

## **Comparative Analysis of Infrastructural Provision for Basic Education between Urban and Rural Areas in Senatorial Districts of Oyo State**

**Oni, Joshua Ogunmola**

08057553170

[onijoshua38@gmail.com](mailto:onijoshua38@gmail.com)

**Babayemi, John Oluwole**

08038521726

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

**Ibrahim, Jamiu Akinola**

08139294235

[jamiuakinola337@gmail.com](mailto:jamiuakinola337@gmail.com)

**Adeniji, Peter Olubunmi**

08038404110

[olubunmipeter@097gmail.com](mailto:olubunmipeter@097gmail.com)

<sup>1,3</sup>Tai Solarin University of Education, College of Specialized and Professional Education, Department of Counseling Psychology and Educational Foundations, Ijagun, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Department of Science Education, Akwa Ibom State University, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

<sup>4</sup>Institute of Education, Faculty of Education, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti.

### **Abstract**

The study compared the Infrastructural provision for Basic Education in urban and rural areas, highlighting the disparities in access to educational facilities. The study was guided by two research hypotheses and adopted quasi-experimental design, combined with sample of 185 head-teachers, comprising of 38 males and 147 females. A self-developed instrument of 15 items called Pupils School Head-teachers Questionnaire (PSHQ,  $r = 0.75$ ) was employed to collect data from the respondents. The results showed that there exist statistical significant difference in the distribution of infrastructure among schools in the urban and rural areas ( $t_{(-2.391)}$ ,  $df = 183$ ,  $p < .05$ ) in favour of rural areas. Similar trend was obtained on Senatorial Districts basis, that there is a statistical significant difference ( $F_{(2,182)} = 6.249$ ,  $p_{(0.002)} < .05$ ) in the distribution of infrastructure for basic education among the three Senatorial Districts. It is then concluded that the provision of basic infrastructure in schools had positive impact on school's enrollment. Nonetheless, there is still need to improve more on infrastructural provision based on the findings. It is recommended that government should increase her commitment towards provision of infrastructural facilities in rural areas where most schools are located and further study on whether provision contribute to pupils' academic achievement should be carried out.

**Keywords:** Basic Education, Infrastructural provision, rural and urban

### **Introduction**

Western education was introduced by the missionaries and colonial masters in the 17<sup>th</sup> century in Nigeria with the aim and objectives of developing lower and middle class workers for mission works. This education later transformed into Basic education and Nigerian citizens began to accept it. Hence, it began to witness series of challenges ranging from overcrowding of the classroom, shortage of qualified teachers, insufficient furniture, shortage of instructional materials, to mention but a few. In order to find solutions to these challenges, Nigerian education sector witnessed educational reforms, in Western Region with Universal Primary Education of 1955. Ever since then various education reforms had been taking place until recently. This include; Universal Primary Education of 1977-1978, National Primary Education Commission of 1988, re-establishment of National

Primary Education Commission of 1993, Universal Basic Education of 1999, Education for All of 2015 and Better Education Service Delivery for All of 2017. The Federal Republic of Nigeria, National Policy on Education (FRN, NPE, 2014) defined education as a process of transferring culture and dissemination of knowledge either to ensure social control or to guarantee rational direction of the society or both. Asodike and Ikpitibo (2014) noted that education is perceived in four ways viz: means to economic prosperity, solution to unemployment, key to scientific technological advancement and source of social equity. Opoh, Okou and Ikang (2015) referred to education as tool and knowledge acquired by individuals to function effectively in the society. With all these definitions of education, it can be seen as a means of acquiring skills, values, knowledge, attitudes etc in order to be acceptable and useful members of the society. So, as education equips the individuals with these fundamental lifelines for survival in the society, it can be aptly described as Basic Education.

The issue of Basic Education dates back to 1952 in Western Region of Nigeria. The region comprised the eight provinces namely Ibadan, Oyo, Ijebu, Abeokuta, Ondo, Lagos (Colony), Edo and Delta. The Premier of the Region His Excellency Late Chief Jeremiah Obafemi Awolowo proposed the Universal Primary Education Scheme to the Regional House of Assembly. This was ratified and the Scheme took off in 1955. The Universal Primary Education was free and compulsory then, with the aim of developing human beings for future economic growth and development (Ajayi, 2014). It started in the Western region in 1955 and continued till 1966, when the military took over the Nigerian government. He stressed further that, other regions (Eastern and Northern) embraced the free Primary Education, but it crashed because its take off was not adequately planned like that of the Western Region (Awokoya, 1952). Meanwhile, Alase (2017) observed poor strategic planning, poor implementation of education reform and mismanagement of education system as problems of UPE in Nigeria.

Along the line, Nigeria soon realized that the British system of Education did not fit-in into her culture and system. By 1973, a seminar to restructure the inherited British colonial education policy was launched by the National Education Research and Development Council (NERDC) and this gave birth to an indigenous system of education under the National Policy on Education (1976-1977). The Universal Primary Education (UPE) was launched in 1977 at the Federal level by Gen. Olusegun Obasanjo, with six years Basic Education Policy (FRN, NPE, 1977). This was reviewed in 1981 and 1990 to support national government development goals. Constant as the overhauling of the national education policy was, it wouldn't have been a problem if the stakeholders in education had closely monitored the sector to achieve the desired result. Mgbodili (2013) observed that education policies are not the problem of education system in Nigeria, for the fact that series of good education policies had been planned, set-up and executed in Nigeria without meaningful results.

Inappropriate and inadequate planning to sustain the policies had been the major problem. The infrastructural facilities in the schools affect school attendance and interest of the pupils. The infrastructural facilities in Nigerian schools before the intervention of Universal Basic Education Commission was pathetic ranging from poor furniture, non-functional toilets, absence perimeter fence in schools and poor learning equipment to mention but a few. Their deplorable and terrible situations were due to poor maintenance culture until they completely collapsed and were devastated. Infrastructural facilities are so important in determining the quality of teaching and learning. Allen et al. (2022) observed supply side interventions as educational inputs that targeted infrastructural provision of teaching materials, physical structure, sport facilities, re-training of teachers and hiring of extra teachers for schools. The actual supply of quantity and quality of resources for

educational institutions depend largely on financial capability of a nation. Even, when all inputs were supplied, thorough supervision and monitoring of these resources also necessary to have better results.

Meanwhile, these facilities were wallowing in neglect and deplorable decadence as they did not receive attention from government and other concerned stakeholders. Nugroho and Wibowo (2019) observed that school infrastructure as a mean to foster academic achievement of students through increasing students infrastructure in school, such as toilets, portable water, library, computer lab, school playing ground, classrooms are likely to affect quality of Basic Education in Nigeria. UNESCO (2015) ascertained that educational infrastructure such as libraries, toilets, furniture, buildings are inadequate and in dilapidated condition in Nigeria. The lingering issue now is to ascertain the situation of school infrastructure in relation to their availability to both urban and rural areas of Nigeria.

Salisu (2016) noted that the impact of infrastructure in national development, such as dilapidated and inadequate infrastructure cannot be overlooked and will jeopardize any nation's development and progress, education inclusive. Alkadri, Ningrum, Santoso and Afriansyah (2017) ascertained poor and insufficient infrastructure as a threat to quality education. Though UBEC is clamouring for quality education, this cannot be achieved unless the quality inputs for education are available in the right locations. Okoye (2016) and Sholihah (2019) were in agreement that schools have to put in place quality infrastructure such as furniture, laboratory, classrooms, libraries, play grounds etc to provide quality education.

Asodike and Ikpitibo (2014) reporting on school infrastructure noted that the component of infrastructure will ensure successful teaching and learning, which will eventually improve Primary Education in Nigeria. In Oyo State, before the intervention of SUBEB on infrastructural facilities, quite a number of schools were in a deplorable state, as a good number of public Primary School building roofs had been blown off by wind. Some were battling with poor furniture; some operated in thatch roofs, one-half-wall structures, classroom demarcated with plywoods; majority of schools were not fenced with no gates; many did not have electricity supplies, some that had electrical fittings had been vandalized by hoodlums. Many schools were not supplied with furniture for both pupils and teachers. In this kind of situation, how could meaningful learning take place? Meanwhile, Conolly and Lampe (2016), Barrelet, Treves, Shmis, Ambasz and Ustinova (2019) and Marmoah, Adela and Frauziah (2019) affirmed that high quality infrastructure such as good classrooms with furniture, well stocked library and well equipped laboratory facilities, improved pupils outcomes and reduced dropout rates. Good building, electricity, modern toilet, good and quality furniture are facilities expected in school setting to attain better and quality education (Amsterdam, 2013; Herwan, Aswandi and Chair, 2018; Alam and Kanako, 2019 and Eton, 2021). Furthermore, Radhika (2019) ascertained that school infrastructures increase students' enrolment and enable individuals to be productive in their working environment.

The chairman of Oyo SUBEB (Dr Adeniran Nureni) revealed the stand of the State government on upward review of education budgetary allocation in order to improve education sector in the State. By 2019, education budget was raised from three (3) percent to ten (10) percent; 2020 budgetary allocation was 22 percent, while that of 2021 was 21 percent. This avails the State an opportunity to pay the counterpart fund to UBEC, in order to access the UBE fund. With accessibility of this fund, Oyo SUBEB had been paying attention to improvement of State's basic educational infrastructure (in the three Senatorial Districts) which include construction, re-construction and renovation of over seven hundred classrooms and toilets, perimeter fencing of schools, provisions of modern boreholes, solar installation, ICT room, furniture for pupils and teachers among

others (<https://subeb.oyostate.gov.ng> >oyo). A good school infrastructure enable children to study hard, improve their attendance, arouse pupils' interest and improve their academic performance (Premium Times). The challenges with infrastructure in our schools are real and the concerned stakeholders UBEC and SUBEB are trying to ensure that the best is achieved for the education of Nigerian children by providing infrastructure in schools for academic and non-academic activities. Burde and Linden (2013) supported construction of schools in rural communities that schools built in those communities would be a succour to pupils from rural areas, because they would no longer be travelling long distances to attend schools in urban centers.

All the UBEC programmes are implemented through close collaboration partnerships between UBEC and State Universal Basic Education Board (SUBEBs), Local Government Universal Basic Education Authority (LGUBEAs) and Basic Education stakeholders at all levels, though the UBEC is at the forefront of Basic Educational national intervention but also welcomes full involvement of individuals, corporate entities, civil societies and community groups to achieve education for ALL (EFA). Then, Education for All should be the responsibility of all, the stakeholders in education cannot be left out on the issue of infrastructure intervention programmes. They are to be provided with relevant information about their roles and core responsibilities in achieving the goals of UBE on intervention programmes. Hence, the development of any nation could be directly traced to her schools products.

### **Statement of the Problem**

The basic education in Nigeria all awhile had been neglected until about two decades ago when federal government launched UBE. The major concern of the then administration was to revamped Basic education by attending to the state of infrastructure in our schools, absence of functional libraries, inadequate furniture, prevalence of absence/non-equipped school laboratories and many other flagrant process abuses such as locating projects in wrong places, misappropriation of fund etc. This prompted UBEC to put in place series of intervention programmes, ranging from renovations and construction of modern classrooms, provision of furniture, recruitment of Federal Scheme Teachers, provision of textbooks for teachers and pupils, sinking of boreholes to mentioned but a few, aimed at checkmating the observed decadence in other to provide the qualitative and quantitative Basic Education for Nigerians. The issue of locating school infrastructure where they were not mostly needed attracted the interest of this researcher, thereby this study compared the basic schools infrastructure distribution between urban and rural areas.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The main objective of this study was to compare the provision of infrastructure for Basic Education between urban and rural areas in Oyo State. Specifically, the study:

1. Verified the distribution of infrastructures among the three Senatorial Districts
2. Ascertain the difference in infrastructural distribution within rural and urban areas

### **Hypotheses**

Two hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance in this study;

1. There is no significant difference in the distribution of infrastructure for basic education among the three Senatorial Districts.
2. There is no significant difference in the distribution of infrastructure provision between rural and urban areas

## **Methods**

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. This design was appropriate for the conditions/events already present and data collected were used to investigate a possible relationship between the observed events. Therefore data collected from heterogeneous groups were analysed to make inferences and generalizations on the entire population at the same time. The target population for this study comprised of all Head Teachers under Oyo State Universal Basic Education. Oyo State has three Senatorial districts namely Oyo South, Oyo Central and Oyo North with 9 LGAs, 11 LGAs and 13 LGAs respectively. The head teachers were considered appropriate as respondents for the study because they were the heads/administrators in public basic schools. The researcher used multi stage random sampling technique in the selection of sample for this study. The first stage involved the selection of four (4) Local Government Areas from each of the three (3) Senatorial Districts by simple random sampling which produced a total of twelve (12) Local Government Areas using the hat and draw method. Each of the names of the Local Government in each Senatorial District was written on a piece of paper, folded and put in a tray. After shuffling and reshuffling, four Local Governments (Egbeda, Lagelu, Oluyole and Oyo west) were picked by the researcher from the Oyo Central Senatorial Districts. The same sampling technique was repeated to select Irepo, Iseyin, Itesiwaju and Olorunsogo Local Government Areas from Oyo North Senatorial Districts, while Ibadan North, Ibadan South East, Ibadan South West and Ibarapa Central were selected from Oyo South Senatorial District. For the second stage, stratified random sampling technique was used to select rural-urban schools, schools selected from rural areas were from villages, hamlets and remote areas while urban ones were selected in towns and cities and for the final stage, simple random technique was used to proportionately select 20% (185) head teachers as respondents for the study.

The Basic School Head Teachers` Questionnaire was designed by the researcher to gather relevant information from the head teachers. The instrument has two sections. Section A was on demographic information of the respondents and Section B consisted 15 items on matters relating to infrastructure facilities, and infrastructural distribution. The response format was four points likert type scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), Agree (A) and Strongly Agree (SA). The content validity method was adopted as it is most suitable to review, critique and adjust questionnaire items. Two experts in items construction from the Evaluation Department of Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun assisted in reviewing the items, as they thoroughly read through the items of the instrument and relate them carefully to the research objectives and research hypotheses. A pilot study was conducted on independent respondents in Afijio Local Government Area of Oyo State to test the reliability of the instruments. Thirty (30) Basic School Head Teachers Questionnaire (BSHTQ) were administered. The completed and returned questionnaires were analysed using Cronbach Alpha to determine the reliability of the instrument. The result of the reliability coefficient of Basic School Head-teacher Questionnaire (BSHTQ) was 0.75. The obtained reliability coefficient was high and there by the instrument was suitable and reliable for the study. A letter of introduction was collected from the Oyo State Universal Basic Education Commission Headquarters (The State SUBEB Chairman), to collect data from Department of Planning, Research and Statistics. Sampled Local Government Universal Basic Education Authorities (LGUBEAs) were visited and obtained permission from their Education Secretaries to used schools head-teachers under their supervision for the study. The researcher sought the permission of the Head teachers of the sampled Public Basic Schools in the selected Local Governments to assist in filling BSHTQ. The instrument was personally administered to the respondents in the field. They were briefed on the content and that the data collected would

be used for research purpose only. The researcher promptly retrieved the copies of the questionnaire to ensure security of the document. The state SUBEB Chairman, concerns Education Secretaries and all respondents were appreciated for their cooperation. The data collected from the respondents were subjected to both descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics of mean and standard deviation were used to present infrastructural facilities on each senatorial district, while the two research hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance using Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and t-test.

## Results

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference in the distribution of infrastructure for basic education among the three Senatorial Districts. This hypothesis was tested with Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and descriptive statistics and the Tables are shown below;

**Table 1: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) showing the difference in the distribution of infrastructure facilities across the three Senatorial Districts**

Source of variation	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F	p-value
Between groups	456.993	2	228.496	6.249	0.002
Within groups	6655.094	182	36.566		
Total	7112.086	184			

Table 1: showed that there is a statistical significant difference ( $F_{(2,182)} = 6.249$ ,  $p_{(0.002)} < .05$ ) in the distribution of infrastructure for basic education among the three Senatorial Districts. Hence, there are differences in the distribution of infrastructure facilities for Basic Education among the Senatorial Districts in the study. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

**Table 2: Descriptive statistics of infrastructural facilities based on the Senatorial Districts**

Senatorial Districts	No. of Head Teachers	Mean	Std. Deviation
Oyo Central	62	31.72	5.59
Oyo North	66	28.20	6.09
Oyo South	57	28.68	6.46
Total	185	29.53	6.22

Table 2: showed the descriptive statistics of infrastructural facilities based on the three senatorial districts. The distribution varies across the Senatorial districts thus, Oyo Central ( $M = 31.73$ ) receives most of the infrastructural facilities, followed by Oyo South ( $M = 28.68$ ) and lastly by Oyo North ( $M = 28.19$ ) respectively.

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference in the distribution of infrastructure provision between urban and rural areas. This hypothesis was tested with t-test and the Table is shown below;

**Table 3: Summary of t-test showing the difference in the distribution of infrastructure facilities between urban and rural areas**

Variable	Location	N	Mean	s.d	df	t-cal.
Distribution of infrastructure facilities	Urban	122	28.75	6.12	183	-2.319
	Rural	63	31.03	6.17		

Table 3: shows that there is a statistically significant difference ( $t_{(-2.391)}$  df = 183) in the distribution of infrastructure between urban and rural areas. Hence from the mean score ( $M = 31.0317$ ), schools in the rural areas

had a higher distribution of infrastructure facilities compared to those in urban areas in the study. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected.

### **Discussion of Findings**

The major findings from the data analysed and interpreted in this research are discussed below. The distribution of infrastructure for basic education among the three Senatorial Districts is statistically significant. This finding is consistent with the finding of Deinne (2021) who asserted that infrastructure distribution varies across Senatorial Districts. He stressed the reasons for uneven infrastructure distribution as poor access roads, poor housing and poor quality of life in coastal communities. All these hinder access for locating and provision of school infrastructure. In the view of Obed-Chukwuka and Rowell (2020) inequality in the distribution of infrastructural facilities in all government primary schools across the District is significant because politicians are fond of influencing the distribution of school infrastructure in favour of their Districts. Though their Districts may not qualify to possess such infrastructure or may not even need such, but for the fact that they had a say in the government, they locate the facilities in their domain. Wazzan (2017) linked the uneven education facilities to land size, population and distance between communities. The area with small land size and less population tends to have less numbers of schools with relative small amount of infrastructural located in such area. Hence the significant difference in the distribution of educational infrastructure. Alabi (2017) in her study in a Senatorial District disclosed the re-distribution of school infrastructure such as textbooks, chairs and desks, renovation of laboratories, etc. within the Senatorial District to improve students' performance and enhance educational standards across the Senatorial District. Furthermore, Shown (2019) reported that there is no significant relationship between school location and the provision and distribution of educational resources in the Senatorial District. He explained further that some schools have enough facilities without students while there were some schools with many students but no adequate resources, therefore essential planning tool is the way out to overcome the possibility of District inequalities in the provision and distribution of educational infrastructure.

Additionally, for distribution of infrastructural facilities between rural and urban areas, the result showed a statistically significant difference. The finding was in line with Mohan et al. (2017) who established the slightly significant difference in the distribution of infrastructural facilities between rural and urban areas and the variation depends on the professional development needs of teachers in either urban or rural areas. For instance, modern structure (building) of multi classrooms, ICT facilities, boreholes etc. were located in urban areas while building of three (3) to six (6) classrooms, wells, solar energy, and generators were located in rural communities. Alonge et al. (2021) found that rural areas were severely deprived of infrastructure especially schools, to the extent that communicable diseases then spread easily among school children because of poor sanitation, and lack of potable water. This challenge could have been avoided and prevented if school infrastructure were equidistributed between rural and urban. Xu et al. (2022) noticed even distribution of infrastructure among primary and middle schools while it was uneven in kindergarten between rural and urban areas. This therefore affirmed the significant difference in infrastructural distribution between urban and rural areas. Also Wood (2023) observed a wider gap of urban to rural infrastructure facilities distribution and the uneven distribution is limiting rural students to compete academically with their urban counterparts though they may have the capabilities to do so. While it corroborates that of Xu et al. (2022) and Wood (2023) Pandey et al. (2022) identified inequalities of infrastructural facilities available between urban and rural areas and that economic level and geographical dimension were the reasons that favored the urban in terms of the infrastructure distribution. More so, Aprajita (2021) posited that the

infrastructure distribution gap between urban and rural schools, the fact that quality, better, and more infrastructural facilities were possessed by urban schools when compared to schools in rural areas. He stressed further that, the reasons for preference for urban schools in the areas of infrastructure distribution were not given but this may not be unconnected with the socio-economic background and status of people living in urban centers.

## Conclusion

It could be concluded that UBEC had provided infrastructural facilities for Basic schools in Nigeria in order to maintain high quality standard education. The timely intervention on infrastructural provision in rural basic schools had encouraged the pupils on their academic pursuit.

## Recommendations

In view of the above, it is recommended that there is need for government through UBEC to further provide infrastructure for schools in rural areas and where it is necessary in urban. Also NGOs and philanthropists should be encouraged to assist on school intervention programmes.

## References

- Alabi, C. T. (2017, June 26). Kaduna spends ₦6.5bn on school infrastructure. *Daily Trust News*. <https://dailytrust.com/kadunaspent>.
- Alam, M. I. &, Kanako, S. (2019). The effects of electrification on school enrollment in Bangladesh: short and long run perspectives. *Energies*, 2(4), 629. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en12040629>
- Alase, A. (2017). The evolution of education in Nigeria: how has it impacted ordinary Nigerian firm pre-independence till present? *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 5(1), 2202-9478. <https://dx.doi.org/10.7575/aiac.ijels.v.5n1p:69t>
- Alkadir, H., Ningrum, T. A., Santoso, Y., & Afriansyah, H. (2017). Essentiality of management of facilities and infrastructure towards a number of students of early year's institution. *Paper presented at Int. Conference Early Childhood Education (ICECE, 2017)*
- Allen, W. J., Mahumaner, A., Riddellir, J., Rosenblat, T., Yang, D., & YU, H. (2022) Teaching and incentives: statistics or complements. *Economics of Education Review*, 91. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2022.10237>
- Alonge, O. Lawal, T., & Akindayo, O. (2021). Addressing the challenges of sustainable rural infrastructure delivery in Nigeria: Focus on Ondo North Senatorial District. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 11(2), 619-631.
- Amsterdam, C. (2013). School infrastructure in South Africa. Views and experiences of educators and students University of Pretoria, South Africa. <https://www.academia.edu/school...>
- Aprajita, V. (2021). Data: UDISE + report highlights the start difference in digital infrastructure into urban/rural and government/private schools. [google.com/imp/s/factly.in](https://google.com/imp/s/factly.in)
- Asodike, J. D., & Ikipitibo, C. L. (2014) Basic issues in primary education delivery Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, ESJ* 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.19044/esj.2012v8nlp%p>
- Awokoya, S. O. (1952). *Proposals for an education policy for the Western Region of Nigeria* (Laid on the tables of the Western Region Legislature by the Ministry of Education). Government Printing.
- Barrelt, P., Treves, A., Shmis, T., Ambasz, D., & Ustinova, M. (2019). The impact of school infrastructure on learning. *A synthesis of the evidence. The World Bank*.
- Bobbyi, H. (2012, December 2). Schools Infrastructure: UBEC to involve COREN in Projects Supervision. *Premium Times*. <https://www.premiumtimes.ng.schools.infrastructure>: UBEC
- Bobbyi, H. (2012, December 2). Schools infrastructure: UBEC to involve COREN in Projects Supervision. *Premium Times*. <https://www.premiumtimes.ng.schools.infrastructure>: UBEC
- Burde, D., and Linden, L. (2013). The effect of village based schools: Evidence from a randomized controlled trial in Afghanistan. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 5(3), 27-40
- Conolly, A., & Lampe, M. (2016). How and active learning classroom transformed IT executive management. *International System Education Journal (ISEDJ)*, 14 (1).
- Deinne, C. E. (2021). Inequalities in access to infrastructure amenities and sustainable development in Delta State, Nigeria. *Ghana Journal of Geography*. 13(2), 206-231. <https://dix.doi.org.4314/gig.v13i2>
- Eton, F. G. (2021). Class furniture and school infrastructure as determinants of preschoolers' performance on social habits. *World Atlas International Journal of Education & Management*, 4(1)
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1977). National policy on education. Pp 15.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014). National policy on education. Pp 2-19.



- Herwan, H., Aswands, A., & Chiar, M. (2018). The role of school committee in supporting the fulfillment of education facilities and infrastructure. <https://www.globalacademicgroup.com>>online.
- Marmoah, S., Adela, D., & Fauziah, M. (2019). Implementation of facilities and infrastructure management in public elementary schools. *Marvin, C. A (pp. 131-147). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.*
- Mgbodili, T. O. (2013). Fundamental in Education administration and planning. University of Nigeria Nsukka: *Magnet business enterprises*
- Mohan, P. P., Chand, D. D., & Lingaim, G. I. & Chand, D. D. (2017). Teachers' perceptions of the impact of professional development on learning and teaching a developing nation, *Australian Journal of Teacher Education, 42(11). 18-33.*
- Nugroho, A. A., & Wibowo, U. B. (2019). The influence of school infrastructure on student learning activeness: a research study advances in social sciences. *Education and Humanities Research, 397, 607-612*
- Obed-Chukwuka, A. N., & Rowell, E. U. (2020). Inadequate infrastructure distribution in public primary schools in delta state: implication for national development. *ATBU Journal of Science, Technology and Education, 8(4), 54-62*
- Okoye, G. O. (2016). The impact of forensic accounting on investigation of corporate fraud in Nigeria: Study of EFCC. *Global Journal of Applied, Management and Social Sciences, 11, 145-163*
- Opoh, F. A., Okou, F. T., & Ikany, R. A. (2015). Universal basic education programme for global competitiveness: A need for paradigm shift. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6(14)*
- Pandey; B, Brelsford; C., & Seto, K.C (2022). Infrastructure inequality is a characteristics of urbanization. *Proc. Natl. Academic Science, 119(15).*
- Salisu, A. K. (2016). Socio-economic infrastructure and natural development: *An analytical assessment from Nigeria perspective IOSR Journal of humanities and social sciences (IOSR-JHSS).21(10), 40-46.*
- Sholihah, N. K. (2019). Management of education facilities and infrastructure. Paper Proceedings of the 3<sup>rd</sup> International Conference on Education Innovation (ICEI, 2019)
- Shown, G. G. (2019). School mapping and the provision of educational opportunities in Secondary School in Plateau Central Senatorial District. *Kiu Journal of Humanities 4(3).127-136*
- UNESCO (2015). Report on Education for All. Pg. 23
- Wazzan, K. (2017). The spatial distribution of the basic education schools in Lattakia City (Syria). *Journal of Educational and Social Research, 7(1), 71.*
- Wood, R. M. (2023). A Review of Education differences in Urban and Rural Areas. *International Research Journal of Educational Research, 14(2), 1-3.* <https://www.interesjournals.org/educational-research.html>
- Xu, R., Yue, W., & Wei, F. (2022). Inequality in public facilities between urban and rural areas and its driving factors in ten cities of China. *Sci. Rep. 12, 13244.* <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-17569-022-17569-2>