

Evaluation of the Objectives of the Universal Basic Education Programme in Rivers State

Nwigor, Justice Da-ue & Dr. E. I Obilor

Department of Educational Foundation
Rivers State University,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria

Abstract

The study evaluated the objectives of the Universal Basic Education programme in Rivers State. Four research questions guided the study and four hypotheses were tested for the study. The study adopted evaluation research design, with a population of 16,182 teaching staff of Universal Basic Education across the 23 local government areas of Rivers State, out of which 7439 are primary schools' teachers and 8743 are junior secondary schools' teachers. A sample of 735 was drawn from the target population with the aid of Fluid Survey Online Sample Size Calculator, and the stratified random sampling technique was employed in selecting the respondents for the study. Two Local Government Areas were chosen from each Senatorial District of the State and four schools (2 primary schools and 2 junior secondary schools) were randomly selected. Checklist was the major instrument used for the study; the instrument was dully validated and it yielded a reliability index of 0.79. The research questions were answered using the mean and standard deviation, while hypotheses were tested using z-test at 0.05 level of significance. The result showed that there was significant difference in the mean response between higher basic and lower basic teachers on pupils/students perception on the importance of education; and that there is a different between the actual and expected outcomes of the UBE programmes. Based on these finding, it was concluded that the UBE objectives be revisited in order to put things right. The study recommended that the UBE programme should be free of payment among other things.

Key Words: Basic, Evaluation, Goal Attainment, Implementation, Installation, Objective, Model, Product, Universal.

Introduction

Evaluation Model

Evaluation can be conducted as formative, summative, or both. Formative evaluation is a way to detect problems and weaknesses in components in order to revise them. In projects with sufficient time and funding, formative assessment is conducted prior to the implementation of the final Programme. In practice, many projects begin with the “best effort” and conduct a formative evaluation with implementation, correcting weaknesses and errors as the project unfolds. While summative evaluation is a process that concerns final evaluation to ask if the project or programme met its goals or not. In both types, instructional programme can be evaluated, but typically, summative evaluation concentrates most than formative evaluation in the final outcomes of a programme.

Summative Evaluation Models

Summative evaluation looks at the impact of an intervention on the target group. This type of evaluation is mostly concerned about the project or programme and the funding bodies. To find out whether the actual outcome is consistent with the expected outcome summative evaluation can take place during a project or programme implementation, but most often undertaken at

the end of a project. As such, summative evaluation can also be referred to as export evaluation (meaning after the event).

Why undertake a summative evaluation. The following are some of the key reasons why one should undertake a summative evaluation.

- Summative evaluation provides a means to find out whether a project has reached its goals/objectives/ outcomes.
- It allows one to quantify the changes attributed to a project so that one can trace how the impact of different projects worked, and make result – based decisions on future spending allocations (taking into consideration unintended consequences).
- And lastly, it allows one to develop a better understanding of the process of change, and to find out what works, and what does not work, and why it does not work. This allows one to gather knowledge about the situation and improve on subsequent future project designs and implementation.

Goal attainment Model or Objectives – Centered Model

This model was developed by Tyler in 1949, in a book titled “Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. In the book he outlined four major structures for delivering and evaluating instruction, which is known as Tyler’s Rationale. These include:

- i) Defining appropriate learning objectives
- ii) Introducing useful learning experiences
- iii) Organizing experiences to maximize their effect
- iv) Evaluating the process base on students’ performance.

Tyler contends that well stated objectives are essential for effective evaluation. These well specified objectives serve as programme standards. Therefore, during evaluation, all that the evaluator need to do is to determine strategies for attaining the set objectives and also to determine the extent to which these strategies are being implemented.

The model focused on the extent to which objectives are realized. It requires that the goals be clearly articulated and expressed in ways that are measurable to the programme outcome. This approach provides a clear and succinct description of the programme and as well delineates a process of measuring the degree to which the objectives are attained. According to Keating (2006), these objectives must have relevancy to the field of study and the overall curriculum. This model obtains the curriculum objectives from three sources.

- i. The student
- ii. The society
- iii. The subject matter

When defining the objectives of a learning experience, Tyler gives emphasis on the input of students, the community and the subject content. He believes that curriculum objectives that do not address the needs and interests of students, the community and the subject matter is not the best.

The second part of the Tyler (1949) evaluation model involves the identification of learning activities that will allow students to meet the defined objectives. Hence, to emphasis the importance of identifying leaving activities that meets the defined objectives, he states that the important thing is for students to discover content that is useful and meaningful to them. From every indications, Tyler is seen as a strong supporter of the student centered approach to learning. The model is designed to measure the degree to which pre-defined objectives and goals have been attained. That is to say that, the model primary focus is on the product rather than the process for achieving the goals and objectives of any curriculum. The Tyler’s model is called decision objective model because, objectives serve as standards in any programme.

Where the outcome of evaluation shows that objectives are being attained, that will lead to a decision by the programme manager, but where the objectives are not being attained or achieved to a limited extent, then this will lead to some sort of decision whether to continue, to modify or to terminate the programme.

Hence, the goal attainment or objectives centered model by Tyler (1949) was found most appropriate among other models for the evaluation of the objectives of the universal basic education programme implementation outcomes in Rivers State.

Evaluation

Evaluation is a process that critically examines a programme. It involves collecting and analyzing information about a programme's activities, characteristics and outcomes. Its purpose is to make judgments about a programme, to improve its effectiveness, and/or to inform programming decisions (Patton, 1987).

According to Oguniyi (1999), evaluation is a qualitative measure of the prevailing situation, which calls for evidence effectiveness, suitability, or goodness of the programme. Evaluation adds the ingredient of value judgment to assessment. It is concerned with the application of its findings and implies some judgment of the effectiveness, social utility desirability of a product, process or progress in terms of carefully defined and agreed upon objectives or values. Evaluation has a wider meaning which goes beyond measurement and making judgment.

Evaluation is a systematic determination of a subject's merit, worth and significance, using criteria governed by standard. Evaluation helps organizations, programmes, projects or any other intervention or initiative to assess any aim, realizable concept/proposal, or any alternative in decision making, or to ascertain the degree of achievement or value in regard to the main aims and objectives (Staff, 2012). Evaluation is the structured interpretation and giving of meaning to predict or actual impacts of proposals or results. It looks at original objectives, and at what are either predicted or what was accomplished and how it was accomplished.

Evaluation can be formative that is taking place during the development of a concept or proposal, project or organization, with the intention of improving the value or effectiveness of the proposal, project, or organization. It can also be summative, drawing lessons from a completed action or project or an organization at a later point in time or circumstance.

Evaluation can be regarded as a formal or disciplined approach to examine the value of a programme not based only on its outcomes but also on its context, inputs, processes and procedures, and products (Worthen & Sanders, 1987). An evaluation makes use of a systematic process of inquiry that includes developing the criteria or standards for evaluation, the collection of relevant data and then making judgments about the object of the evaluation by applying those previously developed standards in order to determine quality. Evaluation is made for the purpose of gathering information in order to make rational decisions about changing elements of the programme. This interpretation of evaluation simply means that the decision makers are fully intent on using data to alter the system, to judge its value and to change its direction if necessary.

Most educators and others trained in the academic discipline of "research" are interested in making independent conclusions about a programme, and commonly research investigators are not necessarily involved in the programme, have no personal interest in its success or failure, and apply a scientific approach in making conclusions. As a tool to improve a programme, evaluation should be relevant to decision makers (Worthen & Sanders, 1987).

According to Hurteau, Houle, and Mongiat (2009), the main purpose of programme evaluation can be to "determine the quality of a programme by formulating a judgment". An alternative view is that "projects, evaluators, and other stakeholders including funders) will all have

potentially different ideas about how best to evaluate a project since each may have a different definition of ‘merit’. The core problem is about defining what is of value (Reeve & Paperboy, 2007). From this perspective, evaluation “is a contested term”, as “evaluators” use the term evaluation to describe an assessment, or investigation of a programme while others simply understand evaluation as being synonymous with applied research.

There are two functions considered when talking of evaluation purpose:

1. Formative evaluation provides the information on the improvement of a product or a process.
2. Summative evaluation provides information on short-term effectiveness or long-term impact to deciding the adoption of a product or process (Staff, 2011).

However, the strict adherence to a set of methodological assumptions may make the field of evaluation more acceptable to a mainstream audience, but this adherence will not prevent evaluators from developing new strategies for dealing with the problems that programmes face (Potter, 2006). It is claimed that only a minority of evaluation reports are used by the evaluand (client) (Hurteau, Houle, & Mongiat, 2009). One justification of this is that “when evaluation findings are challenged or utilization failed, the stakeholders/ clients are seen as the inferences or the warrants unconvincing”. Some reason for this situation may be the failure of the evaluator to establish a set of shared aims with the evaluand, or overly ambitious aims, as well as failing to compromise and incorporate the cultural differences of individuals and programmes within the evaluation aims and process (Reeve & Paperboy, 2007).

Summary of Review on Relevant Literature

This study is concerned with the way and manner in which the UBE programme implementation process is being carried out in Rivers State. The specialized approach of this study has created an orientation towards programme evaluation, especially educational programmes. The review have showed the gap between formative and summative evaluation in terms of programme evaluation using the different summative evaluation models such as Stake (1967) summative evaluation model, Kirk Patrick (1959) four levels evaluation model, Provus (1969) discrepancy evaluation model (DEM), Stufflebeam (1971) CIPP, and Tyler (1949) model among others.

The necessities in the evaluation of public programme following the implementation have been reviewed based on different concepts in programme evaluation. A good number of empirical studies have also been reviewed based on its relevancies to the research topic; and befitting summary drowned in respect to the relevant literature.

Statement of the Problem

Universal Basic Education Board since its inception was saddled with the responsibility of bringing basic education to the grassroots. Its mandate is to make basic education free and compulsory for every Nigerian child irrespective of tribe or religion. The programme is developed in the entire citizenry a strong consciousness for education and strong commitment to its promotion, it is to ensure provision of free universal basic education for every Nigerian child; to reduce drastically the incidence of schools dropout; to care for the learning needs of young persons through appropriate forms; and to ensure the acquisition of appropriate levels of literacy/numeracy. But presently in Rivers State, many children of school age are still roaming the streets during school hours; there is high level of payment among UBE student; the rate of schools dropout is on the increase; learning needs of students are not being cared for; no appropriate level of literacy and numeracy to build ethnical, moral and civic values needed for laying a solid foundation for lifelong learning.

Over a decade after the programme came into effect, researchers have looked into the UBE situation in Rivers State for proper implementation process for a better sustenance of the scheme. Conscious effort has been made by the World Bank and other concerned NGOs in making sure that the programme stand the taste time, yet the actual outcomes is not commensurate with the expected outcome of the UBE programme in Rivers State.

The researcher is therefore disturbed at the disparity between the programme implementation and its objectives. It is this gap that the evaluation is challenged to close. Hence, the reason for evaluating the objectives of the universal basic education programme in Rivers State.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The study evaluated the objectives of the Universal Basic Education Programme in Rivers State. Specifically, the objectives of the study are to:

- 1) Determine the extent to which the UBE programme has made the citizenry conscious of the vigorous promotion of education in Rivers State.
- 2) Examine the extent to which the Universal Basic Education programme is free and accessible among children of school age in Rivers State.
- 3) Determine the extent to which the Universal Basic Education programme has reduced the incidence of dropouts from the formal system in Rivers State.
- 4) Determine the extent to which learning needs of pupils/students are being cared for through complementary approaches in Rivers State.
- 5) Determine the extent to which appropriate levels of literacy/numeracy are ensured by the UBE programme among pupils/students in Rivers State.
- 6) Compare the actual and intended outcomes of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme in Rivers State.

Research Questions

The following research questions were raised to guide the study.

1. To what extent has the UBE programme made pupils and students conscious of the vigorous promotion of education in Rivers State?
2. To what extent is the Universal Basic Education programme is free in Rivers State?
3. To what extent has the rate of schools drop-out from the formal system reduced through efficiency of the UBE programme in Rivers State?
4. To what extent are learning needs of pupils/students being cared for through complementary approaches in River State?
5. To what extent are the literacy/numeracy levels appropriate in ensuring moral and civic values for lifelong learning in River State?
6. To what extent are the actual outcomes of the UBE consistent with the expected outcomes in Rivers State?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested for the study.

- 1: There is no significant difference in the mean rating of lower basic and higher basic teachers on how conscious their students are to the vigorous promotion of education in Rivers State.
- 2: There is no significant difference in the mean rating of lower basic and higher basic teachers on the extent to which the Universal Basic Education Programme is free in Rivers State.
3. There is no significant difference in the mean rating of lower basic and higher basic teachers on the extent to which school dropout rate has reduced through efficiency of the UBE programme in Rivers State.

4. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of lower basic and higher basic teachers on the extent to which learning needs of pupils/students are taken care of through complementary approaches in Rivers State.
5. There is no significant difference in the mean scores of lower basic and higher basic teachers on the extent to which appropriate levels of literacy/numeracy is ensured for moral and civic values among UBE pupils/students in Rivers State.
- 6: There is no significant difference in the consistent level between the actual and the expected outcomes of the UBE programme in Rivers State.

Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will be of immense benefit to major stakeholders in education. Head Teachers of various schools will benefit in no small measure as the research is primarily based on the evaluation of the UBE programme objectives, identifying areas of concerns and suggesting adequate ways of overcoming those concerns.

This study is also going to be of great importance to teachers in the various basic schools in the State because it will provide ways of curbing the challenges associated with the implementation of the objectives of the UBE programme thereby simplifying the teaching and learning process. This study will be of immense benefit to all stakeholders in the educational sector, as it encompasses all the activities of the formal Universal Primary Education (UPE) programme, coupled with the present UBE objectives.

The Universal Basic Education Board and the curriculum developers will also benefit from this study because it will help them identify the challenges in the implementation of the objectives of the UBE programme and also assess its relevance.

The ministry of education will also benefit from this work, since it will provide relevant information with regards to the UBE/programme implementation.

Methodology

This chapter dealt with the method that was used in the execution of the study. It was divided into the following sub-headings: research design, area of the study, population of the study, sample and sampling techniques, instrument for data collection, validation of the instrument, reliability of the instrument, method of data collection, and procedure for data analysis.

3.1 Research Design

The evaluation research design was used for this study. According to Okeke (2004) evaluation research involves decision making regarding the relative worth of two or more alternate actions. In the process changes in the concepts, method, instruments, and technologies of education are introduced and assessed through the use of goal attainment or objectives-centered model by Tyler (1949) evaluation model.

Area of the Study

The study was carried out in Rivers State which is one of the 36 States of Nigeria. It is situated in the South-South Geo-political Zone; it has 3 Senatorial Districts with 23 Local Government Areas, and its capital is Port Harcourt. It has a total number of one thousand, two hundred and thirty seven (1237) public primary and junior secondary schools. (Appendix C).

Population of the Study

The target population for this study comprised all the teaching staff in both primary and junior secondary schools in Rivers State. There is 16,182 teaching staff, out of which 7439 are primary

school teachers and 8,743 are junior secondary school teachers. Rivers State Universal Basic Education (RSUBEB, 2016). (Appendix D).

Sample and Sampling Technique

A sample refers to the actual number or part of a study population which is objectively selected from the target population of the study (Nzeneri, 2010). The sample size for this study was 735 teaching staff. Out of which (366 are lower basic teachers and 369 are senior basic teachers), drawn from the target population with the aid of “Fluid Survey online Sample Size Calculator” (FSOSSC). Therefore, in selecting the respondents for this study, two LGAs were chosen from each Senatorial District of the State. While, the stratified sampling technique was adopted.

Instrumentation

A self-developed instrument (Questionnaire) titled ‘Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Universal Basic Education Programme Objectives’ (QEUBEPO), was drafted using a four (4) point scale of Very High Extent (VHE), High Extent (HE), Low Extent (LE), and Very Low Extent (VLE). The instrument was divided into two sections, section A contains personal information of respondents, while section B was the questionnaire proper with thirty six (36) items, and it was structured and coded thus:

Very High Extent (VHE)	-	4 points
High extent (HE)	-	3 points
Low Extent (LE)	-	2 points
Very Low Extent (VLE)	-	1 point

Validation of Instrument

Validity is the degree to which a measuring instrument measures what it purports to measure (Asuru, 2015). Therefore, to ensure face and content validity of the instrument, the initial draft of the instrument was given to the research supervisor and other experts in the Department of Measurement and Evaluation, where every mistake was corrected and reframed.

Reliability of the Instrument

Reliability is the consistency of scores obtained by the same person when re-examined with the same test on different occasions, or with different sets of equivalent items, [Anastasi (1976) in Nzeneri (2010)]. Therefore, to establish reliability of the instrument, the test-retest method was employed. By that, a test was administered to 20 respondents outside the study sample area, after a period of two weeks, fresh copies of the same checklist were re-administered to the same set of persons. Thereafter, the results were collated and the Pearson Product Moment Correlation was employed to test the reliability coefficient of the two results. And it yielded a reliability index of 0.79.

Administration of the Instrument

Administration of measuring instrument is a systematic procedure through which the instrument is used to elicit responses from the respondents (Ubolom, Uzoeshi, Amini, & Vipene, 2011). Therefore, to ensure precision of the instrument, the researcher employed the services of some of his research friends who assisted in the distribution and retrieval of the instrument back from the respondents after filling. Out of 735 instruments (checklist) that was distributed, only 700 copies were properly filled and returned. That is, 95.2% were properly filled, while 4.8% were damaged.

Method for Data Analysis

The research questions were answered using mean and standard deviation. A decision rule was taken on a criterion mean of 2.50, above were considered to be very high extent while below were considered to be very low extent. The hypotheses were tested using the Z-test at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

This chapter focused on the data presentation, analysis, and discussion of findings, recommendations, and suggestion for further studies.

Analyses of Research Questions

Research Question 1

To what extent has the UBE programme made pupils and students conscious of the vigorous promotion of education in Rivers State?

Table 4.1: Mean Response on how Students are conscious of the Importance of Education

S/N	Items	Lower Basic		Senior Basic		Mean set	Decision
		\bar{x}_1	SD ₁	\bar{x}_2	SD ₂		
1	By showing good character.	2.10	0.75	1.90	0.80	2.00	VLE
2	By being obedient.	1.95	0.78	1.77	0.84	1.86	VLE
3	By dressing neatly.	3.21	0.84	2.94	0.76	3.07	VHE
4	By being punctual to school.	2.4	0.71	2.25	0.73	2.36	VLE
5	Through salutation.	1.8	0.81	1.71	0.86	1.79	VLE
6	By performing above average in exams.	2.24	0.73	2.04	0.76	2.14	VLE
	Aggregate	2.31	0.77	2.10	0.79	2.20	VLE

The table 4.1 above indicates that UBE students especially pupils of Lower Basic have a poor understanding and awareness of the importance of education with an aggregate mean set of ($\bar{x} = 2.20$) which is below the criterion mean of ($\bar{x} = 2.50$).

Research Question 2

To what extent is the Universal Basic Education Free in Rivers State?

Table 4.2: Mean Response on the Extent to which the Universal Basic Education is Free.

S/N	Items	Lower Basic		Senior Basic		Mean set	Decision
		\bar{x}_1	SD ₁	\bar{x}_2	SD ₂		
7	School fees.	1.19	1.09	1.09	1.14	1.14	VLE
8	Free uniform.	1.05	1.16	0.95	1.29	1.00	VLE
9	Free launch.	1.05	1.16	0.95	1.29	1.00	VLE
10	Free textbook.	1.82	0.82	1.66	0.88	1.74	VLE
11	Free medical care.	1.87	0.81	1.71	0.86	1.79	VLE
12	Free school bus.	1.87	0.81	1.71	0.86	1.79	VLE
	Aggregate	1.46	0.98	1.35	1.05	1.41	VLE

Table 4.2 above revealed that the universal basic education programme is not free as expected in Rivers State with an aggregate set mean ($\bar{x} = 1.41$) which is below the criterion mean of ($\bar{x} = 2.50$).

Research question 3: To what extent has the rate of schools dropout being reduced through efficiency of the UBE programme in Rivers State?

Table 4.3: Mean Response on how the UBE programme has reduced school's dropout in Rivers State.

S/N	Items	Lower Basic		Senior Basic		Mean set	Decision
		\bar{x}_1	SD ₁	\bar{x}_2	SD ₂		
13	Taking students out on excursion.	1.79	0.86	1.63	0.89	1.71	VLE
14	All necessary learning materials are supplied.	1.64	0.89	1.49	0.95	1.57	VLE
15	By inspecting their writing materials on daily basis.	1.57	0.92	1.43	0.98	1.50	VLE
16	Schools' facilities are up to date.	1.49	0.95	1.36	1.01	1.43	VLE
17	Awarding of scholarship.	2.76	0.73	2.52	0.71	2.64	VHE
18	Through counseling of students on their career choices.	3.14	0.81	2.86	0.74	3.00	VHE
	Aggregate	2.07	0.86	1.88	0.88	1.98	VLE

Table 4.3 above shows that the learning needs of young people through appropriate and complementary approaches are not really being cared for with an aggregate set. Mean of ($\bar{x} = 1.98$) which is below the criterion mean of ($\bar{x} = 2.50$).

Research question 4: To what extent are the learning needs of pupils/students being cared for through complementary approaches in Rivers State?

Table 4.4: Mean Response on the extent to which learning needs of students are cared for in Rivers State.

S/N	Items	Lower Basic		Higher Basic		Mean set	Decision
		\bar{x}_1	SD ₁	\bar{x}_2	SD ₂		
19	Students learning needs are decided by school principals	0.67	0.54	0.62	0.50	0.65	VLE
20	Learning needs are sole responsibility of students	1.57	0.40	1.43	0.37	1.50	VLE
21	Seat are provided for every student	1.42	0.38	1.29	0.34	1.36	VLE
22	Chalk is provided by the government.	2.02	0.58	1.84	0.53	1.93	VLE
23	Writing materials are normally supply to schools on termly basis.	0.82	0.48	0.75	0.44	0.79	VLE
24	Lessons are delivered through the use of projector.	0.71	0.53	0.65	0.48	0.68	VLE
	Aggregate	3.61	0.49	3.29	0.44	1.15	VLE

The table 4.4 above indicates that learning needs of pupils/students are not cared for as expected, with a mean set of 1.15 which is less than the criterion mean of (2.50).

Research Question 5. To what extent are the literacy/numeracy levels appropriate in ensuring moral and civic values needed by students in laying solid foundation for lifelong learning in Rivers State?

Table 4.5: Mean Response on the extent to which literacy/numeracy levels are appropriate in ensuring moral and civil values.

S/N	Items	Lower Basic		Higher Basic		Mean set	Decision
		\bar{x}_1	SD ₁	\bar{x}_2	SD ₂		
25	Through quality lesson delivering	1.87	0.51	1.70	0.47	1.79	VLE
26	Students are taught according to students' syllabus.	1.94	0.54	1.77	0.50	1.86	VLE
27	Promotion of students to a new class is strictly on merit basis.	0.78	0.50	0.72	0.45	0.75	VLE
28	Students are evaluated after every lesson to ensure better understanding.	1.87	0.51	1.70	0.47	1.79	VLE
29	All teachers are Inloco-parentis and	1.31	0.37	1.19	0.34	1.25	VLE

	as well give the best of their ability.							
30	Through the engagement of students in external competitions.	1.83	0.49	1.67	0.45	1.75	VLE	
	Aggregate	1.60	0.49	1.46	0.45	1.53	VLE	

From table 4.5, the mean response shows that the level of literacy/numeracy is not quite appropriate in ensuring moral and civic values needed by students in lay solid foundation for their life time learning with a mean set which is less than the criterion mean ($\bar{x} = 1.53 < 2.5$).

Research Question 6: To what extent is the actual outcome of the UBE Programme consistent with the expected outcome?

Table 4.6: Mean Response on the extent to which the actual outcome of the programme is consistent with the expected outcome.

S/N	Items	Lower Basic		Senior Basic		Mean set	Decision
		\bar{x}_1	SD ₁	\bar{x}_2	SD ₂		
19	The UBE programme is a mirage.	3.14	0.81	2.86	0.74	3.00	VHE
20	The UBE does not meet the desired expectation.	3.73	1.05	3.41	0.91	3.57	VHE
21	The UBE programme should be revisited.	4.18	1.27	3.82	1.09	4.00	VHE
22	The level of teachers' supervision is poor.	1.59	0.91	1.46	0.98	1.53	VLE
23	There is a big difference between the actual outcome and the expected outcome of the programme.	4.04	1.20	3.68	1.03	3.86	VHE
24	The programme is very consistent.	1.79	0.86	1.63	0.89	1.71	VLE
	Aggregate	3.08	1.02	2.81	0.94	2.95	VLE

Table 4.6 demonstrated that the expected outcomes is some worth commensurate with the actual outcomes with an aggregate mean set of ($\bar{x} = 2.95 \geq 2.50$).

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the mean rating between lower basic and higher basic teachers on how conscious their students are to the vigorous promotion of education in Rivers State.

Table 4.7: Z-Test Analysis on the extent to which Pupils/Students to the vigorous promotion of education.

The table 4.7: revealed that the z-calculated 3.58 was greater than the z-critical value ± 1.96 for degree of freedom of 698 and 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted. This means that there is significant difference between pupils and students in their level of consciousness and commitment toward the vigorous promotion of education in Rivers State.

Respondents	N	\bar{X}	SD	DF	Z-cal.	Z-Crit.	Sig.	Decisions
Higher Basic	366	1.46	0.98	698	1.43	± 1.96	0.05	Accepted
Lower Basic	334	1.34	1.05					

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in the mean rating between lower basic and higher basic teachers on the extent to which pupils/students paid money in Rivers State.

Table 4.8: Z-Test Analysis on the extent to which UBE education is free.

Table 4.8 indicated that the z-calculated 1.43 is less than the Z-critical value ± 1.96 for degree of freedom 698 at 0.05 level of significance. Hence, the null hypothesis was accepted. This means that there is high level of payment by UBE pupils and students in Rivers State.

Table 4.9: Z-Test Analysis on the extent to which schools dropout is reduced.

Respondents	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	Z-cal.	Z-Crit.	Sig.	Decisions
Higher Basic	366	2.31	0.77	698	3.58	± 1.96	0.05	Rejected
Lower Basic	334	2.10	0.79					

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference in the mean rating between lower basic and higher basic teachers on the extent to which dropout rate is reduced through efficiency of the UBE programme in Rivers State.

The table 4.9 above showed that z-calculated 0.04 is less than z-critical value ± 1.96 for degree of freedom 698 at 0.05 level of significance. This means that there is no significant difference between school dropout and graduates of the UBE programme in Rivers State. Thus, the null hypothesis was accepted.

Hypothesis 4

There is no significant difference between the mean scores of lower basic and higher basic teachers on the extent to which learning needs of pupils/students are cared for through

Respondents	N	\bar{X}	SD	DF	Z-Cal.	Z-Crit.	Sig.	Decisions
Higher Basic	366	3.08	1.02	698	3.64	± 1.96	0.05	Rejected
Lower Basic	334	2.81	0.94					

appropriate and complementary approaches in Rivers State.

Table 4.10: Z-Test Analysis on the extent to which learning needs of students are cared for.

Respondents	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	Z-cal.	z-crit.	Sig.	Decision
Higher Basic T	366	3.61	0.49	698	8.00	± 1.96	0.05	Rejected
Lower Basic T	334	3.29	0.44					

From table 4.10 above, the z-calculated 8.00 is greater than z-critical value ± 1.96 , for degree of freedom 698 and 0.05 level of significance. This signifies that, the difference between lower basic teachers and higher basic teachers is significant at 0.05; hence, the null hypothesis failed to accept.

Hypothesis 5

There is no significant difference between the mean scores of lower basic teachers and higher basic teachers on the extent to which appropriate levels of literacy is ensure among UBE students in Rivers State.

Table 4.11: Z-Test Analysis on the extent to which appropriate level literacy/numeracy is ensured among UBE students.

Respondents	N	\bar{X}	SD	DF	Z-cal.	Z-Crit.	Sig.	Decisions
Higher Basic	366	2.07	0.86	698	0.04	± 1.96	0.05	Accepted
Lower Basic	334	1.88	0.88					

The table 4.11 above demonstrated that z-calculated -3.5 is less than z-critical value ± 1.96 for degree of freedom 698 and 0.05 level of significance. This implies that, there is no significant difference between the mean scores of lower basic teachers and higher basic teachers on the extent to which appropriate level of literacy is ensured among lower basic and higher basic students in Rivers State. Meanwhile, the null hypothesis was upheld.

Hypothesis 6

There is no significant difference in the mean rating between the actual outcome and the expected outcome of the UBE programme in Rivers State.

Table. 4.12: Z-Test Analysis on the extent to which the actual outcomes is consistent with the expected outcome.

Respondents	N	\bar{x}	SD	DF	Z-cal.	z-crit.	Sig.	Decision
Higher Basic Teachers	366	1.60	0.49	698	-3.5	± 1.96	0.05	Accepted
Lower Basic Teachers	334	1.46	0.45					

The table 4.12 above revealed that the z-calculated 3.64 is greater than Z-critical value ± 1.96 for degree of freedom 698 at 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that the difference between the actual outcome and the expected outcome is significant. Meanwhile, the null hypothesis was rejected and the alternate hypothesis accepted.

Discussion of Findings

The findings shows that pupils of Lower Basic have a minimal understanding of how important education is, because most of the lower basic children have not seen any change in the educational system from the inception of the UBE programme till date. To them, the school system is still as it were from the time of Universal Primary Education (UPE), apart from the school buildings and their school uniforms that looks different from what it had been. Whereas, students of the Higher Basic (J.S.S. 1-3) are mostly conscious, strong, and aware of the importance of education, through the introduction of some vocational subjects into the UBE curriculum. Having seen themselves indulged in these traits, they became more conscious of the importance of education than those in the lower basic. This is line with the view of Thomas (2013) which says education is a process that enables an individual to distinguish between good and bad. That is why UNESCO, 1994 emphasizes on the scope of basic learning needs and how they should be met in our diverse cultures. Meanwhile, pupils of junior basic are victims of this scenario and needed maximum support to understand why they should be educated.

The UBE programme in Rivers State is partially free as perceived by the school heads and teachers. The programme is termed partially free because, items that are considered to be free are not free. The cost of uniform which is part of the provision of the UBE programme is not free. This means that students are still made to pay for uniform in spite of the programme being considered as free. Books and stationeries that were meant to be shared among pupils/students has been diverted and sold to private school owners. Transportation and cost of feeding while at school are not free as well. Students go to school on their own, paying their transport fares and catering for their launch during break time. Registration fee which was supposed to be completely free is not free in Rivers State. On admission pupils/students are compelled to pay

some certain amount of money. Therefore, it is cleared that pupils/students paid some kind of fees in Rivers State. This means that the UBE programme is partially free in Rivers State.

The UBE should be free from all kind of payment as enshrined in the UBE Acts of 2004, provision of item 30 of part 11 of the second schedule and item (2) of the forth schedule of the 1999 constitution, states that every government in Nigeria shall provide free, compulsory, and universal basic education for every child of school age (Tahir 2006). The provision of learning needs is not certain. Though, chalk and chalkboard are provided but, other learning needs like seats, infrastructural facilities, marker board, buses for excursion are not provided among UBE schools' in Rivers State. Especially, schools in rural areas.

Research question four have an aggregate mean response of 3.61 for lower basic teachers and 3.29 for higher basic teacher. This indicates that pupils/students' needs are actually cared for by teachers. While, hypothesis four was rejected where the z-calculated 8.00 was greater than the z-critical value of ± 1.96 . Showing that, there is significant difference from their perspectives on how student's needs are carried for. In view of (Abakpa,2013; Akpan; Okpala, 2011) the best practice for provision of learning needs, need to be structured through appropriate activities that will foster effective implementation of the UBE curriculum Rivers State.

Research question five and hypothesis five have demonstrated the true state of at which literacy/numeracy levels are appropriate in ensuring moral and civic values needed by students within and outside the school system for laying a solid foundation for their life-long learning in Rivers State. The null-hypothesis was accepted based on the fact that there is no significant difference between lower basic teachers and the higher basic teachers on the extent to which literacy level is ensured. The best way to cover for children's education is to create an enabling environment through a complementary approach in the school where they attend (Bolaji, 2014). Denying children of their playing needs is like limiting their future as they grew up. Agabi and Okorosaye-Orubite (2005) stated that "education is power, it is a process of acquiring knowledge and ideas that shape and condition man's attitudes, action and achievements. Meanwhile, learning needs of students are paramount and most be cared for through complementary approaches.

Researches question six and hypothesis six, shows that the actual outcomes of the UBE programme over the years does not commensurate with the peoples' expectation. The UBE programme was supposed to be completely free from inception to graduation, but the reverse is the case in Rivers State. The programme was designed to equipped her graduates with entrepreneurial skills capable of establishing them where there is no money to further their education. But in Rivers State, those who could not further their education end up joining cultism. This means that, the actual outcome is not consistent at all with the expected outcomes. Education is the pillar for all developed nation in the world, therefore, where the policy of a country is not in line with its educational goals, then the policy must be revisited (Songhua & Wang, 2012)

Conclusion

The UBE objectives were designed to correct the mistakes of the Universal Primary Education (UPE), and bridged the gap in the present UBE programme implementation. But from the findings, it could be reasonably concluded that the UBE programme is being implemented in line with its objective. The findings revealed that pupils of the Lower Basic have a minimal understanding of the importance of education. The findings also showed that the level of

payment is on the high side among UBE students in Rivers State, upon the fact that pupils/students learning needs are not properly met as enshrined in the UBE Acts, 2004.

From every indication, it is obvious that the universal basic education objectives are not faulty, but the implementation process is where the problem lies. Hence, the government should endeavour to implement the law as enshrined in the UBE Acts 2004.

Therefore, the UBE implementation committees need to be more proactive in the implementation process in order for the actual outcome to commensurate with the expected outcome as enshrined in the UBE Act, 2004.

Recommendation

From the findings and conclusion, the following recommendations were made:

1. More effort should be made by government in doing that which is expected of them so as to develop in the entire citizenry a strong consciousness for education and strong commitment to its vigorous promotion.
2. The government should endeavour to make the UBE programme free from payment.
3. Teachers should be more proactive in carrying awareness campaign across the State.
4. Teachers should employ the best teaching methodology while teaching in order to reduce the incidence of drop-outs through improved relevance quality and efficiency.
5. Both the parents and teachers should pay more attention to their wards by providing their learning needs through appropriate and complementary approaches.
6. Students should as well endeavour to acquire the necessary skills needed to excel in life.
7. To ensure high level of literacy and numeracy among UBE pupils/students, teachers' welfare must be a priority to the government.

References

- Abakpa, B.O. (2013). Challenges of Attaining MDGs in Nigeria through Mathematics Curriculum Delivery. In: Attaining the MDGs through Stem Education. OkechukwuAbonyi (Ed). *Proceedings of 5th Annual Conference of STAN*, 3-9.
- According to (Abakpa,2013; Akpan; Okpala, 2011) The best practice for provision of learning needs, need to be structured through appropriate activities that will foster effective implementation of the UBE curriculum.
- Adeyanju, S.F. (2010). Career choice among adolescents. Port Harcourt. *Journal of Psychology*, 5(2), 28-39.
- Agabi, O.G. & Okorosaye-Orubite, A.k. (2005). *School and Society*. Port Harcourt: Davidstones Publishing.
- Akpan, B.B.(2012). *Science education in Nigeria: Education in Nigeria: From Beginning to theFuture*. Lagos: Foremost Educational Services
- Alabi, L. (2003). *Evaluation of the impact of universal basic education on primary schools enrolment in Kwara State*. Unpublished B.Sc. (Ed) project, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
- Asuru, V.A. (2015). *Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*. Port Harcourt: Pearl Publishers International Ltd
- Bolaji, S.D. (2014). *Intent to Action: Overcoming the Barriers to Universal Basic Education Policy Complementation in Nigeria*. A doctorate thesis submitted to the Graduate Research School of Edith Cowan University, Western Australia.
- Brown, N.E. (2012). *Implementation of Universal Basic Education Programme in Rivers State of Nigeria*. Unpublished Dissertation, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria.
- Callanan, M., Cervantes, C. & Loomis, M. (2011). Informal Learning". *Wires Cognitive Science*. 2,640-655.

- De Cos, P.L. (2005). *High school dropout, enrollment, and graduation rates in California*. California: California State Library.
- Dewey, J. (1916). *Democracy and education. An introduction to the philosophy of education*. (1966. edn) New York: Free Press.
- Didactic Encyclopedia (2013). *What is the Meaning of Informal Education, Concept, Definition of Information Education*. Retrieved from <https://edukalife.blogspot.com.ng/2013/01/html>.
- Dike, H.I. (2016). *Evaluation of educational programmes: Needs analysis formative evaluation, and summative evaluation*. Port Harcourt: Sacheks Publishers.
- Eaton, S. E. (2010). *Learning, teaching and leadership*. Retrieved from <https://drsarahheaton.com/2010/12/31>.
- Eaton, S. E. (2011). Formal, non-formal and informal learning. Retrieved 31(12)2010 from <https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/non-formal-learning>.
- Fall, A.M., Roberts, G. (2012). High school dropouts: Interactions between social context, Self perceptions, school engagement, and student dropout. *Journal of Adolescence*. 35(4), 787-98.
- Fatunwa, A.B. (1983). *Dropout in the Nigerian Education System*. In S.A. Adesina, & Ajayi, E. (Eds.) *Nigerian Education Trends and Issue*. Ife: University of Ife Ferguson, R. (1999). Ideological marketing. *The Education Industry Report*.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Policy on Education*. Lagos: NERDC Press.
- Gredler, M.E. (1996). *Programme Evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice hall, Inc.
- House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (1998). *Deliberative democratic evaluation in practice*. Boulder: University of Colorado.
- House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (2000a, Spring). Deliberative democratic evaluation. *New Directions for Evaluation*, 85, 3–12.
- House, E. R., & Howe, K. R. (2000b). Deliberative democratic evaluation in practice. In D. L. Stufflebeam, G. F. Madaus, & T. Kellaghan (eds.). *Evaluation models*. Boston: Kluwer.
- Hurteau, M. Houle, S. & Mongiat, S. (2009). How Legitimate and justified are judgments in programme evaluation? *Evaluation*. 15(3), 307-319.
- Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) (2014). *University drop-out risk for poorer students*. BBC News.
- International Human Rights Law (IHRL) (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. ISCED(2011). *Internal Standard Classification of Education: A Framework for Analysis*. Paris.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1981). *Standards for evaluations of educational programs, projects, and materials*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1988). *The personnel evaluation standards: How to assess systems for evaluating educators*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation. (1994). *The program evaluation standards: How to assess evaluations of educational programs*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kirkpatrick, D.L. (1999). *Evaluating Training Programme*, Tata: McGraw-Hill Publishing Company Limited.
- Levin, B. (1993). Students and Educational Productivity. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*. 1(5),90-120.
- Lopez, N., Operti, R., & Carlos, V.T. (2017). *Youth and changing ealities. Secondary education*. America. Unesco. Pp. 22-24-28.

- Maduabum, M.A. (2007). *Fundamentals of Educational Research (FER)*. Port Harcourt: First Born Printers.
- Nzeneri, I.S. (2010). *An Introduction to Research Methods and Statistics*. Uyo: Abigal Associates Ltd.
- Ogunniyi, M.B. (1999). *Educational Measurement and Evaluation*. Lagos: Longman Nig.
- Okeke, B.S. (2004). *Qualitative research in education. Supervisor's perspective*. Port Harcourt: Palm Unique Publishing Company Ltd.
- Okpala, P.N. (2011). Reforms in STEM Education. Keynote Address at the 52nd Annual Conference of STEM held on the 15th – 20th August, 2011, Akure, Nigeria.
- Ololube, N.P. (2013). *Sociology of education and society: An interactive approach*. Owerri: Spring Field Publishers.
- Olori, T. Ibuku, W., Oyedeji, L. & Tahir, G. (2005). Lack of Resources Threaten UBE. http://www.newsfromafrica.org/newsafrika/articles/art_9114.html. retrieved on 12/10/2014.
- Onwuka, E.C. (2012). Perspectives on education and development. An appraisal of Nigeria's experience. *Multidisciplinary Journal of Research Development*. 20(1), 1-5
- Parankmalil, J. (2012). *Meaning, nature and aims of education*. Retrieved from <https://johnparakimalil.wordpress.com>.
- Patton, M.Q. (1987). *Qualitative research evaluation methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publishers.
- Potter, C. (2006). Psychology and the art of programme evaluation. *South African Journal of Psychology*. 36(1), 28-30. Press, Nig. Ltd.
- Provus, M. (1969). Discrepancy Evaluation Model (DEM). *Journal of Construction Education Summer*. 3(2), 64-66.
- Reeve, J. & Paperboy, D. (2007). Evaluating the Evaluation: Understanding the utility and Limitations of Evaluation as a Tool for Organizational Learning". *Health Education Journal*. 66(2): 120-131.
- Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rogoff, B., Callanan, M., Gutierrez, K. & Erickson, F. (2016). The Organization of Informal Learning. *Review of Research in Education*. 40,356-401.
- Ross, P.H., Ellipse, M.W., Freeman, H.E. (2004). *Valuation: A systematic approach* (7th ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sages.
- Rumberger, R.W. & Larson, K.A. (1998). Student mobility and the increased risk of high school dropout. *American Journal of Education*. 197(1),1-35.
- Sanghua, T. & Wang, C.Y. (2002). Strategic planning for deepening the all-around structural reform of education. *Chinese Education and Society*. 45(3), 23-26.
- Staff, (2012). "What is Evaluation?" *International Center for Alcohol Policies Analysis. Balance Partnership*.
- Stake, R. E. (1983). Program evaluation, particularly responsive evaluation. In G. F. Madaus, M. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebeam (eds.), *Evaluation models*, pp. 287-310. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Stake, R.E. (1967). The Countenance of Educational Evaluation. *Teachers College Records*. 68,523-540.
- Stufflebeam, D.L. (1971a). The use of experimental design in educational evaluation. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 8(4),267-274.
- Suigbo, P. (2011). *Assessment of the Implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) Programme in Rivers State: A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Educational Management, University of Port Harcourt*.

- Thomas, G. (2013). *Education: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. (Kindle Edition).
- Ubolom, W.J., Uzoeshi, K.C., Amini, C.A., & Vipene, J.B. (2011). *Fundamentals of Measurement and Evaluation*. Port Harcourt: Celwil Nigeria (Publisher).
- UNESCO Global Report (2012). Education for all (EFA) Global Week, Magazine.
- Worthen, B.R. & Sanders, J.R. (1987). *Educational Evaluation: Alternative Approaches and Practical Guidelines*. White Plains, NY: Longman.