

FUNDING OF PRIMARY EDUCATION: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR
PRIMARY SCHOOL EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT
AJUDEONU Helen I., Ph. D

FUNDING OF PRIMARY EDUCATION: ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR PRIMARY SCHOOL EDUCATION DEVELOPMENT

AJUDEONU Helen I. , Ph. D

Faculty of Education

Delta State University, Agbor.

E-mail: helen.ajudeonu@unidel.edu.ng; ajudeonu.helen@gmail.com

Abstract

The National policy on education placed much value on primary education as the first phase of education which is the bedrock of all levels of education. This paper investigated the funding of primary education and its implications for primary school education development. The population consisted of all head teachers as administrators. A sample of two hundred and seventy head teachers were randomly but purposively selected to allow for equal representation. Questionnaire was the instrument employed in the study. Data was analysed using descriptive statistic of frequency count, percentages, mean and standard deviation. The hypotheses were tested with t-test at 0.05 level of significance. The study revealed that the sources of funding public primary school education were both governmental and non-governmental sources. It also highlighted the roles played by Local Government Education Authority LGEA in funding primary education. Constraining factors to effective funding of education included low allocation to primary school, corruption in the financial administration of fund among others. The under-funding of primary education has adverse implication for educational development. The local Government Education Authority played a prominent role in the funding of public primary education in their area of Jurisdiction. Therefore it was recommended that there should be true commitment and demonstration of government will power in providing adequate fund for primary school education. Local Government Education Authority should ensure proper accountability and transparency in the management of fund.

Keywords: Primary education, Funding, implications, education development.

Introduction

The future of any country is determined by its educational system. Education continues to be the main tool for promoting both individual and social economic empowerment as well as for ending poverty. Unfortunately, one of the major

problems now hurting education in Nigeria is insufficient funding. We have witnessed a steady reduction in infrastructure, human resource development, and accessibility to high-quality education over the last few decades. Ogbonnaya (2012) defined funding as a sum of money set aside or made accessible for a specific purpose. It is also known as money or financial assets. In other terms, funding is the sum of money required to support a current project or program for advancement in the future. Primary education spending is now acknowledged on a global scale as an excellent development tool. Since primary education is the foundational level of any educational system, it requires more adequate public finance support than any other level of education. Belinger & Fletcher (2014) opined that aid to funding education has been declining; and between 2009-2012 the aid to basic education fell by 20%, stating that only 25% of countries in Africa today adhere to the recommended 6% of Gross National Product (GDP) in financing education to obtain better quality education. Furthermore, Aguba & Ani (2016) observed that the government of Nigeria has not fulfilled the recommendation of United Nation Educational Scientific and culture Organization (UNESCO) of setting aside 26% of their budget to education sector.

Bozimo & Sanda (2007) noted that the missionaries in the mid 19th century laid emphasis on primary education as a means for enhancing evangelization in the country. According to them, teachers then were made to believe that their reward was in heaven and were simply living on charity and the free will offerings and gifts from the host community and the mission. They further noted that even though teacher had no good income then, they had prestige and honour. Isma'il (2001:75-87) noted that educational financing has not been uniform in practice from state to state and local government to local government. This trend, according to him is rooted in the manner by which education was introduced, embraced and managed. While western education was embraced with

enthusiasm in the south, it was received with apathy in the north because of cultural, religious and geographical reasons.

In September 1976, with 8.2 million primary school students nationwide enrolled, the Universal Primary Education (UPE) program was introduced by the country's then-head of state, (Rtd) General Olusegun Obasanjo. 48, 780 primary school teachers were trained for the program. There was 11, 220 fewer instructors than the 66,000 expected. Because of this, the government hired retired but healthy instructors on contracts, withdrew third-year students from a five-year program for a year before sending them back to their training facilities, and hired auxiliary teachers (Ogbonnaya, 2010).

The federal government under former president Olusegun Obasanjo launched the Universal Basic Education (UBE) scheme in 1999 to provide free compulsory basic education, a free adult literacy program among its citizens as a means of eradicating illiteracy in the nation, and free junior secondary education in an effort to realize the misguided Universal Primary Education (UPE) scheme. Government cannot effectively administer education in the country on its own because it is a costly endeavor. This is demonstrated by the old Universal Primary Education (UPE) program, which during the federal military administration of 1976 experienced repeated setbacks and failed due to insufficient funding.

The head teacher is in charge of the elementary school. In order to help the primary school students, teaching staff, support staff, and the administration of the school achieve its goals and objectives, the head teacher serves as the institution's administrator. The head teacher is responsible for ensuring the smooth operation of the school, for ensuring that he and his staff carry out their responsibilities effectively and efficiently in order to fulfill the goals and objectives of the school, and for being held accountable for the management of funds. By Decree 3 of 1991, Local Government Education Authority were established to oversee and finance primary education in each local government district across the nation (Nwosu, 2005). Nwosu added that the Decree gives local government education authorities the authority to hire teachers and non-teaching staff for grades 01–06 in their areas of jurisdiction, as well as to pay their

salaries and allowances, submit accounts and monthly returns to the state Primary Schools Board, which is now known as the State Universal Basic Education. How can they perform these different tasks without sufficient funding? It is necessary for Local Government Authorities to explore for alternative methods to finance primary education in the nation because it would undoubtedly be challenging. The government chooses Local Government Education Secretary to monitor and carry out the duties outlined in Decree 3 of 1991 as a statutory body established by Decree. In other words, the Local Government Education Secretary are responsible for overseeing the institutions that make up the primary school system in their respective regions.

In Nigeria, local government councils are responsible for managing federation account monies allocated to basic education. Charles (2023) posited that primary education is the foundation to every formal education system and funding is essential to their level of education. He further stated that the LGEA is responsible for the administrative and management of primary schools. The way money is spent in Delta State is not encouraging because not enough money is available to manage the state's basic schools. As a result, this frequently results in a variety of other issues, including a delay in the payment of primary school teachers' salaries and benefits, a lack of teaching staff, a lack of learning-appropriate school facilities, a lack of infrastructure, a lack of supplies for teaching materials, a lack of equipment, a lack of funds for efficient supervision, and more. This has an impact on the quality of elementary education in Delta State since there are not enough teachers in the classrooms to accommodate the growing number of pupils, and the learning environment is not conducive.

The nation's policy makers are aware of the value of primary education as the first phase in which the foundation of education is set. Because the federal, state, or local governments cannot bear the burden of paying primary education alone, they should look for alternative mechanisms for doing so in Nigeria. As a result, the need for enhancing Local Government Education Authorities in funding primary schools is impending. This is because Local Government Authorities don't seem to be meeting expectations for primary level education; as a result, the researchers has been looking for ways to improve

how Local Government Authorities in Delta State support primary schools.

Literature Review

No education programme at any level can be managed without funds. Funds remains one of the most important factors of the management of education in any country. There abound studies on primary school education funding. In a research carried out by Nakpodia (2011), it showed that government contributed immensely to funding of Universal Basic Education in Delta State. Also the parents Teachers associations (PTAS) and non-governmental organizations equally contributed in the provision of instructional materials and building of classroom blocks. In another study by Alabi (2010) on matters of primary school funding in Lagos State It revealed that primary school was under-funded and sought away to improve the modalities of funding primary education. Agbai et al (2021) in their study of comparative study of Education funding in Nigeria, identified low funding of education as the primary cause of poverty and in equality in Nigeria. Also inadequate funding of education by the government of Nigeria was also reported.

In a similar vein, Agala (2000) on a study on analysis of the role of local government and local government Education authorities in supporting primary education in Delta State, one of the major findings is that there were supportive roles from local government through the local government education authorities.

Another study by Ajudeonu (2013) titled Towards Effecting Funding of Primary Education on for Quality Assurance: The Role of Stakeholders. The paper identified obstacles militating agent the fund of primary education to include lack of political will, inconsistency in policy formation, corruption and more. Also in the research carried out by Egberibin (2014) on Modalities for moving the Funding of primary schools by Local Government Education Authorities in Bayelsa State. It showed that funding of education have implications on primary schools level as the basic and foundation of all levels of education Egberibin (2014). These studies shed lights on the funding of primary school education in various dimension and the implications of funding on

primary education.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to the investigate the funding of primary school education and its implications on primary educational development. The specific objective to:

- Σ identify the sources for funding public primary school education
- Σ determine the extent of the Local Government Education Authority's involvement in the funding of public primary school education
- Σ identify the factors constraining the effective funding of public primary school education
- Σ discuss the implications of inadequate funding on public primary school educational development.

Research Questions

- i. What are the various sources of finding public primary school education?
- ii. To what extent is the local government education authority finding public primary school education?
- iii. What are the constraints hindering the effective finding of public primary school education?

Hypotheses

- H₀1: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female head teachers on the factor hindering the effective funding of primary school education.
- H₀2: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female head teacher on the implications of inadequate finding on primary school educational development.

Methodology

The study was empirical using the descriptive design. The descriptive design was adopted as appropriate to enable the researchers to gather reliable information on the respondents on the funding of public primary school education. According to Nworgu (2015) the design allow the

collection and analyzing of data from only a few people or items considered to be representation of the entire group. The study was carried out in the North Senatorial District of Delta State, comprising of nine local Government Areas in Delta State. The population for the study comprised of all head teachers of the 415 public primary school in the area under the state Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEB) Asaba. The sample size for the study was two hundred and seventy head teachers both male and female selected from urban and rural public primary school randomly selected. Head teachers were purposively selected from each of the nine local government area to allow for equal representation. Since some local government had more schools. The questionnaire was constructed on likert type scale of (strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree). The questionnaire has two sections. Section A sought to elicit information on the respondents personal data of age, Gender and work-experience. Section B was

made up of four clusters with items based on the research questions. The questionnaire is titled: Funding of Primary School. Education – Issues and Implications for Educational Development (FPSELLED) have four six items. The instrument was face validated by experts in faculty of educations of university of Delta Agbor and tested for reliability using Cronbach alpha with index of 0.81, 0.86, 0.72 and 0.83. respectively for the four clusters with over all coefficient index of 0.84. This was an indication that the instrument reliable for the study. The researchers distributed the questionnaire with the help of trained research assistants for easy administration and retrieval. Two hundred and seventy questionnaire were distributed, two hundred and sixty two were referred but only two hundred and fifty were found usable questionnaire for data analysis. The data was analysed descriptively with frequency count, percentages, mean, standard deviation and the hypotheses was tested using t-test of 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Research Question 1: What are the various sources of funding public primary education?

Table I: Respondents' mean ratings on the various sources of funding public primary school education

S/N	Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
1.	Government allocation – grants (capital, recurrent and special	3.08	1.67
2.	Taxes (Direct and indirect)	2.86	0.73
3.	School fees	2.75	0.54
4.	Education Trust fund (EFT)	2.77	0.63
5.	Foreign/External Aids (UNESCO, WORLD BANK ETC)	2.61	0.70
6.	Education Levies	3.24	1.46
7.	Community efforts and donations (cash/kind)	2.83	0.88
8.	Payment by parents/guardians (PTA)	2.85	0.79
9.	Private organizations (NGOS)	2.66	0.72
10.	Proceed from school activities – renting of playground, hall, form products Ceremonies-cultural day, interhouse sport. etc	2.81	0.74
Grand mean		2.85	0.88

The responses presented on table revealed that all the head teachers agreed on the school education. The items ranged from 2.61 to 3.24 with a grand mean of 2.85 and standard deviation of 0.88. With

the aggregate mean score of 2,85 above the criteria mean of 2.50, it indicates that all respondents accepted all item as sources of finding public primary school education.

Research Question 2: To what extent is the local government education authority funding public primary school education?

Table 2: Respondents frequency and percentage ratings of the extent of the funding of public primary school education by Local Government Education Authority

S/N	Items	4 VHE	3 HE	2 LE	1 VLE
1.	Prompt payment of staff salaries (Teaching & non-teaching)	198 (79.2)	43 (17.2)	7 (2.8)	2 (0.8)
2.	Payment of over-head cost to head teachers	22 (8.8)	26 (10.4)	122 (48.8)	80 (32)
3.	Construction of classrooms in primary schools	66 (26.4)	89 (35.6)	48 (19.2)	47 (18.8)
4.	Provision of furniture to primary schools	34 (13.6)	41 (16.4)	99 (39.6)	6 (30.4)
5.	Construction of school libraries	26 (10.4)	42 (16.8)	100 (40)	82 (32.8)
6.	Distribution of registers and diaries to schools	85 (34)	93 (37.2)	36 (14.4)	36 (14.4)
7.	Distribution of teaching and learning materials	74 (29.6)	63 (25.2)	51 (20.4)	62 (24.8)
8.	Provision of information communication technologies facilities	10 (4)	37 (14.8)	105 (42)	98 (39.2)
9.	Maintenance of primary school infrastructure and facilities	45 (18)	89 (35.6)	71 (28.4)	45 (18)
10.	General maintenance of the public primary schools in the local government area	66 (26.4)	95 (38)	70 (28)	19 (7.6)

Table 2 determined the extent of funding of public primary school education by local Government Education Authority. The responses revealed that LGEA funded public primary school education was to high extent in area like prompt payment of salaries and allowance, distribution of registers and diaries and general maintenance of the

schools with means of 3.74, 2.80 and 2.83 respectively. While funding of public primary school education was low in payment of overhead cost to head teachers and in the provision of information communication technologies facilities with means of 1.96 and 1.83 respectively.

Research Question 3: What are the factors constraining the effective funding of public primary school education

Table 3: Respondents' mean ratings on the factors constraining the effective funding of public primary school education.

S/N	Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
1.	Low/less allocation to primary education	2.69	0.61
2.	Lack of data for proper allocation of fund to the sector	2.74	0.88
3.	Politicization of appointment to into LGEA's post	2.81	0.74
4.	Unstable government educational policies	2.60	0.72
5.	Irresponsibilities among individuals in the administration of primary education	2.70	0.69
6.	Interference by the local government in primary school funding	2.83	0.88
7.	Inadequate funding of educational facilities and equipment	2.85	0.79
8.	Corruption in the financial administration of primary education	2.86	0.73

S/N	Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
9.	Less contribution from the private sectors	2.75	0.54
10.	Government as the sole source for finding primary education	2.77	0.63
	Unequal distribution of funds	2.61	0.34
	Grand mean	2.75	0.68

The result on table 3 showed head-teacher perception on the factors constraining the effective funding of public primary school education. The head teachers agreed on all the

eleven items with the item on corruption in the financial administration of public primary school education having the highest mean of 2.85 unequal distribution of funds with a mean of 2.61 as the lowest mean.

Research Question 4: Mean rating

What are the implications of inadequate finding on public primary school educational development?

Table 4: Respondents mean ratings on the factors constraining the effective funding of public primary school education.

S/N	Items	$\bar{x}$	SD
1.	Poor attendance to school by teachers and pupils	2.19	0.61
2.	Inadequate preparation for lesson by teachers	2.74	0.88
3.	Poor quality of primary school products	2.81	0.74
4.	Poor morale for teachers	2.60	0.72
5.	Lack of modern information technology equipment	2.71	0.69
6.	Less of confidence by the general public in primary school education	2.87	0.88
7.	Irregular academic sessions due to teacher's strike	2.56	0.79
8.	Poor infrastructure facilities in primary schools	3.00	0.54
9.	Poor performance of teachers in their duties	2.98	0.83
10.	Possible closure of schools	1.79	0.57
	Grand Total	2.62	0.72

The result on table 4- revealed that the mean responses of the respondents on the implications of inadequate funding on public primary school educational Development. The head teachers agreed on all the items as the implications of inadequate funding on the public primary school

educational development except for items 1 and 10 with means of 2.19 and 1.79 respectively which is below the mean bench mark of 2.50. The grand mean of 2.62 proves that inadequate funding have implication for public primary school educational.

Hypotheses one

Ho 1: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female head teachers on the factors hindering the effective funding of public primary school education.

Table 5: t-test analysis of male and female head teachers mean responses on the factors hindering the effective funding of public primary school education.

Teachers	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	DF	T. cal.	p. value	Remark
Male	90	3.88	0.96	230	1.34	0.69	NS
Female	100	3.05	0.83				

Table 5 showed t. calculated of 1.34 and P. value significant of 0.69. since the significant P. value of 0.69 is less than the t. calculated of 1.34. The null hypothesis is upheld. Therefore, there is no

significance difference in the male and female head-teachers responses on the factors hindering the effective funding of public primary school education.

Hypothesis two

Ho2: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female head-teachers on the implications of inadequate funding on public primary school education

Table 6: t. test analysis of male and female head-teachers mean responses on the implications of inadequate funding on public primary school education.

Teachers	N	$\bar{x}$	SD	DF	t. cal.	p. value	Remark
Male	90	4.11	1.12	230	1.88	0.38	NS
Female	160	4.04	1.20				

Table 6 showed t. calculated value of 1.88 and significant p. value of 0.38. Since the significant p. value is greater at 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, there is no significant difference in the mean responses of male and female head-teachers on the implications of inadequate funding on public primary school education.

Discussion of Findings

The head-teachers accepted the items as sources for funding primary school education with education levels with the highest means scores of 3.24. this findings is in agreement with Nakpodia (2011). The source of funding primary education were both governmental and non-governmental but the Local Government Education Authority provided most of the fund. The result of this research agreed with the findings of Obidike (2014), who reported that educational institution got fund by launching and receiving donations from people; as observed in this study that proceed from school activities and donations from community in cash or kind were sources of fund for public primary education.

The study revealed that the Local Government Education Authority to a large extent was involved in the funding of primary school education. The study is line with the findings of Ogbonnaya (2010) that stated that LGEAS were involved in the funding of public primary education. This could be traced to in compliance with Decree 3 of 1991 which placed the financing of primary education under local government district across the nation. But the study pointed out that the LGEAS did not meet up in the areas of over-head cost payment to schools and in the

provision of information communication technologies facilities.

The finding on the factors constraining the effective funding of primary school education revealed that many factors are hindering the funding of public primary school education included low allocation to primary education, corruption in financial administration, lack of data for proper planning among others? The finding agreed with Ajudeonu (2013). Ajudeonu 2013 highlighted that corruption, lack of data, lack of political will and commitment were obstacles to funding primary education in Nigeria.

On the implication of inadequate funding on public primary school education, it resulted in poor quality of primary school products, poor morale for teachers, lack of facilities and poor teachers performance. This result is in agreement with the research works of Ajudeonu (2013) and Nwagwu 1989. In their researches they reported that inadequate funding result in lack of learning infrastructure, inadequate teachers and multiplicity of levies.

The means of the male and female Head-teachers were subjected to t-test on their views on factors constraining the effective funding of public primary school education and the implication of inadequate funding of public primary school education.

The two hypotheses were upheld. The male and female head-teachers have the same opinion and ideas towards factors constraining the funding of public primary schools and implications of inadequate funding of public primary school education. In the same vein, the researchers

believed the same problems affected the head teachers irrespective of gender in their administrative work as managers of their various school.

Conclusion

The success of public primary school education depends on proper and adequate funding bearing in mind the place and crucial role of primary education as the rock and foundation of all other levels of education adequate funding is a necessity. The government and non-governmental bodies founded public primary education in the state. It is worthy to mention that the Local Government Education Authority's funding of public primary school education was quite impressive and encouraging. There were factors which constrained the effective funding of public primary school education which had implications on the development of primary education.

Recommendations

In consideration of the findings, the following recommendations are made:

- There should be true commitment and demonstration of true commitment by providing adequate fund for primary school education.
- There should be proper accountability and transparency in the management of funds by the Local Government Education Authority Managers.
- Appointment to position of administrator in the LGEAS should be based on educational qualification not politics.
- Apart from funds, other facilities should be provided to enhance public primary education
- Non-governmental agencies should participate in funding public primary school education – such as individuals, co-operate bodies among other.

Reference:

Aguba, C.R. & Ani .A (2016) Extent of utilization of innovative source funding strategies to increase internally generated revenue. A paper presented at the first Annual National Conference of the Department of Educational Management, Enugu State

University of Science and Technology. (ESUT) 13-16. June, 2016.

- Ajudeonu, H.I. (2013) Towards Effective funding of primary Education quality Assurance: The Role of stakeholders. Research in Education. 19. pp 250-255
- Akumah A.H (2012), Adequate Funding : A need for quality assurance in vocation. Mediterranean journal of social science, 4(150), 105-109.
- Az Research Consult, (2021). Approaches to funding primary schools by local government Education Authorities in Nigeria.
- Belinger.A; & B. Fletacher (2014) Non traditional finacy for education: EPS-PEAKS. DFIS
- Bozimo and Sanda (2007). Historical Perspective on the funding of primary Education in Nigeria. Gida do (2 0 0 2) . www.academic.edu> An appraisal of universal basic Education system in Nigeria.
- Charles ogun (2023). Local Government and management of primary education fund. Business Day Jan, 12, 2023
- Edward A; Anthony O. & Funminiye E. (2021) comparative study of Education funding in Nigeria – Journal of Education and Practice. D01:10 7176/12-5.01
- Eze .T. Amogechukwu & Chidobi R.U (2017) “Extent of Head Teachers' Utilizations of Innovative Sources of Funding Primary Schools in Enugu State of Nigeria. Journal of Education e-learning Research D01:10.20448/Journal.509.2017.42.41.4 5
- Ismail (2001). Scholarly article for Ismail 2001, Educational financing: Scholar .google.com
- Maduasli (2005). Approaches for funding of schools by Local Government Authorities in Nigeria. Eduschooler.com
- Isabela Chomba. (August, 4th, 2020). Present way of funding primary Education, University of the Nelson D.L, Tierney M.J (2003). World Bank International Organization, Cambridge.org
- Nworgu, B.G. (2015) Educational research Ibadan. Wisdom Publishers Ltd.
- Nwagwu (1989). Current Issue 1 Educational

- Management in Nigeria. (Book).
Ijhumas.com
- Obidike, N.D. (2014) Funding education for sustainable development in Nigeria: challenges and the way forward. Journal of Education and Practice 5(20)51-56
- World Ban Annual Report (2003) Volume 1, year in review, Volume 2 financial state and appendix