

## Situation and Policy Analysis of Basic Education in Yenagoa Local Government Area Bayelsa State, Nigeria (2000–2013)

Numoipre IKURITE

Department of Educational Foundation

Isaac Jasper Boro College of Education, Sagbama, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.

[trumpetair@gmail.com](mailto:trumpetair@gmail.com)

---

### Abstract

The paper examines the situation and policy analysis of basic junior education in Yenagoa LGA Bayelsa State (2000-2013). A descriptive survey research design was utilized for the study. Four hundred and three (403) students participated in the study using the instrument of questionnaire in 13 randomly selected Basic Junior secondary schools as well as fifteen (15) in-depth interviews conducted with school principals, Director and Deputy Director in SUBEB and Basic Junior Education, Yenagoa LGA. Cluster and purposive sampling techniques were adopted for the study. Frequency and percentage distribution tables were utilized for the quantitative data analysis, whereas qualitative data adopted thematic and content analysis. The findings showed that 100% of school aged students did not have access and equity to basic junior education; personal supply and resources availability were not 100% achieved; supervision and inspection of schools was not carried out on regular basis; government efforts to improve the means and scope of basic education did not show 100% adequacy; and that there were problems retarding the implementation of the UBE programme in the state. In view of the findings, every school aged-child should have access to basic education without hindrance as stipulated in the policy; basic education should be funded appropriately by the government; supervision and inspection of the implementation of the policy should be set as the utmost priority of the government; as well as having adequate provisions of basic infrastructure, training and retraining of teachers so as to improve the quality of teaching for better results.

**Keywords:** Basic education, Situation, Policy, Implementation, Quality control, Bayelsa State, Nigeria.

---

### INTRODUCTION

The concept of education is defined in various ways by different scholars. According to Amaele (1998) education is a process of enculturation or socialization of the younger by the elder members of the society. Oroka (2005) views education as “the intentional bringing about of a desirable state of mind, and relates to processes and activities that can contribute to or involve something that is worthwhile”. Flowing from the various definitions however, education remains a social process in capacity building and maintenance of the society. Amuche and Kukwi (2013) stressed further that education seemed to be identified as a dynamic instrument of change. Hence, developed countries and those aspiring to develop have adopted it as an instrument of excellence for effecting national development (Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN), 2004).

As Yoloje (2004) averred the concept of basic education is not a completely new term to the Nigerian society and that within the last decade, it has assumed a global significance and its meanings have been broadened. According to him he expanded the vision of Universal Basic

Education to include universalization, accessibility and promotion of equity, focusing on learning and enhancing the environment of learning and strengthening partnerships.

Tracing the historical antecedents of basic junior secondary school, the idea of universal education which was first mooted in 1955 when the universal primary education scheme was inaugurated by the government of Western Nigeria sprouted BJSS in the post-colonial era of Nigeria. The Eastern Nigeria government, however, launched its own universal primary education in 1957. In Northern Nigeria, education was provided free by the government in a bid to make children attend school (Adeyemi, 2007). Thus, at its onset, the universal primary education (UPE) scheme had been undertaken by regional government. As Adeyemi (2007) observed, there was no federal government intervention until 1976 when the universal primary education (UPE) was launched to cover the whole country by the Murtala Mohammed/Obasanjo Military regime in October 1976 and made primary education programme free all over the country. With regards to this, Nakpodia (2011) noted that the Universal Basic Education (UBE) is actually an expansion of the UPE scheme which he further stated that instead of ending it in primary six (6), it is now extended to the first three years of secondary education which is junior secondary school (JSS).

Moreover, in 1990, a world conference on education was held in Jomtien, Thailand, which was popularly called education for all (EFA), the outcome of this world conference on education was to be adopted by all countries in a bid to reduce drop-out and illiteracy rates in every society. For Nigeria to be in line with this recommendation, the UBE programme was launched by the federal government on 30th September, 1999 in Sokoto by the then Head of State, President Obasanjo with Obanya as National Coordinator (Federal Ministry of Education, 2000). According to Nakpodia (2011), the objectives of the UBE included among other objectives: the provision of universal access to basic education; the provision of a conducive learning environment; eradication of illiteracy as well as the ability to communicate effectively. The objectives also included laying of sound basis for scientific and reflective thinking, development of sound attitudes, giving every child the opportunity of developing manipulative skills that would enable him or her function effectively in the society (Babalola, 2000).

Correspondingly, the provision of quality basic education has been on the priority list of the Federal Government of Nigeria. Government policies on basic education are explicitly stated in the National Policy on Education (FRN, 2013) section 2, paragraph 12, which stated that Basic Education is to be provided by government, and it shall be free compulsory, universal and qualitative. It comprises 1 year of kindergarten, 6 years of primary and 3 years of junior secondary education (FRN, 2013).

Furthermore, the policy stated in paragraph 23, that for effective teaching and learning at the junior secondary education level, the teacher-student ratio should be 1:35 and in paragraph 26.4 p 10 of the 2013 edition of the policy also stated that all tiers of government shall promote access, quality and inclusiveness in education. Government further stated that it would provide the following educational services for the Basic Education level: school libraries, school health services, guidance and counselling, educational resources centres as well as laboratories and workshops (FRN, 2013).

Against this background, this paper examines the situation and policy analysis of basic junior component of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Yenagoa Local Government Area of Bayelsa State in order to assess and evaluate the extent to which the objectives set for the policy at its inception have been achieved.

## Statement of the Problem

UNICEF (1999) report on “*state of the world’s children*” stated that about four million Nigerian children have no access to basic education. Ogbuka (2000) commenting on this reported that out of 21 million children of primary school age in 1996, only about 14 million were enrolled in schools. The completion rate was 64.1% while rate of transition to the junior secondary school was 39.8%. According to him, the situation in junior secondary schools was not better. He said out of the total population of 7.2 million children of 12 and 14 years old in Nigeria, only 2.4 million pupils were enrolled in school. This was manifested at the sight of so many children of school age roaming the streets in many Nigerian cities during school hours. Yet, the policy stipulates ‘free education for all and universalization of education without discrimination.

Specifically, according to the Nigerian Tide (2010) titled: *Bayelsa Ready for UBE Programmes*, the Chairman, Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC) in Bayelsa State, Mr. Rhodesia White identified lack of political will and under-funding as the main factors militating against the basic education programme of the federal government. According to him, the delay to implement the programme in the state was due to inability of the government to pay its counterpart funding (The Nigerian Tide, 2010). Idumange (2012) looked at the current state of education in Bayelsa State and noted that there are only 537 primary schools in the state which spread across the eight local government areas. Brass has 44 schools, Nember 86 schools, Ekeremor 86, Kolokuma–Opokuma 24 schools, Ogbia 73, Sagbama 62 schools, Southern-Ijaw 131, and Yenagoa 59 primary schools respectively. According to him, over the years these schools are characterized by a high wastage rate, low completion rate, and high drop-out rate arising from inadequate teaching staff both in quality and quantity, dearth of educational inputs such as laboratories, audio-visual aids and the peculiar riverine terrain which makes the deployment of teachers in rural schools very difficult (Idumange, 2012). This must have made Jackson (2011) to note that Bayelsa State had a lower-than average education index when compared with the entire south-south of 0.8% and the National of 0.7%.

Interestingly however, sixteen years after the launching of the UBE programme in September 1999, full implementation of the policy designed to achieve the goals set for the basic education generally have remained uncertain. This study, therefore, intends to investigate the extent to which the junior secondary component of the policy (as contained in the National Policy on Education Document - 2004 and 2013) have been implemented in Yenagoa Local Government Area, Bayelsa State with special reference to access and equity, quality of instruction, efforts at broadening the means and scope of education. Against this, the following research questions are raised to be answered in the study.

## Research Questions

The under listed five research questions guided the study:

- What is the status of basic junior secondary schools in Yenagoa, Bayelsa in terms of students’ access and equity?
- What is the level of material provisions in terms of personal supply and resource availability in the basic junior secondary schools?
- What are the quality control policies of the government through supervision and inspection of basic junior secondary schools in the state?

- What are the efforts of the government to improve the means and scope of basic junior secondary schools in Yenagoa LGA?
- What are the problems retarding the implementation of basic junior secondary school policy in Yenagoa LGA of Bayelsa State?

## **METHODOLOGY**

The study adopted descriptive survey design. This was motivated by the advantages accrue to it in terms of not only describing the nature of the phenomenon under investigation as it exists at the time of the study but help to facilitate the collection of data from the field of study in the most representative and manageable manner through a given sample population. It also engenders researcher's ability to employ descriptive statistical data analysis techniques for data interpretation.

The study population comprised the officials of the Basic Junior Education Board in Bayelsa State, Yenagoa; YLGEA, Junior Secondary School students, as well as Junior Secondary School principals in Yenagoa Local Government Area, Bayelsa State utilizing both cluster and purposive sampling techniques. Cluster sampling technique was adopted for the selection of 13 sampled Basic Junior Secondary Schools where 403 students were randomly selected for the study using the instruments of questionnaire and in-depth interviews as appropriate. The quantitative data were coded and entered into computer program using SPSS version 17.0 and Microsoft Excel respectively for analysis using frequencies and percentage distribution tables whereas the qualitative data was analysed using content analysis and thematic method.

However, in the course of the study; all ethical issues were strictly applied ranging from informed and voluntary consents of the respondents/participants to participate before administering questionnaire and the commencement of the in-depth (IDI) interviews with the selected officials from the board and Junior Secondary Schools respectively. The anonymity of the respondents and confidentiality of responses were in no doubt strictly respected.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

**Research Question 1:** What is the status of basic junior secondary schools in Yenegoa, Bayelsa State in terms of students' access and equity?

Table 1.1a presents the status of basic junior secondary school in Yenegoa in terms of access by showing the distribution of estimated school aged children of Yenegoa LGA, Bayelsa State and the actual enrolment in basic Junior Secondary School between 2000 and 2013. From the table, it can be seen that though the percentage difference in actual enrolment increase from 30.4% in 2000 to 31.4% in 2001, there was a drop in the percentage enrolment between 2003 and 2006 before an increase in percentage enrolment kicked off from 2007 to 2013. This implies that though there was an increase in enrolment the increase is at a slow pace compared to the increase in the total population of the school aged-children in the local government area as indicated on the table. It means that access was not 100% achieved in the local government area since not all the estimated children of school age were made to enrolled in schools.

Table 1.1a: Distribution of Estimated school aged-children of Yenegoa LGA, Bayelsa State and their Enrolment (2000-2013)

Year	Estimated population of school aged-children	School Enrolment (Actual)			Difference	Percentage Difference
		Male	Female	Total		
2000	16,356	5,822	5,568	11,390	4,966	30.4
2001	17,870	6,210	6,055	12,265	5,605	31.4
2002	17,978	7,159	6,825	13,984	3,994	22.2
2003	18,078	7,363	5,898	13,261	4,817	26.6
2004	19,298	6,858	7,121	13,979	5,319	27.6
2005	19,670	7,526	7,534	15,060	4,610	23.4
2006	20,479	7,543	7,542	15,085	5,394	26.3
2007	20,875	6,816	6,219	13,035	7,840	37.6
2008	20,987	5,765	5,749	11,514	9,473	45.1
2009	21,876	5,777	5,835	11,612	1,0264	46.9
2010	21,678	5,650	5,488	11,138	1,0540	48.6
2011	21,578	5,595	5,293	10,888	1,0690	49.5
2012	22,987	5,623	5,210	10,833	1,2154	52.9
2013	23,678	5,402	5,950	11,352	1,2326	52.1

Source: Bayelsa State Government, Ministry of Education, Yenegoa (2000-2013)

In terms of gender equity and access to basic junior secondary education, table 1.1b shows the difference in gender in relation to school enrolment in basic education between 2000 and 2013. The table revealed that the percentage difference between male enrolment and female enrolment in year 2000 was 2.2% which fell to 1.3% in 2001 before it began to rise again. Also, it could be observed that there was a negative difference in gender enrolment which showed negative in percentage difference indicating that female enrolment was higher than male enrolment in the year 2005 (-1.9%), 2006 (-0.1%), 2009 (-0.5%) and 2013 (-4.8%). This implies that there was a change in population distribution of school aged children in these years as well as a change in orientation due to the government campaign for school enrolment in Basic Education without discrimination especially since 2007 when the new system of basic education was changed from 6-3-3-4 to 9-3-4.

Table 1.1b: Yenegoa LGA Basic Junior Secondary School Enrolment By Sex 2000-2013

Year	BJSS School Enrolment By Gender					
	Total	Male	Male (%)	Female	Female (%)	Percentage Difference
2000	11,390	5,822	51.1	5,568	48.9	2.2
2001	12,265	6,210	50.6	6,055	49.4	1.3
2002	13,984	7,159	51.2	6,825	48.8	2.4
2003	13,261	7,363	55.5	5,898	44.5	11.0
2004	13,979	6,858	49.1	7,121	50.9	-1.9
2005	15,060	7,526	50.0	7,534	50.0	-0.1
2006	15,085	7,543	50.0	7,542	50.0	0.0
2007	13,035	6,816	52.3	6,219	47.7	4.6
2008	11,514	5,765	50.1	5,749	49.9	0.1
2009	11,612	5,777	49.8	5,835	50.2	-0.5
2010	11,138	5,650	50.7	5,488	49.3	1.5
2011	10,888	5,595	51.4	5,293	48.6	2.8
2012	10,833	5,623	51.9	5,210	48.1	3.8
2013	11,352	5,402	47.6	5,950	52.4	-4.8

Source: Bayelsa State Government, Ministry of Education, Yenegoa (2000-2013)

Table 1.1c shows the results on various categories of responses on access to education especially by the payment of fees or levies (exam fees, development fees, uniforms payment and students driven home for non-payment of the levies). As indicated on the table, a good number of respondents showed that they paid some of the levies sometimes compared to what the policy stipulates – ‘free education for all’. Indeed, this finding corroborates Igbuzor (2006), who observed that enrolment rate fell by 5% in Malawi 2 years after fees were introduced into the school system in 1980. Also in Tanzania, enrolment surged by as much as 1.5 million children when fees were abolished in primary schools in January 2002. This suggests that introducing payment of some levies will increase school drop-out rate which may be detrimental to the future of the students. As the work of Charles, Ikoh Iyamba and Charles (2006), and Oloko (1990) on the issue of increase in house-helpship or domestic labour as a result of high rate of students drop-out in schools was found significantly necessary since many children were sent out on the streets to hawk goods and services in order to supplement the family income.

These findings were found in contrary with the interviews conducted on what the nature of enrolment in the basic education looked like relative to payments: *Basic Education is free enrolment for every qualified child* (IDI/Deputy Director Basic Education Board/Yenagoa/204). This suggests that the findings in the quantitative data, ‘the free education clause’ seemed not to have been clearly applied in the study area in totality.

Table 1.1c: Distribution of respondents by payment of exam fees, development fees, uniforms payment and students driven home for non-payment of levy

Accessibility Measures	Frequency (N=403)	Percentage
<b>Payment of exam fees</b>		
Always	87	21.6
Sometimes	306	75.9
Never	10	2.5
<b>Development fees</b>		
Always	39	9.7
Sometimes	200	49.6
Never	164	40.7
<b>Uniforms payment</b>		
Always	47	11.7
Sometimes	81	20.1
Never	275	68.2
<b>Students driven home for non-payment of levy</b>		
Always		
Sometimes	09	2.2
Never	101	25.1
	293	72.7

Source: Field Survey (2014)

**Research Question 2:** What is the level of material provisions in terms of personal supply and resource availability in the basic junior secondary schools?

Table 2.1a shows the distribution of the respondents by personal supply and resource availability in basic education. As revealed on the table, though most of the materials were made available but not adequately supplied or rather not well-utilized. This means that more is still required to

be done by the government to solve this problem for the full implementation of the policy in the state.

Corroborating these findings, the responses from the interview conducted with the Deputy Director, Basic Education School, Yenegoa LGA stated thus: *“The school learning facilities availability and adequacy is not encouraging as well as the school sport activities in the basic education being poor”*. This means that generally speaking, the school learning facilities and school sport activities in the basic education were generally poor. This fact was supported by Obima (2006) that the new system of education need a lot of materials especially in science technical and vocational areas since these are the areas of emphasis but these materials have been grossly inadequate. Again, the result has also been found in line with the earlier study by Ivowi (2007) as he made it known that the major obstacle facing the 9-3-4 system of education is inadequate personnel to execute it.

Table 2.1a: Distribution of respondents by the level of material provisions, availability, adequacy and utilization of personal supply and resource in basic education

Items	Categories of responses						
	Availability		Adequacy			Utilization	
	AV	NS	VA	AD	NA	WU	NU
Class room in the school	398 (98.8%)	5 (1.2%)	58 (14.4%)	152 (37.7%)	193 (47.9%)	231 (57.3%)	172 (42.7%)
Teaching staff in the school	401 (99.5%)	2 (0.5%)	60 (14.9%)	132 (32.8%)	211 (52.4%)	168 (41.7%)	235 (58.3%)
Tables and chairs in the class	395 (98.0%)	8 (2.0%)	60 (14.9%)	99 (24.6%)	244 (60.5%)	175 (43.4%)	228 (56.6%)
Well-equipped laboratory	317 (78.7%)	86 (21.3%)	8 (2.0%)	48 (11.9%)	347 (86.1%)	66 (16.4%)	337 (83.6%)
Well-equipped library	284 (70.5%)	119 (29.5%)	4 (1.0%)	48 (11.9%)	351 (87.1%)	3 (8.7%)	368 (91.3%)
Viable ICT	306 (75.9%)	97 (24.1%)	10 (2.5%)	36 (8.9%)	357 (88.6%)	20 (5.0%)	383 (95.0%)
Games and play grounds	397 (98.5%)	6 (1.5%)	13 (3.2%)	265 (65.8%)	125 (31.0%)	137 (34.0%)	266 (66.0%)
Health care facilities	312 (77.4%)	91 (22.6%)	16 (4.0%)	55 (13.6%)	332 (82.4%)	42 (10.4%)	361 (89.6%)
Safe water	391 (97.0%)	12 (3.0%)	45 (11.2%)	102 (25.3%)	256 (63.5%)	145 (36.0%)	258 (64.0%)
Toilets facilities	392 (97.3%)	11 (2.7%)	14 (3.5%)	123 (30.5%)	266 (66.0%)	151 (37.5%)	252 (62.5%)
Electricity supply	395 (98%)	8 (2%)	18 (4.5%)	127 (31.5%)	258 (64%)	148 (36.7%)	255 (63.3%)
Fire extinguisher	307 (76.2%)	96 (23.8%)	10 (2.5%)	74 (18.4%)	319 (79.2%)	56 (13.9%)	347 (86.1%)
Non-teaching staff	316 (78.4%)	87 (21.6%)	11 (2.7%)	82 (20.3%)	310 (76.9%)	52 (12.9%)	351 (87.1%)

Source: Field Survey (2014) \*NB: Availability =Av means Available; NS means Not supplied  
Adequacy=VA means very adequate; AD means Adequate; NA means Not Adequate  
Utilization= WU means well-utilized; NU means Not Utilized

**Research Question 3:** What are the quality control policy of the government through supervision and inspection of basic junior secondary schools in the state?

Table 3.1a shows the summary of the interviews conducted with the principals of selected schools so as to ascertain the quality control policy through supervision and inspection, the summary of the findings were presented on table 3.1a as indicated with the marks against the number of times those actions were carried out.

Table 3.1a: Table showing the summary of interviews conducted with the basic junior secondary schools’ principals on quality control through supervision and inspection

Categories of questions	Categories of responses					
Number of times education supervisors visited school	Once	Twice	Thrice	Four times	Five Times	Six Times
BJSS A			✓			
BJSS B		✓				
BJSS C				✓		
BJSS D		✓				
BJSS E	✓					
BJSS F					✓	
BJSS G		✓				
BJSS H					✓	
BJSS I		✓				
BJSS J					✓	
BJSS K		✓				
BJSS L				✓		
BJSS M			✓			
<b>Inspection of learning facilities</b>			Frequency (%)			
Yes			13 (100%)			
No			0 (0%)			
<b>Disciplinary action if any teacher errs</b>			Frequency (%)			
Yes			5 (38.5%)			
No			7 (53.8%)			
No response			1 (7.7%)			

Source: Field survey (2014)

Table 3.1b shows the distribution of the respondents (students) by the quality control through supervision and inspection of the government as a measure to evaluate the level of implementation of the policy. As indicated on the table, 100% always of all items were not achieved which may go a long way to hamper the achievement of the goals set for the basic education. This finding is found in line with the earlier study conducted by Yusuf and Ajere (2011) that regular inspection by the inspectorates was lacking. Indeed, as Yusuf and Ajere (2011) stated, some teachers may branch off into quick money-generating activities such as farming, butchering, petty-trading and so on even during school hours. This unprofessional behavior creates indiscipline as children remained unsupervised. The benefits and success of the UBE programme lie in the aspects of monitoring and evaluation if the learners are to be useful. This no doubt could enhance productivity.



Table 3.1b: Distribution of respondents by quality control policy through supervision and inspection

Items	Category of responses	
	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Education inspection</b>		
Always	45	11.2
Sometimes	354	87.8
Never	4	1.0
<b>Supervisors inspect teachers' lesson notes</b>		
Always	60	14.9
Sometimes	327	81.1
Never	16	4.0
<b>Supervisors inspect students class work</b>		
Always	27	6.7
Sometimes	333	82.6
Never	43	10.7
<b>Supervisors discipline erring teachers</b>		
Always	29	7.2
Sometimes	294	73.0
Never	80	19.9
<b>Supervisors inspect facilities around the schools</b>		
Always	26	6.5
Sometimes	281	69.7
Never	96	23.8
<b>Supervisors supervise classroom competence</b>		
Always	24	6.0
Sometimes	255	63.3
Never	124	30.8
<b>Supervisors evaluates students work</b>		
Always	20	5.0
Sometimes	140	34.7
Never	243	60.3
<b>Supervisors inspect feedback to students' work</b>		
Always	27	6.7
Sometimes	120	29.8
Never	256	63.5

Source: Field Survey (2014)

**Research Question 4:** What are the efforts of the government to improve the means and scope of basic junior secondary schools in Yenagoa LGA?

Table 4.1a shows the distribution of respondents by the government efforts to improve the means and scope of basic education in the local government. It was however, revealed on the table that not 100% of the respondents indicated always in the items considered in the constructs. Although from the responses of the Deputy Director of Basic Education Yenagoa LGA on the government efforts to improve the means and scope of basic education, the following were mentioned by the Deputy Director to have been the provision made to basic schools in the state: provision of basic infrastructure, and following up of every consignment from the government.

From the responses of the Director of Basic Education at the Basic Education Board, the efforts of the government are stated: to build new classroom blocks; to build principals' quarters; they sank boreholes in the schools, they provided water for school compounds and free uniforms.

This result shows that the government in their own way had made provisions for the development of basic education in the state. But were they actually going round the schools or made available adequately? With regard to government efforts to improve the means and scope of Basic Junior Secondary School Education, the policy stipulated that all facilities necessary for the development of basic education shall be provided (NPE, 2004), with all indications, they have not been fully provided. This may go a long way to hinder the achievement of the universal basic education not only in the state but in Nigeria at large.

Table 4.1a: Distribution of respondents by government efforts to improve the means and scope of basic education

Items	Category of responses	
	Frequency	Percentage
<b>Recruitment of competent and qualified teachers</b>		
Always	151	37.5
Sometimes	238	59.1
Never	14	3.5
<b>Renovation of class rooms</b>		
Always	11	2.7
Sometimes	326	80.9
Never	66	16.4
<b>Provision of library facilities</b>		
Always	3	0.7
Sometimes	33	8.2
Never	367	91.1
<b>Subsidizing payment of learning materials e.g writing materials, desk, etc</b>		
Always	9	2.2
Sometimes	174	43.2
Never	220	54.6
<b>ICT centre</b>		
Always	34	8.4
Sometimes	369	91.6
Never	-	-
<b>Recreational and sporting facilities</b>		
Always	34	8.4
Sometimes	60	14.9
Never	309	76.7

Source: Field Survey (2014)

**Research Question 5:** What are the problems retarding the implementation of basic junior secondary school policy in Yenagoa LGA of Bayelsa State?

In an attempt to unveil the problems retarding the implementation of Basic Education policy in the state, the Deputy Director of Basic Education in Yenegoa LGA was asked about the major problems, he stated that the major problems responsible for retardation of the implementation of Basic Education are: lack of infrastructure, corruption on the part of the people responsible for implementation, government lack of supervision, money sharing syndrome. In addition to this, the Director at the Basic Education Board stated that lack of political will to implement NCE decisions, poor funding and release of funds as well as environmental challenges and difficult

terrain in the region may be found responsible for the problems retarding the implementation of the basic junior secondary school policy in Yenagoa LGA. This suggests that viable nations in the world must be nations that are experiencing growth through increases in the output or amounts of goods and services they produce over time. This must be based on the educational development. Unfortunately, Nigeria manifests a slow economic growth largely due to the poor state of the education sector.

## CONTRIBUTION

It should be noteworthy that findings from the study have indicated less than 100% access to basic education; inadequate resource availability to implement the policy effectively; supervision and inspection of the policy that would have enhanced monitoring and evaluation of the policy for assessment and improvement was not carried out in the most effective manner. Indeed, there are problems retarding the implementation of the policy ranging from under-funding and corruption among other critical problems that have retarded the full implementation of the policy. Based on these findings, it is therefore recommended that the policy should be implemented as stipulated 'free education for all', as well as efforts to ensure that every school aged-child have access to basic education without hindrance or discrimination in any form.

Besides these, the government in its own part should have the political will to put into effect the full implementation of the policy. Also, the issue of funding the policy adequately should be set as government utmost priority so as to ease its implementation without corruption or misappropriation of funds. Effort to provide the enabling infrastructure and facilities such as libraries, laboratories, vocational workshops, etc. to fast-track the implementation of the policy as stipulated should be put in place by the government and all stakeholders in education. Frequent training and re-training of teachers should be advocated as well as efforts to embark on regular teaching audit should be undertaken by the government so as to improve on the quality of teaching among teachers and the extent to which the students are coping with their respective teachers.

## REFERENCES

- Adeyemi T. O. (2007). Teacher Preparation and Availability for Achieving Basic Education in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Humanity and Social Science Journal*, 2(2), 159-168.
- Amaele, S. (1998). Nigerian Education and Its Commitment to Moral Values: *An Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria.*
- Amuche, C. I., Kukwi, I. J. (2013). An Assessment of Stakeholders' Perception of the Implementation of Universal Basic Education in North-Central Geo-Political Zone of Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(3), 158-167
- Babalola, S. K. (2000). Blue Print for the Management of the Universal Basic at the Secondary School Level. Paper presented at a National Workshop organized by all Nigeria Conference of Principals of Secondary School.
- Bayelsa State Government, Ministry of Education. 2000-2013. Basic Junior Secondary School Enrolment between 2000 and 2013, Yenegoa
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN) (2013). *Edition National Policy on Education (6<sup>th</sup> Edition)*. Lagos: NERDC Press.

- Idumange, J. (2012). Free Education in Bayelsa State: working the talk. Retrieved from <http://www.thenigerianvoice.com/news/83449/1/free-education-in-bayelsa-state-working-thetalk.html>.
- Ivowi, U. M. O. (2007). Telescoping Curriculum and Instruction in Nigeria. WCCI 4th Biennial Seminal Lecture, held at NERDC, Sheda-Abuja on 23rd October 2007.
- Nakpodia, E. D. (2011). Teacher Factor in the Implementation of Universal Basic Education Programme in Junior Secondary School in South Senatorial District of Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research*, 3(10), 286-293.
- Obima, A. (2006). The Nigerian Education times No 12 Nov. 2006. In *International Journal Innovative Educ. Research* pp.10–16.
- Ogbuka, C. (2000). The Punch Gearing up for the Universal Basic Education, Lagos. July 25, p.25.
- Oloko, B. A. (1990). Evolution for prevention of child labour and for working children (28–31). International Child Labour Seminar, Amsterdara.
- Oroka, O. (2005). Deregulation of Education and Citizenship Right to Education in Nigeria: A Paper presented at the Philosophy of Education Association of Nigeria (PEAN), University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Tide Newspaper April (2010). Bayelsa Ready for UBE programmes–Chairman.
- Yoloye, A. (2004). Concept of Basic Education. *Journal of Education and Practice*. Retrieved from [www.liste.org/](http://www.liste.org/).
- Yusuf, A., & Ajere, R. O. (2011). Universal Basic Education (UBE) in Nigeria. Retrieved 15th March 2012 from on [www.ubeonline.gov.ng](http://www.ubeonline.gov.ng)