = 135, X = 1.975, SD = 0.814) and schools without UBE facilities (N = 65, X = 1.204, SD = 0.326). The t-cal value 12.95 was also greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance. It can be deduced that schools with facilities had better sitting arrangement than schools without UBE facilities and the study of Enoch & Okpede (2000) emphasized the influence of sitting arrangement on students' academic performance. Good

sitting arrangement of students ensures ventilation, decorum, hygiene, and academic discipline in the classroom setting.

Hypothesis four tested the significant influence of provisions of UBE facilities on students' level of cooperative learning habit. The t-test analysis revealed a significant mean difference in the students' level of cooperative learning habit between the schools with UBE facilities ($N = 135$, $X = 2.112$, $SD = 0.743$) and schools without UBE facilities ($N = 65$, $X = 0.678$, $SD = 0.310$). The t-test analysis also revealed that the t-cal value 10.77 is greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance.

The results of the analysis of hypothesis five also showed a significant mean difference in the level of students' stimulation to learning between the schools with UBE facilities ($N = 135$, $X = 1.528$, $SD = 0.912$) and schools without UBE facilities ($N = 65$, $X = 0.725$, $SD = 0.677$). The t-cal value 10.77 was greater than the t-tab value of 1.645 at 0.05 level of significance, and this confirmed that provisions of UBE facilities significantly influenced the level of students' stimulation to learning in schools with UBE facilities than in schools without these facilities. This result supported the findings of Ezeocha (1990), Odo (2000) and Obayan (2000) who in separate studies established that availability of learning facilities enhances students' stimulation to learning in schools.

7. Conclusions

The results of this finding corroborated the findings of Oni (1995) who opined that educational facilities – human, financial, material or physical and educational centers constitute strategic factor in the functioning of the educational system. Universal Basic Education (UBE) facilities include those that have been described by Aghenta (2000) as those teaching materials; some real, some graphics, not solely dependent upon words as a predominant source of meaning for the observer. Such materials according to him include field and classroom study of real things, objects, demonstrations, dramatization models, workings, television programme, motion pictures, maps, lantern slides, transparencies for the overhead study prints and other illustrations (opaque projectors) cartoons, posters, globe, graphs and charts.

This study confirmed the findings of Edling and Paulson (2001) which asserted that facilities enable students to acquire knowledge, skill, attitude, which include graphics, photographic electronics such as tapes or mechanical means of arresting, processing and reconstituting visual and verbal information. The purpose of instruction is to enable each students develop their potentials to the fullest, if given the right type of knowledge, skills and attitudes to function effectively within their complex and dynamic society.

8. Recommendations

While rounding up on this research work, and considering results of the analysis of the data, the following recommendations are made: -

1. Owing to the influence of the availability of UBE facilities on schools' learning environment, more facilities should be provided by the government and Universal Basic Education Board.
2. School administrators and principals should jealousy guard and protect the UBE facilities in the schools in order to ensure its durability.
3. Teachers and instructors should make proper and effective use of these facilities to enhance learning among students.
4. Where these facilities are not available, community, parents, NGOs, philanthropists, and alumni associations should complement government's efforts in the provisions of these learning facilities.
5. UBE facilities should be extended to those schools that are yet to have these UBE facilities, so that the impact of these facilities would go round and thereby enhance overall educational accomplishments in Nigeria.

9. References

- Adewole, A. (2003). *Universal Basic Education: Aspects of meaning and purpose*. Proceeding of the 15th Annual Congress of the Nigerian Academy of Education. University of Benin 6th - 9th November
- Adeyemi, O. (2006). Entrepreneurial spirit. *Nigeria Business Times*, Tuesday September 19th Pages 16-22
- Anyabolu. C. (2000). Basic Education for Productivity and Enhanced National Economy. *Journal of Vocational and Adult Education*. 2. Nnamdi Azikiwe University, (UNIZIK), Awka, Nigeria.
- Awoniyi, O. (1988) An Ideal theory of values, *Journal of Values Education*, 15(2)
- Cox, C. (1996). "Schools in the Developing Countries: Education Forum Vol. 1, (2).
- Enoch E. and Okpede, E. (2000). *The Meaning, History, Philosophy and Lesson of UBE* Proceedings of the 15th Annual Congress of the Nigerian Academy of Education. University of Benin 6 - 9th November.
- Ezeocha, P. (1990). *Education Administration and Planning* Nsukka: Optional Computer Solution Publishers, Nigeria.
- Fafunwa, A. (1976). *History of Education in Nigeria*. London: George Alien and Unwin.
- Federal Ministry of Education (2000). *Implementation Guidelines for Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programmes*, Abuja FME.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Policy on Education*. Lagos NERDC Press.
- Idowu, O. (2002). *The Economics of Education: An Introduction*. Ibadan: Shaneson C.I. Limited
- Maduwesi, E. (2005). *Universal Basic Education, Issues, Problems and Prospects*. Benin City: Dasylya Influence Enterprises.
- Nwagwu, N. (2002). *From UPE to UBE: Some Basic Planning Considerations for Effectiveness*. Lead paper presented at a conference organized by the National Institute of Educational Planning and Administration, Ondo. May 30-31.
- Obayan P. (2000). *National Press Briefing on the Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme* Lagos.
- Obayan, P. (2000). *Education and the Nigerian Society Revised the UBE as a People's Oriented Programme* being the 2000 Prof. J. A. Majasan first Anniversary Memorial Lecture Ibadan.
- Odo, C. (2000): *Towards Enhancing the Success of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) Scheme*: The School Administrators' Role. Proceedings of the 15th Annual Congress of the Nigerian Academy of Education, University of Benin 6 - 9th Nov., 2000
- Ogunu, M. (2000), *Strategies for Effective Supervision of Instruction in UBE Programme in Nigeria*. Proceedings of the 15th Annual Congress of the Nigeria Academy of Education, University of Benin.
- Ohuche, R. and Ali, A. (1989): *Development of Primary School Teacher Education in Nigeria*. Onitsha: Summer Publisher Ltd.

Ojele, O. (1998); *Quality and Stress in Nigerian education*. Nigeria: Zaria :Publishing Company.

Okoh, E. (2000) An Appraisal of Vocational and Technical Education Programmes at the Primary School Level in Nigeria. *African Journal of Education* 5, (2) 27 - 39.

Okoh, S. (2002) *High Level Education, Manpower Development and Training*. A key to sustainable Economic growth and Development. Inaugural Lecture Series 63, University of Benin.

Olaitan, S. (1996) *Vocational and Technical Education in Nigeria. (Issues and Analysis)*. Onitsha: Noble Graphic.

Oyekan, A. (2007). *Educational Resources for Effectiveness*. Ibadan: Aromolaran Publishers.

Salami, L. and Uko-Aviomoh, E. (2000): *Using the UBE to Bridge the Gender gap in Educational Opportunities and Participation*. Proceeding of the 15th Annual Conference of the Nigerian Academy of Education. University of Benin. 6 - 9th Nov., 2000.

Ukeje B. (1995): *Teacher Educational for National Development*. A key note address presented at National Conference on Teacher Education, Organized by NCCE Kaduna.

Ukeje, K. (1995). An Investigation into the Relationship Between Teacher Motivation and Learners' Motivation. *Educational Psychology*, 20 (1), 45-57.

UNESCO (1969), *Educational Development in Africa, "Costing and Financing"* Paris.

Walberg, P., and Thomas, O. (1999). *The Oxfam Education Report*. Bath, UK: Redwood Books.

First Author

DR. MUYIWA ADEYEMI (ARISTOTLE) is an erudite academic with high capacity for creative thinking and research endeavors. As a very young scholar, he has been engaged in teaching, research and community service at the tertiary level of education for well over a decade. He holds a Doctoral and Master Degrees in Educational Management with specialization in Human Resource Management and Psychology, Bachelor of Arts Degree in Counseling Psychology, Certificate in Law and a Postgraduate Diploma in Theology. His experience as a University lecturer has culminated into keen interest in the study of the implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) in all ramifications of the scheme, including the production of the book – *Universal Basic Education (UBE) - Implications of Facilities Provision on Primary Education in Nigeria* and the first ever *Nigerian Education Report* with several other nation and international researched works around the world. Adeyemi currently teaches at the Olabisi Onabanjo University on a full time basis, Lagos State University and Tai Solarin University of Education as an Associate Lecturer. He's the Assistant Coordinator of Leadership Advocacy Concept (LAC), Africa and the Coordinator of Life-Line Consultancy International. Adeyemi is a consultant on Human Resource Management (HRM).

Second Author

Quadri, A (Mrs) holds a Master Degree in Educational Management from the Olabisi Onabanjo University in Nigeria. Her interest in studying issues relating to the Universal Basic Education (UBE) became realizable as a result of the supervision of her Master research work under Dr Muyiwa Adeyemi. She currently teaches in one of Nigeria's Secondary schools in Ogun State

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:**

<http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a fast manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

