



Research Article

Spatial Analysis of Resource Mobilization and Utilization for the Implementation of the Universal Basic Education in Kwara State, Nigeria

Martins Olanrewaju Atunde*, Blessing Odunola Oloye**, Abdulganiyu Adebayo Tijani***, Adedapo Adetiba Atolagbe***, Adenike Felicia Oyedele****

Abstract: This study carried out a spatial analysis of resource mobilisation and utilisation for the implementation of the universal basic education programme in Kwara State, Nigeria. To achieve this main objective, the study employed a cross sectional survey research design that was descriptive and exploratory. A sample of 800 respondents consisting of 100 Universal Basic Education Board officials, 200 head teachers and their assistants and 500 teachers were selected through multi-stage sampling technique. Questionnaire entitled “Resource Mobilization and Utilization Questionnaire” (RMUQ) was used to collect data. Data collected were statistically treated with mean, standard deviation and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The main finding of the study revealed that, the extent to which resources (financial, personnel, physical and material) were mobilized for the implementation of UBE programme in Kwara State was low ($GM = 2.47$), while the extent to which these resources were utilized was moderate ($GM = 2.54$). Analysis further indicated that there was significant disparity in how resources were mobilized ($F\text{-cal} = 14.67$) and utilized ($F\text{-cal} = 25.32$) based on senatorial districts (Kwara Central, Kwara North and Kwara South) basic schools were located. Therefore, the State Universal Basic Education Board should ensure even distribution of resources among UBE schools across the State by introducing geographical spread in the mobilization of resources, as this will help in reducing the problem of over concentration, underutilization and overutilization of resource in schools located in a particular senatorial district of the State.

Keywords: Resources, Mobilization, Utilization, Universal Basic Education Programme.

*Martins Olanrewaju Atunde is a Research Manager in the Department of Research, Innovation and Development, Brightlight Research Centre, Ilorin, Nigeria;

** Blessing Odunola Oloye is an Education Officer at National Examinations Council, Kwara State Office, Ilorin, Nigeria; ***Abdulganiyu Adebayo Tijani, Adedapo Adetiba Atolagbe are lecturers from the Department of Educational Management, University of Ilorin, Nigeria;

*** Adenike Felicia Oyedele is a lecturer from the Department of Business Education, Kwara State College of Education Ilorin, Nigeria. The authors can be reached at: [atundemartins@gmail.com]

Introduction

Basic education encompasses a wide range of non-formal and informal public and private activities meant to satisfy the basic learning needs of people of all ages and serves as the foundation for lifelong learning. According to Oboegbulem and Onwurah (2014), the overall objective of basic education is to assist people deal with issues such as unemployment, prejudice, rage, and low self-worth. The Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) established this as its guiding principle when it introduced a number of comprehensive basic education programmes, including the Universal Primary Education (UPE) in the Western and Eastern Regions in 1955 and 1957, respectively, and the Universal Free Primary Education in 1976. These programmes, which were well-received throughout Nigeria, were abandoned midway because resources were not easily accessible and properly mobilized, while materials for their success were no longer arriving and, most importantly, because personnel resources were not taken into account in their management, which led to their failure (Babalola, 2017). In 1999, the Universal Basic Education (U.B.E.) Programme was introduced in Sokoto by the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) under President Olusegun Obasanjo in accordance with the 1990 Declaration of the World Conference on Education for All (WCEFA) and the World Summit for Children (WSC), to improve upon past basic education programmes.

This UBE programme, which aimed to eradicate illiteracy, ignorance, and poverty, was designed to include adult and non-formal education as well as formal education up to the age of 15, as well as education for the physically challenged, street children, out-of-school youth, hawkers, and adults with special needs in Nigerian society (Medupin, Atunde, Etejere, Njoku, Johnson, Oladejo, Mustapha, Jesuwaye & Bello, 2021). The UBE Programme is a 10-year, universally free, and required educational programme. This is divided into three phases: one year of pre-primary education, sometimes known as Early Childhood Development Education (ECCDE), six years of Primary Education, and three years of Junior Secondary Education (JSE). According to the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC, 2006), completing elementary school does not give a child the required life skills to become independent, making the 10-year continuous basic education important.

In more detail, the following general goals of the UBE Programme are listed in the implementation guideline:

Developing in the entire citizenry, a strong conscientiousness for education and a strong commitment to its vigorous promotion; Provision of free Universal Basic Education for every Nigerian child of school going age; Reducing drastically the incidence of drop out from the formal school system; Catering for young persons, their schooling as well as other out of school children or adolescent through appropriate form of complementary approaches to the provision of UBE; and

Ensuring the acquisition of appropriate levels of literacy, numeracy, manipulative communicative and life skills as well as the ethical, moral and civil values needed for laying a solid foundation for the lifelong living (Federal Republic of Nigeria - FRN, 2000, p.31).

The effective execution and actualization of the defined objectives to a considerable extent can be attributed to many elements, some of which may include the mobilization and efficient use of educational resources (Brenyah, 2018; Babalola, 2017; Adokiye, 2015; Achamkulangare, 2014). In this context, educational resources refer to the various financial, human, physical, and material resources required to realize the goals of the UBE programme in Nigeria, and specifically Kwara state. The term "financial resources" refers to the monetary contributions made to and spent on the educational system. These include monetary support for education provided by government subsidies, PTA dues, charitable donations, and internally generated revenues (IGRs). The workers, both academic and non-academic, who are in charge of implementing successful teaching and learning in secondary schools are referred to as personnel resources. Physical resources are facilities and structures that physically and spatially support teaching and learning. This covers the physical infrastructure of the school, such as the classrooms, school halls, office building, libraries, labs, workshops, assembly halls, and special facilities like the sickbay. The equipment and teaching materials used to assist the provision of high-quality education are referred to as material resources (Atunde, Abdulraheem, Abdussalam, Medupin & Adewara, 2022).

However, it is the responsibility of the government through its implementing organizations at the federal, state, and municipal levels to mobilize these resources for the UBE programme as outlined in the National Policy on Education. According to FRN (2013), these organizations are the Local Government Education Authority (LGEA) at the local level, the State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB) at the state level, and the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC) at the federal level. This suggests that the three branches of government share responsibilities for raising funds for the UBE programme. The government is specifically expected to: sufficiently support UBE programmes; hire and regularly train quality staff; provide sufficient teaching materials or resources for efficient teaching and learning; and invest in physical infrastructure and cutting-edge technologies for the delivery of qualitative and quality basic education programmes. In this regard, the Federal Government of Nigeria, in accordance with section 11 of the UBE law, among other things, made the following provisions on August 24, 2004: (1) The implementation of the Universal Basic Education shall be financed from: Federal Government block grant of not less than 2% of its consolidated revenue fund, funds or contributions in form of Federal guaranteed credits,

and local and international donor grants; and (2) In order for a state to be eligible for a block grant from the federal government under subsection (1) of this section, that state must agree to spending at least 50% of the project's total cost (UBEC, 2011; FRN, 2008). Explicitly, it was stipulated in the acts that, the federal and state governments each contribute an equal amount toward the UBE matching grants, which total 70% of the 2% in consolidated revenue. The matching grant is to be used in the programme's implementation as follows: 5% is spent on Early Child Care Development Education (ECCDE), 60% is spent on primary schooling, and 35% is spent on junior high schooling. The provision of infrastructural facilities, instructional materials, teacher training and retraining, among other things, are to be covered by the 70% of the aforementioned funds (UBEC, 2013). The statute also stipulated that the state Universal Basic Education Board would be responsible for handling money administration and distribution (FRN, 2008).

All the above-mentioned laws were domesticated at the State level especially by the Kwara State Government in the implementation of the UBE programme. However, the current issue is not about the domestication of the UBE acts but whether implementing organizations at the State level (SUBEB) have effectively mobilized educational resources for the effective implementation of the UBE programme in Kwara State and throughout Nigeria. Evidence from UBEC's annual report in 2013 showed that the FGN-UBE intervention funds were wisely used to reform education in the field of school infrastructure development. The report also noted that the SUBEBs in the 36 states and the FCT have received significant funding from the government for both capital expenditures for the construction of buildings and the purchase of equipment and recurrent expenditures for the payment of salaries and other expenses. In particular, the reports revealed that UBE marching grants statutory allocations to the 36 states and FCT from 2005 to 2013 was ₦ 200,392,601,491.67k, and out of this figure ₦ 159,734,113,067.03k has been accessed by the 36 states and FCT, while the sum of ₦ 1,312,500.00k was spent on the development of the new 9-year basic education curriculum in 2007. The Kwara State SUBEB accessed a total of ₦ 4,301,175,672.00 between 2005 and 2013 from the FGN/UBE intervention funds, according to another report of a similar nature published in 2014 (Kulu, 2014). The state government is making sure that qualified teachers are hired while maintaining an efficient monitoring mechanism to ensure that the programme is successfully implemented in the State. According to Atunde et al. (2021), who provided evidence to support this claim, Kwara State Government is prepared to enhance the educational content of its school curriculum in terms of both quantity and quality. This has been accomplished through the hiring of qualified teachers, the provision of learning resources like textbooks, classrooms, desks, and chairs, as well as the renovation of

deteriorating school buildings throughout the state. Furthermore, it is significant to note that, as the demand for education at the basic education level grew, so did the responsibility for mobilizing resources for the UBE programme, which gradually shifted from the government to self-help projects through the use of PTAs and CBOs (Parent-Teacher Associations) and community-based organizations (CBOs). The self-help projects of the UBE programme were created, according to UBEC (2013), as a method to incorporate participation from the community and the private sector in the delivery of basic education through the conception, implementation, management, and ownership of designated school projects. The self-help approach has shown to be very successful in supplying the necessary facilities and services for the educational setting as well as in energizing popular community support and participation in UBE delivery. The report's strategy, as observed, has established openness and accountability in resource management, prepared the road for community ownership of the UBE programme, and enhanced the possibility for simpler access to quality and equity in UBE delivery (UBEC, 2013).

Despite significant efforts by governments and its implementing organizations to provide basic education schools with necessary educational resources like finances, infrastructural facilities, trained teachers, instructional materials, and others; there appear to be conflicting reports as to the availability, sufficiency or quality and utilization of these resources for the effective implementation of the programme at all levels. According to Ikoya and Onoyase (2016), Abutu (2015), and Gyang (2015), some UBE schools, particularly those in rural areas, lack infrastructure amenities and educational materials. This is because some schools are improvised buildings that more closely resemble farm sheds. The few teachers that were deployed there find the facilities there to be less than promising. According to a report from the United Nations Scientific Educational and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2015), although improvements have been made in the delivery of basic education, much work still needs to be done in terms of quantity and quality because few stakeholders participate in funding middle and upper basic education, the teacher-to-student ratio is high, and the quality of the national school curriculum is undermined by the generally poor quality of teachers who implement it, inadequate and dilapidated state infrastructure, toilets and furniture. In addition, the system of collecting comprehensive, relevant data for planning is weak; and there is a lack of enforcement of the UBE Act 2004 on resource provision (UNESCO, 2015).

Obua (2018) and Anero (2017) further confirmed the fact that the availability of educational resources like funds, books, laboratory equipment, audio-visual materials, among others, has always been hampered by the inadequacy of statistical data, which in and of themselves poses significant obstacles to the successful implementation of the UBE

programme. When they are available, they are insufficient, mismanaged and/or out of date in many schools. This observation was further supported by an interview conducted with Professor Adaramaja Shehu, the Executive Chairman of Kwara State Universal Basic Education Board, in June 2022. In that interview, he stated that over ₦ 1 billion had been diverted between 2011 and 2021, that teacher morale was low, and that they were reluctant to report to work because there were no rewards for their efforts and their salaries were paid piecemeal and in installments. Professor Adaramaja went on to say that most rural UBE schools lacked the personnel and physical resources necessary for effective teaching and learning, while in urban areas, poor learning environments, including crumbling structures, roofs that had been blown off, students who had to sit on the floor for lessons, a dearth of instructional materials, and instructors who had to teach in tree shade, were common. More specifically, enrollment in public elementary schools had drastically decreased, which had created favorable conditions for the growth of private schools in the state. The poor state of the majority of Nigeria's government-run elementary schools, particularly in Kwara State, may have a highly negative impact on the UBE programme since it may make it more difficult to achieve its goals. At this point, the question that needs to be answered is if sufficient financial, human, physical, and material resources have been mobilized for optimal use. And are resources distributed geographically in the best possible way?

These questions were theoretical rationalized by the Resource Mobilization Theory (RMT) also known as the Resource Mobilization Model (RMM). RMT is of the emerging theory in organizational management which originated with the work of New South Wales Department of Education in 2014. According to Seltzer (2014), RMT attempts to explain social movements by viewing individuals as rational actors that are engaged in instrumental actions that use formal organizations to secure resources and foster mobilization. The theory also stresses the ability of a movement's members to acquire resources (physical, fiscal, or materials) and to mobilize people towards accomplishing the organization or community goals (Akbar & Abbas, 2016). However, the main argument of the resource mobilization theory is that, the success of any programme based on social services depends on resources provisions (time, money, skills, facilities etc.) and the ability to use them. This according to the African Capacity Alliance (ACA, 2018) as well as scholars such as Akbar and Abbas (2016), McCarthy and Mayer (2015) and Ulriksen and Katusiimeh (2014) is underpinned on three major components, namely targeted funding, equity loadings and base school allocation. In targeted funding, many schools with resources gap benefits, as funding enables schools to respond to additional resource needs when they arise throughout the school year. In view of this, funds are dedicated to support the provision of needed resources (financial, personnel,

physical and material) for the development of Basic Education schools such as ECCDE, primary education and JSE. Equity loadings refers to beneficiary to all gender and races, including in-school children, out-of-school children, nomadic children, special needs children, the Almajiris and other vulnerable and excluded groups. This is the aim of UBE programme. The base school allocation provides funding for schools based on area of location i.e equality in resources distribution irrespective of school location (senatorial districts/ rural and urban areas). In view of these components, Crossman (2017) stated that, an organization should divide its resources between recruiting new people, maintaining its constituency and directing activity towards its stated goals. Therefore, education stakeholders, from ECCDE to primary and JSE level are to mobilize resources effectively, in order to meet the expanding needs of school and learners. This is because the education sector in most African countries is facing many challenges including inadequate funding, teachers, infrastructure and teaching and learning facilities. Others are low enrolment rate at various levels of education, low transition rate, gender disparity, and out-dated curriculum. Like in Nigeria the achievement in enrolment at the Basic Education level attained so far had triggered the need for even more resources to match the increased enrolments. Hence, this theory is germane to this study, as it explains the need by SUBEB and other stakeholders delivering basic Education to robust-fully mobilize adequate resources for effective use for the implementation of the UBE programme.

To substantiate this theory, numerous research projects and studies have been conducted throughout the years in various States of Nigeria as well as in certain African countries in an effort to find answers to these claims. Notably, studies have been carried out in African nations like Ghana, Uganda, Kenya, and Malawi (Brenyah, 2018; Salifu, Boateng & Kunduzore, 2018), as well as in Nigeria in States like Akwa Ibom (Bolapeju & Aloysius, 2016), Benue (Sule & Oluwole, 2015), Edo (Elechi, 2015; Nwogu & Esobhawan, 2014), Enugu (Abutu, 2015; Olelewe, Nzeadibe & Nzeadibe, 2014; Omeke, Okpalaoka & Ugwuoke, 2016; Ugwoke & Agwara, 2014), Kaduna and Niger (Adamu, 2016), Kogi (Babalola (2017), Kwara (Atunde et al., 2021), Oyo (Leye-Akinlabi & Komolafe, 2023), Rivers (Agi, 2018), and Yobe (Adamu & Adole, 2015). Regardless of these numerous investigations, the majority of the earlier ones had limitations that led to a research gap. The majority of studies were primarily focused on material, physical, or financial variables while ignoring human resources, according to observatory literature patterns on the conceptual growth of prior studies. Outcomes on the mobilization and usage of education resources from prior researches were incoherent, and the conceptual scope of those studies was also poorly examined. While some studies (Abutu, 2015; Adamu, 2016; Agi, 2018; Bolapeju & Aloysius, 2016; Olelewe, Nzeadibe & Nzeadibe, 2014) reported that the problems with inadequate funding as well as

the provision of physical resources and the shortage of qualified teachers remained the main issues affecting management of Universal Basic Education, others (Nakpodia, 2011; Onele & Aja-Okorie, 2013) found that the government, parent teachers association and non-governmental organizations contributed adequate finance towards effective implementation of UBE programme. Likewise, previous studies were limited based on geographical spread of resource mobilization and utilization, as the present study present results of resources mobilization and utilization based on a spatial analysis of senatorial districts in Kwara State. The majority of studies were not done within the boundaries of Kwara State, Nigeria; hence there is also a geographic gap. Given the discussion and identified gap in the literature, it is pertinent to take into consideration a close examination of the spatial psychoanalysis of resource mobilization and utilization for effective implementation of the UBE programme, given that the programme's objectives are similar to those of the unsuccessful UPE programme.

Specifically, the study aims to:

- (i) Ascertain the extent to which financial, personnel, physical and material resources are mobilized for the implementation of UBE programme in Kwara State;
- (ii) Determine the extent to which financial, personnel and material resources are utilized for the effective implementation of UBE programme in Kwara State; and
- (iii) Examine the significant disparity in the mobilization and utilization of financial, personnel, physical and material resources for the effective implementation of UBE programme based on senatorial districts in Kwara State.

In line with the aforementioned objectives, the following research questions were raised to guide the study.

- 1. To what extent are financial, personnel, physical and material resources mobilized for the implementation of UBE programme in Kwara State?
- 2. To what extent are financial, personnel, physical and material resources utilized for the effective implementation of UBE programme in Kwara State?
- 3. Does the mobilization and utilization of financial, personnel, physical and material resources for the effective implementation of UBE programme significantly differ based on senatorial districts in Kwara State?

Methodology

An exploratory and descriptive cross-sectional survey was used as the research design for this study. This design was chosen because it makes it possible to get data from diverse groups of people (UBE programme's stakeholders). As a result, conclusions and generalizations about

the entire population where data are collected are possible. This is consistent with Atunde et al.'s (2021) assertion that the researcher may effectively analyze representative samples, draw conclusions, and make generalizations utilizing the survey approach.

The study was conducted in Kwara State in North-central geo-political zone of Nigeria. Kwara State has 16 Local Government Areas which are divided into three zones including Kwara Central (Asa, Ilorin East, Ilorin South and Ilorin West LGAs), Kwara South (Ekiti, Ifelodun, Irepodun, Isin, Offa, Oke - Ero and Oyun LGAs) and Kwara North (Baruteen, Edu, Kaiama, Moro and Patigi LGAs) respectively. The State have at total of 1,736 public basic schools that are overseen and managed by SUBEB in Kwara State. However, the study's target population is 19,666 participants, who are made up of 17,518 teachers in basic schools (primary and junior secondary) in Kwara State, 206 Universal Basic Education Board executives and staff, and 1,736 school heads (UBEC, 2014). This varied population is anticipated to be knowledgeable about and capable of reporting appropriately on matters pertaining to infrastructure, coordination, and supervision as well as funding, staffing, and infrastructure.

Multi-stage sampling is the method used for the selection of the samples for this investigation. This sampling method was deemed adequate for a study of this scope because it is the method that is most commonly used to study a geographically scattered population and incorporates several steps (Atunde et al., 2021; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2019). Explicitly, 10 LGAs are chosen in Stage 1 using a proportional random sampling technique. These LGAs were chosen in order to guarantee a fairly representative sample of the whole target population. Also, they make up more than fifty percent (50%) of all LGAs in Kwara State. Stage 2 also involves grouping and choosing the study population according to senatorial regions and level of primary and junior secondary education. In each chosen L.G.A, 10 schools were chosen (five elementary schools and five junior secondary schools). With this, a total of 100 basic schools were studied. Stage 3 also includes choosing the study's respondents. Thus, using a random sampling technique, the Universal Basic Education Board officials (100), head teachers and their assistants (200), and teachers (500) were chosen. This totals the number of responders used to 800.

The "Resource Mobilization and Utilization Assessment Questionnaire" (RMUAQ), which was created after a thorough literature search, was the source of the data used. There were three components to the structured questionnaire. The respondents' demographic information was included in Section A. The purpose of Section B, a closed-ended question with 35 items, is to assess the extent to which SUBEB mobilizes its financial, human, physical, and material resources. The 30 items in Section C were used to elicit data about the

amount to which financial, human, physical, and material resources are exploited. Sections B and C of the questionnaire were closed-ended and based on a four-point Likert scale, Strongly Agree (SA) = 4 points, Agree (A) = 3 points, Disagree (D) = 2 points, and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 points. Four experts, including three in Educational Management and one in Measurement and Evaluation, exposed the research instrument to content and face validation. These specialists were asked to assess the instrument's suitability for use, its lack of ambiguity, and the degree to which it accurately measures the variables being studied. The researchers were able to tweak and create the final instruments thanks to the independent suggestions and modifications offered by these specialists. A pilot research including 60 participants, including 20 UBE board members, 20 head teachers, 20 assistant head teachers, and 20 teachers who were not included in the sampling population, was carried out to determine the reliability of the instrument. Their responses were examined using the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) 24.0 version and the Cronbach Alpha Reliability technique. For the questionnaire's parts B and C, the alpha values were 0.85 and 0.81 respectively. The estimated total dependability was 0.83. This outcome demonstrates the instrument's dependability, which makes it suitable for use.

In order to provide the questionnaire to the research participant properly, the researchers adopted a direct delivery strategy. In its place, 800 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents in order to collect data for this research project. On the spot, the instruments were retrieved and this produced a 100.0% retrieval rate. Both descriptive and inferential analyses were performed on the data gathered for this investigation. Descriptive statistics like mean and standard deviation were used for RQs 1 and 2, whereas Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed to assess RQs 3.

Findings

Data for the study were analysed and presented based on the three research questions raised that guided the study. In addition, the results obtained were discussed accordingly.

Table-1: Mean ratings on the extent financial, personnel, physical, resources were mobilized for the implementation of UBE programme across the three senatorial districts in Kwara State.

S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec	
	MOBILIZATION OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES										
1	Government votes adequate fund to UBE programme	3.45	0.61	HE	3.26	0.62	HE	3.31	0.68	HE	HE
2	The fund vote meant for UBE is released as at when due.	2.84	0.71	ME	2.70	0.76	ME	2.78	0.79	ME	ME
3	Schools are allowed to generate money from the Parents Teachers	1.59	0.76	LE	1.71	0.94	LE	1.97	0.78	LE	LE

S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	
	Association (PTA) and development fund										
4	Old students and the local communities are mobilized for the provision of resources.	3.26	0.73	HE	2.88	0.71	ME	3.00	0.72	ME	ME
5	SUBEB attracts the active participation of local and international donors in the funding and provision of resources.	2.38	0.91	LE	1.41	0.99	LE	1.57	0.97	LE	LE
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.88	0.72	ME	2.53	0.80	ME	2.65	0.75	ME	ME (2.68)
MOBILIZATION OF PERSONNEL RESOURCES											
6	SUBEB recruit and retain specialist and quality teachers adequately	3.51	0.62	HE	3.05	0.70	ME	3.14	0.77	ME	ME
7	SUBEB recruit security men and gardeners/caretakers for the school	3.25	0.70	HE	2.60	0.81	ME	2.88	0.50	ME	ME
8	SUBEB provide guidance counsellors to the schools	2.68	0.79	ME	1.65	0.91	LE	2.37	0.98	LE	LE
9	SUBEB provide teachers for special need students in UBE schools.	1.59	0.76	LE	1.35	1.09	LE	1.41	0.95	LE	LE
10	SUBEB employ technical or other professional staff to the school.	1.78	0.82	LE	1.40	0.96	LE	1.46	0.82	LE	LE
11	SUBEB in collaboration with the local communities provide the school with local coaches for training team in soccer, basketball, swimming, athletic.	2.48	0.91	LE	1.59	1.07	LE	2.16	0.93	LE	LE
12	Local craft experts are recruited to teach vocational subjects.	2.37	0.97	LE	1.40	0.95	LE	1.95	0.97	LE	LE
13	SUBEB in collaboration with NTI organize training workshop for teachers regularly.	1.62	0.93	LE	1.31	1.11	LE	1.52	0.96	LE	LE
14	SUBEB encourages teachers to go for higher qualification in local and abroad institutions.	3.31	0.72	HE	3.25	0.60	HE	3.28	0.81	HE	HE
15	SUBEB conduct regular capacity building for teachers and staffs.	2.42	0.91	LE	1.40	0.96	LE	2.19	1.01	LE	LE
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.50	0.81	ME	1.90	0.92	LE	2.24	0.87	LE	LE (2.21)
MOBILIZATION OF PHYSICAL RESOURCES											
16	Expansion and renovation of existing facilities are carried out periodically in UBE schools in Kwara State since 1999	3.07	0.77	ME	2.40	1.03	LE	2.73	0.94	ME	ME
17	New UBE schools and adequate classrooms are	3.28	0.71	HE	2.57	0.74	ME	2.78	0.72	ME	ME

S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	
	been built by SUBEB to cater for pupils enrolment										
18	Functional libraries and computer centre are adequately provided in all UBE schools.	2.89	0.78	ME	2.16	0.93	LE	2.45	0.95	LE	ME
19	Adequate playgrounds are provided in all UBE schools	3.04	0.77	ME	3.27	0.85	LE	3.31	0.81	LE	ME
20	Adequate social amenities like drinkable water, electricity and toilet are provided in all the UBE schools	2.16	0.93	LE	1.78	0.82	LE	2.01	0.80	LE	LE
21	Chairs and tables are adequately provided to cater of students' enrolment	3.07	0.55	ME	2.64	0.73	ME	2.89	0.78	ME	ME
22	SUBEB has built and equipped home economic centers in strategic locations in the State	2.52	0.98	ME	1.92	1.19	LE	2.37	0.97	LE	LE
23	The government through SUBEB has embarked on massive infrastructural development in UBE schools in order to increase access to Basic Education in Kwara State	2.67	0.80	ME	2.47	0.93	LE	2.58	0.83	ME	ME
24	Pedagogical centers are constructed by SUBEB in every UBE schools in the state	1.89	0.79	LE	1.22	1.00	LE	1.32	0.99	LE	LE
25	Maintenance of educational facilities/resources in UBE schools are done at a regular interval	2.29	0.88	LE	1.59	0.95	LE	2.21	0.92	LE	LE
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.69	0.80	ME	2.20	0.92	LE	2.47	0.87	LE	LE (2.45)
MOBILIZATION OF MATERIAL RESOURCES											
26	Textbooks in all subjects are supplied free to pupils in primary schools	3.09	0.66	ME	2.68	0.75	ME	2.84	0.71	ME	ME
27	Teachers are being mobilized to write books that are based on specific curricula	2.38	0.91	LE	2.19	1.01	LE	2.21	0.92	LE	LE
28	Audio media resources like radio, tapes - cassettes and disc records, phonographs and wire recorders are available and adequate in UBE primary schools	2.40	0.97	LE	1.98	1.07	LE	2.11	0.99	LE	LE
29	Visual media resources like graphs, charts, diagrams, maps, photographs, pictures, filmstrips, cartoons, stereographic materials	2.48	0.96	LE	1.92	1.19	LE	2.29	1.20	LE	LE

S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	
	are available and adequate in UBE primary schools										
30	Recreational (audio-visual) resources e.g. TVs, Videos, computer are available and adequate in UBE primary schools	2.35	0.77	LE	2.06	0.65	LE	2.18	0.80	LE	LE
31	Teaching resources such as manilas, dusters, plasticine, chalk are adequately provided by SUBEB	3.50	0.58	HE	3.18	0.49	ME	3.30	0.78	HE	HE
32	Teaching aids and materials in all subjects are supplied by SUBEB adequately	2.37	0.98	LE	2.01	1.04	LE	2.21	0.92	LE	LE
33	Non text materials are being supplied by SUBEB through the National Education Technical Centre	3.31	0.64	HE	3.06	0.84	ME	3.29	0.57	HE	ME
34	The schools libraries are properly equipped with books to cater for the needs of pupils in various subjects.	2.65	0.78	ME	2.12	0.93	LE	2.43	0.95	LE	LE
35	Home science/economics centres are fully equipped with practical resources	2.50	0.98	ME	1.90	1.12	LE	2.36	0.99	LE	LE
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.71	0.82	ME	2.31	0.91	LE	2.52	0.88	ME	ME (2.51)

Key: 3.25-4.00 = High Extent (HE); 2.50-3.24 = Moderate Extent (ME); 1.00-2.49 = Low Extent (LE)

Table 1 shows the overall analysis of the extent to which resources were mobilized to basic education schools across the three senatorial districts for the implementation of UBE programme in Kwara State. This was further summarized in Table 2 as follows:

Table-2: Summary of Resource Mobilization Based on Geographical/Senatorial District

S/N	Sub-scales	Kwara-Central			Kwara-North			Kwara-South		
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.
1	Financial resources	2.88	0.72	ME	2.53	0.80	ME	2.65	0.75	ME
2	Personnel resources	2.50	0.81	ME	1.90	0.92	LE	2.24	0.87	LE
3	Physical resources	2.69	0.80	ME	2.20	0.92	LE	2.47	0.87	LE
4	Material resources	2.71	0.82	ME	2.31	0.91	LE	2.52	0.88	ME
	OVERALL	10.78	3.15		8.94	3.55		9.88	3.37	

Key: S.D = Standard Deviation, Dec. = Decision.

According to the statistics in Table 2, the respondents largely concur that financial resources were to a moderate extent mobilized to basic education schools in Kwara Central (CM = 2.88), Kwara North (CM = 2.53) and Kwara South (CM = 2.65) respectively. Regarding the personnel resources, they were mobilized to moderate extent to basic education schools located in Kwara Central (CM = 2.50), while Kwara North (CM = 1.90) and Kwara South (CM = 2.24) respectively were low extent. Similarly, in the area of physical resources, they were also mobilized to basic education schools in Kwara Central (CM = 2.69) to a moderate extent, while schools located in Kwara North (CM = 2.20) and Kwara South (CM = 2.47) respectively were low extent. For material resources, they were mobilized to moderate extent to basic education schools located in Kwara Central (CM = 2.71) and Kwara South (CM = 2.52), while schools located in Kwara North (CM = 2.31) was low. Furthermore, Table 3 shows the overall grand mean ratings on the extent of resource mobilization for the UBE programme's implementation in Kwara State.

Table-3: Overall Extent of Resource Mobilization

Indicators	Overall Mean	Grand Mean	Remark
Mobilization of financial resources	8.06	2.68	Moderate Extent
Mobilization of personnel resources	6.64	2.21	Low Extent
Mobilization of physical resources	7.36	2.45	Low Extent
Mobilization of material resources	7.54	2.51	Moderate Extent
Overall Mean	29.60	9.85	
Overall Average Grand Mean	7.40	2.46	Low Extent

Key: 3.25-4.00 = High Extent (HE); 2.50-3.24 = Moderate Extent (ME); 1.00-2.49 = Low Extent (LE)

The results in Table 3 show that there was only a modest level of resource (financial, personnel, physical, and material) mobilization for the implementation of the UBE programme in Kwara State, as seen by the overall average grand mean value of 2.46. Explicitly, personnel (GM = 2.21) and physical (GM = 2.45) resources were mobilized to a low extent, while the extents of mobilization of financial (GM = 2.68) and material (GM = 2.51) resources were moderate in basic schools in Kwara State.

Table-4: Mean ratings on the extent financial, personnel, physical and material resources were utilized for the implementation of UBE programme across the three senatorial districts in Kwara State.

senatorial districts in Kwara State.											
S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	
UTILIZATION OF FINANCIAL RESOURCES											
36	Funds provided by UBEC are utilized judiciously by SUBEB for the construction of structures such as classrooms, toilet, staff rooms etc	2.80	0.74	ME	2.68	0.77	ME	2.75	0.80	ME	ME

S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	
37	Funds provided by UBEC are utilized judiciously by SUBEB for the procurement of materials/equipment.	2.75	0.78	ME	2.56	0.89	ME	2.66	0.87	ME	ME
38	UBEC through SUBEB fund the installation and maintenance of technical workshops, Home economics laboratories, science laboratories etc.	2.22	1.05	LE	1.91	0.94	LE	2.13	0.64	LE	LE
39	The government provides fund for the recruitment, development and regular payment of staff salaries, arrears and allowances.	3.20	0.57	ME	3.15	0.58	ME	3.18	0.58	ME	ME
40	SUBEB regularly provides grant for the day-to day running of UBE schools.	2.45	0.99	LE	1.99	0.54	LE	2.15	1.03	LE	LE
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.68	0.74	ME	2.46	0.74	LE	2.57	0.78	ME	ME
UTILIZATION OF PERSONNEL RESOURCES											
41	Teaching personnel-student ratio is 1:35 in each UBE schools	2.34	0.91	LE	2.64	0.71	ME	2.38	0.99	LE	LE
42	Both teaching and non-teaching personnel are deployed based on gap in human resources in each school	2.88	0.50	HE	2.28	1.01	ME	2.60	0.81	ME	ME
43	Subject allocation to teaching personnel is based on qualification, experience and expertise.	3.15	0.81	ME	2.34	0.99	LE	2.68	0.79	ME	ME
44	Position allocated to non-teaching personnel is based on qualification, experience and expertise	2.48	0.91	LE	1.59	1.07	LE	2.16	0.93	LE	LE
45	Periods allocated to teaching personnel are in line the National Minimum Teachers workload.	2.77	0.95	ME	2.62	0.83	ME	2.75	0.77	ME	ME
46	Work time of personnel is in line with minimum standard	2.55	0.82	ME	2.69	0.84	ME	2.62	0.83	ME	ME
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.70	0.82	ME	1.95	0.91	LE	2.53	0.85	LE	LE (2.46)
UTILIZATION OF PHYSICAL RESOURCES											
47	The classrooms are used for teaching and learning	3.71	0.50	HE	3.66	0.57	HE	3.58	0.62	HE	HE
48	The furniture are used	3.75	0.47	HE	3.20	0.50	ME	3.56	0.62	HE	HE

S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	
	for sitting and writing by students										
49	School health facilities are used by students and staff when they are ill.	1.79	0.64	LE	1.75	0.63	LE	1.77	0.64	LE	LE
50	The school library is utilized by both teachers and pupils.	2.62	0.79	ME	2.15	0.98	LE	2.41	0.96	LE	LE
51	The students and staff use the school toilet when needed.	2.31	0.93	LE	1.96	0.99	LE	2.03	0.82	LE	LE
52	The laboratories (science, home economics, agriculture, fine art and language) are utilized.	2.55	0.99	ME	2.00	1.14	LE	2.40	0.98	LE	LE
53	The play field is used for sporting activities.	3.06	0.78	ME	3.29	0.86	HE	3.32	0.83	HE	ME
54	The pedagogical center are utilized to store audio, visual and audio-visual resources	1.96	1.03	LE	1.54	1.01	LE	1.75	1.00	LE	LE
55	All forms of physical resources are judiciously utilized for academic purposes	2.79	0.92	ME	2.65	0.86	ME	2.80	0.79	ME	ME
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.73	0.78	ME	2.47	0.84	LE	2.62	0.81	ME	Moderate Extent
UTILIZATION OF MATERIAL RESOURCES											
56	Audio media resources like radio, tapes - cassettes and disc records, phonographs and wire recorders are utilized in teaching.	2.43	0.98	LE	1.90	1.09	LE	2.06	0.99	LE	LE
57	Visual media resources like graphs, charts, diagrams, maps, photographs, pictures, filmstrips, cartoons, stereographic materials are utilized for instruction.	2.50	0.96	ME	1.99	1.20	LE	2.33	1.15	LE	LE
58	Recreational (audio-visual) resources e.g. TVs, Videos, computer are utilized to demonstrate and motivate learner's interest.	2.32	0.99	LE	2.00	1.00	LE	2.16	0.98	LE	LE
59	The chalk board is used for teaching and writing class note	3.74	0.50	HE	3.59	0.62	HE	3.66	0.56	HE	HE
60	Textbooks are used for teaching and learning.	3.21	0.64	ME	2.87	0.77	ME	2.94	0.73	ME	ME
61	The facilities in the home economics lab are used in teaching/practical	2.54	0.98	ME	1.99	1.13	LE	2.40	0.99	LE	LE

S/N	Items	Kwara Central			Kwara North			Kwara South			Overall Decision
		Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	Mean	SD	Dec.	
	classes.										
62	The library is utilized by students for reading and doing assignment.	2.59	0.86	ME	2.20	0.98	LE	2.47	0.96	LE	LE
63	The library is utilized by teachers for advanced materials for teaching.	2.62	0.79	ME	2.13	0.93	LE	2.44	0.94	LE	LE
64	The computers are used in the school.	2.34	0.77	LE	2.02	1.04	LE	2.19	0.90	LE	LE
65	The school curriculum is utilised for preparing programme of work.	3.29	0.57	HE	3.03	0.91	ME	3.18	0.58	ME	ME
	CLUSTER MEAN	2.76	0.80	ME	2.37	0.97	LE	2.58	0.88	ME	ME (2.57)

Key: 3.25-4.00 = High Extent (HE); 2.50-3.24 = Moderate Extent (ME); 1.00-2.49 = Low Extent (LE)

Table 4 shows the overall analysis of the extent to which resources were utilized across the three senatorial districts for the implementation of UBE programme in Kwara State. This was further summarized in Table 5 as follows:

Table-5: Summary of Resource Utilization Based on Geographical/Senatorial District

S/N	Sub-scales	Kwara-Central			Kwara-North			Kwara-South		
		Mean	S.D	Dec.	Mean	S.D	Dec.	Mean	S.D	Dec.
1	Financial resources	2.68	0.74	ME	2.46	0.74	LE	2.57	0.78	ME
2	Personnel resources	2.70	0.82	ME	1.95	0.91	LE	2.53	0.85	LE
3	Physical resources	2.73	0.78	ME	2.47	0.84	LE	2.62	0.81	ME
4	Material resources	2.76	0.80	ME	2.37	0.97	LE	2.58	0.88	ME
	OVERALL	10.87	3.14		9.25	3.46		10.30	3.32	

Key: SD = Standard Deviation, Dec. = Decision.

Result displayed in Table 5 reveals that financial resources were moderately utilized in basic education schools in Kwara Central (CM = 2.68), and Kwara South (CM = 2.57) respectively, while that of Kwara North (CM = 2.46) was low. Regarding the personnel resources, they were utilized to moderate extent in basic education schools located in Kwara Central (CM = 2.70), and Kwara South (CM = 2.53) respectively, while in Kwara North (CM = 1.95) personnel resources was utilized to a low extent. Similarly, in the area of physical resources, they were also utilized in basic education schools located in Kwara Central (CM = 2.73) and Kwara South (CM = 2.62) to a moderate extent, while schools located in Kwara North (CM = 2.47) were low extent. For material resources, they were utilized to moderate extent in basic education schools located in Kwara Central (CM = 2.76) and Kwara South (CM = 2.58), while schools located in Kwara North (CM = 2.37) was low. Additionally, Table 6 showed

the total grand mean scores on the extent resources was utilized to implement the UBE programme in Kwara State.

Table-6: Overall Extent of Resource Utilization

Indicators	Overall Mean	Grand Mean	Remark
Utilization of financial resources	7.71	2.57	Moderate Extent
Utilization of personnel resources	7.18	2.39	Low Extent
Utilization of physical resources	7.82	2.61	Moderate Extent
Utilization of material resources	7.71	2.57	Moderate Extent
Overall Mean	30.42	10.14	
Overall Average Grand Mean	7.61	2.54	Moderate Extent

Key: 3.25-4.00 = High Extent (HE); 2.50-3.24 = Moderate Extent (ME); 1.00-2.49 = Low Extent (LE)

In light of the findings in Table 6, the overall average grand mean value of 2.54 suggests that the use of resources (financial, personnel, physical, and material) in Kwara State's basic schools for the implementation of the UBE programme was only moderate. Specifically, personnel (GM = 2.58) resources was utilized to a low extent, while those of physical (GM = 2.61), financial (GM = 2.57) and material (GM = 2.57) resources were moderately utilized in basic schools in Kwara State.

Inferential results from Table 7 illustrate the differentials in the mobilization and utilization of resources for the implementation of the UBE programme based on senatorial districts in Kwara State. Analysis of Variance results of resource mobilization indicate statistically significant differences ($F\text{-cal} = 14.67, p = 0.001$) based on senatorial location of basic schools in Kwara State. The results in Table 7 also revealed that utilization of resources among basic schools within Kwara-central ($M = 10.87, SD = 3.14$) were higher than those in Kwara South ($M = 10.30, SD = 3.32$) and Kwara North ($M = 9.25, SD = 3.46$), indicating a significant disparity (overall $F\text{-cal} = 25.32, p = .001$).

Table-7: Statistical Synopsis of Differentials in Resource Mobilization and Utilization

ANOVA summary showing the differentials on the extent of resource mobilization for effective implementation of UBE programme based on senatorial districts					
SENATORIAL DISTRICTS	Mean	Std Deviation	F-cal.	Sig.	Remarks
Kwara-Central	10.78	3.15	14.67	.001**	There is significant difference in resource mobilization among the three senatorial districts ($p<.01$).
Kwara-North	8.94	3.55			
Kwara-South	9.88	3.37			

ANOVA summary showing the differentials on the extent of resource utilization for effective implementation of UBE programme based on senatorial districts					
SENATORIAL DISTRICTS	Mean	Std Deviation	F-cal.	Sig.	Remarks
Kwara-Central	10.87	3.14	25.32	.001**	The three senatorial districts: 'Kwara-central', 'Kwara-north' and 'Kwara-south' statistically differs ($p < .01$).
Kwara-North	9.25	3.46			
Kwara-South	10.30	3.32			

* Degrees of freedom = 2 and 779

*F-tab = 3.00

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Discussion

The first study question's revealed that Kwara State has a low level of resource mobilization (grand mean value of 2.47), making it difficult to implement the UBE programme. This result is consistent with those of other Nigerian research carried out in the states of Kogi, Akwa-Ibom, Enugu, Delta, and Bayelsa (Babalola, 2017; Bolapeju & Aloysius, 2016; Abutu, 2015; Nakpodia, 2011; Ado, Akinbobola & Inyang, 2010). These researches in several capacities showed that there is a severe lack of resources for the proper implementation of the UBE programme, including infrastructural facilities, instructional materials/facilities, educated and quality teachers, and funding. The results of this study, as well as those of previous studies, are highly disturbing and worrying, especially in light of government (federal and state) announcements of significant investments and financial support for the UBE programme. According to Akinyemi (2022) and Obua (2018), this may be due to overt corruption, money being diverted to pointless projects or into the pockets of a few people, as well as a lack of transparency and accountability. In light of this, Atunde et al. (2021) argues that educational programmes like UBE cannot achieve the stated goals and objectives unless the funds intended for the programme are used appropriately.

Accordingly, findings from the second research question indicated that, Kwara State utilized resources to a moderate extent (overall average grand mean value of 2.54) in the implementation of the UBE programme. The findings in Tables 3 provide an explanation for this conclusion, as financial (GM = 2.57), physical (GM = 2.61), and material (GM = 2.57) resources were moderately utilized. Although the level to which these resources were mobilized and in short supply in most schools might be responsible for this conclusion, the circumstance might also result in overuse and resource waste, both of which would be unproductive in the long run. This is why resources and facilities start to deteriorate as soon as

they are made available and are overused (Awuor, 2015; Amuche & Kukwi, 2013). Contrasting this assertion, research findings (Bolapeju & Aloysius, 2016; Abutu, 2015; Adamu & Adole, 2015; Elechi, 2015) showed that educational resources in Nigerian schools are woefully insufficient, and the few ones that have been mobilized are being over- or under-utilized because of the heavy demands placed on them and a lack of technical knowledge regarding the use of some of these facilities. Similarly, those resources have been deployed. Similarly, if those resources were mobilized but not used, effective teaching and learning would be non-functional. This is in line with Usman's (2016) findings that the majority of junior secondary schools in Nigeria do not provide their students with the knowledge and abilities needed for the advancement of economic, scientific, and technological fields. This is because the teachers and instructors did not expose the students to the necessary resources due to their unavailability and underuse.

Further discovery from the third RQ revealed that the senatorial districts (Kwara Central, Kwara North, and Kwara North) where the schools were located significantly affected the resources mobilized to them ($F = 14.67$). Therefore, it can be said with certainty that UBE schools in the Kwara Central senatorial district were more heavily mobilized in terms of resources (financial, personnel, physical, and material) than those in the Kwara South and Kwara North. Particularly, Kwara North UBE schools had the lowest level of resource mobilization. This result confirms Bolapeju and Aloysius' (2016) observation that geographical location has a substantial impact on the accessibility and sufficiency of educational materials for the UBE programme's implementation. When compared to resources in urban schools, resources for teaching and learning in rural schools are less accessible and adequate. The findings of the present study and those of Bolapeju and Aloysius (2016) may be explained by the fact that some schools are located within the geographical dispensations of rural and urban areas with urban schools having higher student enrollment and populations than those in rural locations. This is confirmed by the study because the State capital, Ilorin, is located in the Kwara Central senatorial district. Since there are more pupils and a larger population in the Ilorin metropolis where many of the UBE schools in this area are located, more resources are directed there. This, however, comes at the expense of other geopolitical regions of the state, who also require resources to address the growing population outflow caused by the UBE programme's free primary education policy.

Lastly, it was discovered that, according to the senatorial districts (Kwara Central, Kwara North, and Kwara North) where the basic schools were located, there were substantial differences in how resources were utilized for the implementation of the UBE programme in Kwara State ($F = 25.32$). This indicates that compared to UBE schools in Kwara South and

Kwara North, those based in Kwara Central senatorial area made better use of resources. Additionally, UBE schools in the Kwara South senatorial constituency used resources more efficiently than those in the Kwara North area. This data suggests that the higher level of resource use in UBE schools in the Kwara Central senatorial district will put more strain on the few resources that have been mobilized, leading to overutilization. On the other side, the lesser level of resource usage among UBE schools situated in Kwara South and Kwara North senatorial districts, respectively, has the implication that it will result in the non- or underutilization of resources.

Conclusion and Recommendations

It is impossible to separate the mobilization and use of educational resources from the quality of education provided to pupils. The study demonstrates that, despite the low level of resource (financial, personnel, physical, and material) mobilization for the UBE programme's implementation in Kwara State, the distribution of those resources is more concentrated in one senatorial district (Kwara Central) than in the other two (Kwara South and Kwara North). Similar to this, though the usage of these resources for the proper implementation of the UBE programme in Kwara State is modest, its utilization level is higher in one senatorial district (Kwara Central) than the other. This finding makes it clear that SUBEB must mobilize resources (financial, personnel, physical, and material) to their fullest potential if it is to prevent catastrophic effects on the entire basic education system. Additionally, because resources are seen as tools for implementing the UBE programme, they must be used to their fullest potential so that Basic Schools can accommodate the current school enrollment and population expulsion while also providing quality and qualitative education for all children. Therefore, in order for the UBE to accomplish its stated goals, the SUBEB should ensure that resources are distributed equally among UBE schools throughout Kwara State by implementing a geographical spread in the mobilization of resources. Doing so will help to mitigate the issue of resource overconcentration, underutilization, and overutilization in schools that are situated in a given senatorial district of the State.

References

- Abutu, J.D. (2015). *Evaluation of the implementation of UBE programme in primary schools in Nsukka education zone of Enugu State* [Unpublished M.Ed Thesis]. University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Nigeria.
- Achamkulangare, G. (2014). *An analysis of the resource mobilization function within the United Nations system*. Geneva: United Nations

- Adamu, S.G. (2016). *Assessment of the management of universal basic education in selected local government areas of Kaduna and Niger States* [Ph.D Thesis]. Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria.
- Adamu H.D. & Adole, R.A. (2015). Challenges of the implementation of the universal basic education programme in Yobe state, Nigeria and the prospects for 2015 and beyond. *Global Journal of Politics and Law Research*, 3 (3), 72-95.
- Ado, I. B., Akinbobola, A.O. & Inyang, G.B. (2010). Status of human resources: Implications for the implementation of upper basic of the universal basic education (UBE) programme in Bayelsa State of Nigeria. *Bulgarian Journal of Science and Education Policy (BJSEP)*, 4 (2), 169 – 184.
- Adokiye A. O. (2015). Human resources development (HRD) and the universal basic education (UBE) in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4 (5), 19 – 26.
- Africa Capacity Alliance (2018) Resource mobilization course for AIDSPAN watchdogs curriculum. Independent Observer of the Global Fund.
- Akbar, G. & Abbas, H. (2016). The role of resource mobilization theory in social movement. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 3 (6), 1 – 5.
- Akinyemi, D. (2022, June 15). How Kwara is changing the face of basic education – Adaramaja, SUBEB boss. Vanguard Media Limited. Retrieved 24th April 2024 from <https://www.vanguardngr.com/2022/06/how-kwara-is-changing-the-face-of-basic-education-adaramaja-subeb-boss/>
- Agi, U.K. (2018). Effective implementation of universal basic education in Rivers State: Role and utilization of physical resources. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 11(1), 127-136.
- Amuche, C.I., & Kukwi, I.J. (2013). An assessment of stakeholders' perception of the implementation of universal basic education in North-Central Senatorial district of Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4 (3), 158 – 167.
- Anero, N. (2017). Implementation of funding and teacher recruitment policies as correlates of quality primary education in Rivers State, Nigeria. *Human Resource Management Research*, 7(2): 75-82
- Asia Pacific Fundraisers' Network (2013). Resource mobilization guidebook Volume 1: Policies and Guidelines. Asia Pacific Fundraisers' Network.
- Atunde, M.O., Abdulraheem, J.W., Abdussalam, T.A.B., Medupin, J.A. & Adewara, J.O. (2022). Resource development and library effectiveness in Kwara State public secondary schools: A school-community synergism. *WE: A Multidisciplinary and Multilingual Peer-Reviewed Research Journal*, 3 (1), 15 - 32.
- Awuor, J.O. (2015). *Financial resource mobilization strategies and internal efficiency of public secondary schools in Rachuonyo South Sub-County, Homabay County, Kenya*. [PhD Thesis]. University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Babalola, G. O. (2017). *Impact of the universal basic education (UBE) programme in the development of primary education in Yagba West Local Government Area of Kogi State* [Unpublished M.Ed Thesis]. National Open University of Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria.
- Bolapeju, M. A. & Aloysius, N. (2016). Resources availability and implementation of universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme in Ikot Abasi education zone of Akwa Ibom State. *Sky Journal of Educational Research*, 4(6), 053 - 059. Available online <http://www.skyjournals.org/SJER>

- Brenyah, J.K. (2018). Implementation of social protection interventions in Africa: The trend in the outcomes of free basic education in Ghana, Malawi, Kenya and Uganda. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 6(12):2822-2833. DOI: 10.13189/ujer.2018.061216
- Crossman, A. (2017). Resource mobilization theory. Retrieved on 24th November, 2018 from, <https://www.thoughtco.com/resource-mobilization-theory-3026523>
- Elechi, C.N. (2015). Personnel crisis in the implementation of universal basic education (UBE) Programme: The role of science technology engineering and mathematics (STEM) Educators. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 3 (8), 293 – 302.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2013). *National policy on education (6th Edn.)*. Lagos: NERDC.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2008). *Universal basic education programme: A flagship programme of the federal government of Nigeria*. Abuja: Universal Basic Education Commission.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2000). *Implementation guidelines for universal basic education programme*. Abuja: Government Press.
- Gyang, T.S. (2015). Improving universal basic education implementation in Nigeria. Workshop Organized by Human Development Initiatives on the Theme: Improving Governance and Accountability in Primary and Junior Secondary Education in Nigeria, Held at Grand Ibro Hotel II, Sokode Crescent, Wuse Zone 5, Abuja on the 19th to 21st May, 2015.
- Ikoya, P.O. & Onoyase, D. (2016). Universal basic education in Nigeria: availability of schools' infrastructure for effective programme implementation. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 34 (1). Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/03055690701785228>
- Kulu, I.I. (2014). *An evaluative study of the challenges and prospects of universal basic education in Kwara State* [Unpublished M.Ed Thesis]. National Open University of Nigeria, Abuja, Nigeria.
- McCarthy, J.D. & Mayer N.Z. (2015). The enduring vitality of the resource mobilization theory of social movements. In Jonathan H. Turner (ed.), *Handbook of Sociological Theory*, p. 533-65
- Medupin, J.A, Atunde, M.O, Etejere, P.O., Njoku, I.C., Johnson, B., Oladejo, J.O., Mustapha, A., Jesuwaye, O.D.I., & Bello, K.Y. (2021). Universal basic education intervention programmes and the development of upper basic schools in Kwara State. In Sofoluwe, A.O., Akinsolu, A.O., Ogbudinkpa, I.C., Ogundele, M.O. & Manga, S.D. (eds). *Educational planning and management for national transformation. Book of Reading: A Festschrift in honour of Professor David Olufemi Durosaro*. p. 220 - 235.
- Nakpodia, E. D. (2011). Integrative funding and effective implementation of Universal basic education programme in Central Senatorial District of Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and International Finance*, 3(3), 157-167, Available online at <http://www.academicjournals.org/JEIF>
- Nwogu, U.J. & Esobhawan, B.I. (2014). Teacher quality and quantity: implications for the implementation of universal basic education in Nigeria. *Academic Research International*, 5 (1), 233 – 241.
- Oboegbulem, A. I. & Onwurah, C .U. (2014). *Organization and Management of Education, a Nigerian Perspective*. Nigeria: Great AP Express Publishers Ltd.
- Obua, C.I. (2018). Material resource management for effective implementation of universal basic education in junior secondary schools in Rivers State. *International Journal of Innovative Education Research*, 6(2), 14-18.

- Ogo, U.I, Eneyo, E.O. & Akpan, E.A. (2014). Evaluation of the implementation of Universal Basic Education curriculum modules in primary schools in Nigeria. *The African Symposium*, 14 (12), 30 – 35.
- Ogonor, B.O. (2013). *Educational reformation for National Security*. A Conference Lead Paper Presented at the Institute of Education, Abraka 11-15th June, 2013.
- Olelewe, C.J., Nzeadibe, C. A. & Nzeadibe, C. T. (2014). Availability and utilization of educational resources in selected rural communities of Enugu State: Implications for achieving universal primary education of millennium development goals (MDGs) in Nigeria. *Educational Research International*, 3 (1), 16 – 24.
- Omeke, F.C., Okpalaoka, H.C. & Ugwuoke, S.C. (2016). Utilization of instructional materials for effective implementation of the universal basic education (UBE) programme. *SAUSSUREA*, 6(1), 1-8.
- Onele, A.A. & Aja-Okorie, U. (2013). Integrative funding and effective implementation of universal basic education programme: A need assessment in primary and junior secondary schools of Ebonyi state, Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, 9 (31), 530 – 542.
- Salifu, I., Boateng, J.K. & Kunduzore, S.S. (2018). Achieving free compulsory universal basic education through school feeding programme: Evidence from a deprived rural community in northern Ghana. *Cogent Education*, 5, 1509429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2018.1509429>
- Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2019). *Research methods for business students (8th Edn.)*. London: Pearson.
- Seltzer, J.B. (2014). What is resource mobilization. Health Communication Capacity Collaborative. Management Sciences for Health.
- Sule, M.N. & Oluwole, M.U. (2015). Assessment of the implementation of the universal basic education programme in Benue State of Nigeria. *Report and Opinion*, 7(4), 116 – 123.
- Ugwoke, S. C. & Agwara, C.I. (2014). Management of universal basic education towards national transformation in junior secondary schools in Enugu state. *JORIND*, 12 (2).
- Ulriksen, M.S. & Katusiimeh, M.W. (2014). The history of resource mobilization and social spending in Uganda. UNRISD Working Paper, No. 2014-6, United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD), Geneva
- Universal Basic Education Commission (2014). *2012 Basic Education Profile - National and Regional Statistics*. Abuja: Universal Basic Education Commission.
- Universal Basic Education Commission (2011). *UBEC 2010 annual report*. Abuja: Universal Basic Education Commission. ISBN-10: 978-50391-0-2
- UNESCO (2015). *Pacific education for all: 2015 review*. Paris: UNESCO Apia Office
- Usman, Y.D. (2016). Educational resources: An integral component for effective school administration in Nigeria. *Research on Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6 (13), 27 – 37.