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Abstract: The research assessed the implementation of Upper Basic Education Curriculum in vulnerable areas of Katsina state. The population comprised five hundred and seventy six (576) teachers of upper basic school, forty five (45) principals and ninety (90) School Based Management Committee (SBMC) members. Using the research advisors sampling table, the sample of the research stands as two hundred and seventeen (217) teachers, forty four (44) principals and eighty (80) School Based Management Committee members. Five objectives to guide the study were formulated which consequently led to the designing of five research questions. One null hypothesis that centred on curriculum implementation was developed in congruence with the objectives and research questions. A four fingered Likert Scale Questionnaire was developed with twenty (20) items. Mean and standard deviation in the descriptive data were presented. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the hypothesis. The findings revealed that the null hypothesis was rejected to infer variation in the respondents opinions in all the five areas of curriculum implementation. It also showed that insecurity constituted a great challenge for curriculum implementation as pupils, teachers could not attend schools regularly. The study recommended among other things proactive measures by security personnel in tackling the challenges, developing appropriate pedagogical strategies of teaching and facilitating good learning environment.
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Introduction

Education is the bedrock upon which the progress of a nation hinges on. It is important to point out that political, social as well as economic development cannot take place without the provision of sound education. A responsible society that endeavours to collectively make education paramount in the society follows a way for creating sustainability in all aspects of national development. The type of any education depends largely or is related to the current challenges the nation is facing. Acquiring of basic knowledge is therefore an essential feature of the foundation of any skill development.

Curriculum encompasses the entire scope of various educational programmes that are collectively designed in order to make learners acquire experiences that can make them responsible or functional in the society. Sharma and Promilly (2015) see curriculum as to mean two things (i) range of courses from which students choose what subject matter to study, (ii) a specific learning programme.

Curriculum implementation simply refers to collective effort by stakeholders to carry out the teaching and learning process that will make learners acquire the skill and problem solving approaches for daily living. Universal Basic Education which has been largely emphasized in Nigerian education cuts across the lower, middle and upper basic. The major contention is the need to make the children to acquire functional education that makes it necessary to reform basic education.

Problem Statement/Justification

Curriculum implementation is the cornerstone in the attainment of every educational policy in every society, Nigeria inclusive. In Nigeria, since independence in 1990 attempts have been made by successive governments to increase access to education in consonance with the increasing social demand for education as well as conformity with 1900 Jontein conference on education, which seeks to increase access to education especially in developing countries of Africa and Asia. The attempt to increase access to education is hinged in the Nigeria’s Philosophy of Education which holds that “every Nigerian child shall have a right to equal educational opportunities”, (NPE, 2004).

However, attempts to successfully implement curriculum could be impinged by a number of factors in Nigeria. These factors could include social, political, economic etc. Of recent, there was a United Nations report which claimed that there exists more than ten million out of school children roaming streets in both rural and urban centres of Nigeria. The social crises witnessed in some states especially in North-East and North-western parts of Nigeria have devastated communities’ social and economic activities. The incidences of banditry, kidnapping, Boko-Haram have continued to affect the peaceful settlement of people. The problem of cattle rustling, kidnapping and banditry has led to rural-urban migration leading to depopulation of rural areas.

In the banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina state for example, the problem has forced people to abandon their settlements, farmlands, businesses and schools. Because of apprehension and tension, teachers find it very difficult in some communities to attend schools. Where schools operate, pupils learn under traumatic conditions, while attendance is always less regular. This unhealthy condition has serious negative repercussion on curriculum implementation. This essentially is the reason behind this research. The research is set to investigate the level of curriculum implementation of upper Basic Education level in vulnerable areas of Katsina state.

Objective(s) of the Study

This research is hinged on the following objectives:

1. To ascertain the level of curriculum implementation in the Upper Basic level among the banditry vulnerable areas in Katsina state.
2. To determine whether the content areas of the curriculum have been covered in the Upper Basic Level in the banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina State.

3. To ascertain whether the pupils in the Upper Basic Level of Junior Secondary School in Katsina state have acquired the relevant learning experience in the curriculum.

4. To discover whether the curriculum is properly evaluated in the implementation of the UBE in the Upper Basic Level in the banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina state.

5. To find out whether the community plays a significant role in the implementation of the curriculum in the vulnerable areas of Katsina state.

Research Questions

In order to investigate the problems, the following research questions are formulated

1. What is the level of JSS Curriculum Implementation in banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina State?

2. To what extent the contents of the JSS Curriculum are covered in banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina state?

3. How do pupils of JSS in banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina state acquire relevant learning experience?

4. To what extent are contents of the JSS curriculum evaluated in banditry vulnerable areas?

5. What is the extent of the community participation in JSS curriculum implementation in banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina state?

Hypothesis

There is no significant difference in the opinion of Teachers, Principals and School Based Management Committee Members on curriculum implementation in banditry vulnerable areas of Katsina State.

Literature Review

Some Curriculum Implementation Models

Stenhouse (1975) in Fullan and Baurer (1991) contends that a curriculum implementation is an attempt to communicate the essential principles and features of an educational proposal in such a form that it is open to critical scrutiny and capable of effective transformation into practice.

This assertion indicated that for proper implementation, a model which is simply a blue print for executing a plan is highly crucial. Curriculum in some cases is a hypothesis of major educational issue based on the yearnings of the society, curriculum experts therefore are highly occupied in formulating various models for diligence implementation. Curriculum as a work plan should not be regarded as mere rhetoric or assembly of topics beautifully listed in a document but as yardstick for getting effective desired results.

The models of curriculum implementation are geared towards proper implementation. Furthermore, the objectives, methods, materials, logistics and evaluation procedures are virtually reflected in the implementation model. All the subjects that are taught in the school are also reflected in the various curriculum implementation models. The following are some of the curriculum implementation models:

1. Concentric Circle Model:

Esun, Enukoha and Umoren (2006) states that, one of the curriculum implementation models is the concentric circle model that consists of components of the development process and it is continues rather than a piece meal.

Conception stage: In this stage the teacher, curriculum expert, parents, government and all other stakeholders are involved. Teacher in this case needs to identify the design of curriculum in
order to organize the teaching according to yearnings of the society.

**Planning Stage:** This stage portrays a set of decision for action in the future. It consists of sourcing the materials and organizing them, it also involves selection of contents and learning experience. Any teacher plans adequately before the delivery of the lesson.

**Selection/development of objectives, content materials and methods.** Curriculum implementation doesn’t take place haphazardly, hence it requires careful selection of objective for proper conduct of teaching/learning process. The teacher during the implementation at the classroom level selects relevant objectives.

**Try out:** This stage is meant to assess whether the curriculum materials, processes and equipments are workable. The teacher put the plans into practice.

**Revision:** This is the modification of the original text by designers and implementation based on field trials. Revision takes place during the lesson session so as to ascertain the attainment of behavioural objectives.

**Generalization State:** This stage increases the numbers of participants in the curriculum implementation. The teacher uses various members of the community such as resource persons, community places for effective curriculum implementation.

**Monitoring/Quality Control:** This is the evaluation stage. Effective teaching to attain quality control. This evaluation stage can either be formative or summative.

**2. Life Skills Curriculum Implementation Model**

Curriculum implementation models can emerge as a result of the dynamic nature of the society and innovation. That support new life skills, UNICEF (2012) opines that curriculum model for effective life skills development includes:

a) **Formal Educational Model:** That includes syllabus with teachers and stipulated qualifications, methods of teaching and other resource persons.

b) **Non-formal programme model:** Which should be delivered through community setting and organization e.g health centers, mosques, and churches.

c) **Crossover Model:** This emphasizes extra-curricular activities i.e using school as a resource that encourage socialization provisions of guidance and counseling services and the efforts of members of the community.

**Indices of Curriculum Implementation**

Indices could be considered as issues or important topic for discussion. Issues are therefore matters of discussion that are of high concern to stakeholders. Issues are aspects that are debatable, unsettled or open to varieties of decisions. These indices include:

a) Nature of the curriculum that is whether the curriculum is complex, simple or difficult.

b) Teacher quality/training i.e are qualified teachers available? Do teachers utilize proper method of teaching? Do teachers have the opportunities for in-service training?

c) Nature of the adopting unit/agency? Do these units accept innovation promptly or resist innovation?

d) Resource support, do the teachers have material resources? Is the human resource available in both urban and rural school?

e) Socio political factors, are there enough funds to implement the curriculum, does the leadership provide basis for sustaining innovation?

Curriculum implementation is the actual translation of goals of education at the classroom level through effective utilization of both human and material resources. The issues on curriculum include teacher involvement in the educational decision making process, empowerment and
continuing professional development of teaching, effective implementation of the curriculum design. Consideration of universal, national and political aspects of the society, all these point shave a greater bearing in any curriculum implementation.

The situation of curriculum implementation in Nigerian schools must be backed up with emerging issues in Nigeria, these issues include unemployment, developing sound national ideology that can assist in maintaining security, adequate follow up producing qualitative administrators to see the smooth manning of the curriculum implementation. Furthermore, teachers' should be assisted to have adequate information on curriculum through curriculum dissemination. Teachers should also be guided to understand various innovations that assist in using teacher-centered methods.

Curriculum implementation is a dynamic process that involves the consideration of needs and problems of the society. It is necessary to reflect on the issues and reach a decision so that more coherent means of effective implementation could be discovered. Curriculum issues are normally discussed through mind mapping which consist of concern groups that are engage in the examining of curricular issues. Paykoc, Mengi and Kamayo (2004) identify the following as curriculum issues:-

a) Holistic conception (planning, implementation, evaluation)
b) Continuous professional development of curriculum experts.
c) Relating curriculum theory to research and practices
d) Consideration of foundations/bases
e) Issues related to emerging areas

Implementation of curriculum is a consortium of multifaceted issues in education that requires, a well organized systematic accepted procedure supported by psychological laws and principles, administration, planning strong sociological and philosophical basis of the society in which the curriculum is to be implemented. Barrow (1976) posits that curriculum is put forward as a paradigm ideal, not a utopian. It is ideal in the sense that putting it into practice would require certain changes in teaching attitude, teaching skill, parental attitude, government directives and so on, it is practical in the sense that, the change could easily come about, it is ideal in the sense that claims made for the curriculum involve what idea would result from it.

The above contention indicates that there are many factors and participants that influence curriculum implementation. Curriculum implementation is an aspect of curriculum process that embodies curriculum dissemination and diffusion, diffusion on the other hand comprises the distribution and publication of information, reflection and decision that affect curriculum renewal or innovation. Curriculum implementation is a highly complex and multi-dimensional process that must employ the support of various factors. The following are some of the factors that influence curriculum implementation.

1. Teachers: The most important person in curriculum implementation process is the teacher. He should have adequate knowledge and experience. Teachers are central to any curriculum implementation effort. Professional development of teachers is highly paramount. One disgusting thing in any curriculum implementation process is lack of pedagogical skills to handle curriculum.

2. Students: The role students play in curriculum implementation should not be ignored, students are the final recipients of curriculum, if students are not made to see the importance of an educational plan, the whole plan could be thwarted. The stakeholders should make the students better recipient of the curriculum through the provision of various facilities. The teacher on the other hand should be adequately professionally trained.

3. Principals/Inspectors: These are also important players in the crucial implementation process they should have an in-depth knowledge of complex curriculum issue. The role of
the government here should be the provision of various facilities, so that principals and inspectors could discharge their duties as key actors in the implementation of curriculum. They should use effective communication process to disseminate curriculum information to parents with regard to implementation issues.

4. **Parents**: Parents are also a very important segment in the process of curriculum implementation. Parents should provide a higher support in PTA activities. They should be the watchdogs in the academic pursuits of their children. Parents should complement the government in the provision of adequate instructional materials which is a major factor in curriculum implementation.

5. **Government** plays a major role in curriculum implementation. The government through its agencies such as NERDC, NTI and other professional agencies such as MAN, STAN, SOSAN should play a major role in ascertaining the quality of education through adequate funding and effective supervision. Other stakeholders include the entire members of the public that give moral support in the progress of educational development these include business tycoons, philanthropists etc.

6. **School environment** is also another factor that determines curriculum implementation. It is important to point out that, sharp difference exist between the schools that are located in urban and rural areas, urban school may have more access to materials and other benefits.

Basic Education means the type of education, in quality and content, that is given in the first level of education. This construct changes from country to country. In Nigeria, basic education was equated with six years of primary schooling in the past. Currently basic education is extended to include the three years of Junior Secondary School. Universal Basic Education (UBE) is conceived to embrace formal education up to age 15, as well as adult and non-formal education including education of the marginalized groups within the Nigerian society. It is a policy reform measure of the Federal Government of Nigeria, that is in line with the state objectives of the 1999 Constitution which states in section 18 that…

Government shall eradicate illiteracy; to this end, government shall as and when practicable provide a free and compulsory, Universal Primary Education, free secondary education, and free adult literacy programmes.

**Objectives of the UBE**

According to the Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC, 2004), the objectives of the programme among others include:

- Developing in the entire citizenry a strong consciousness for education and a strong commitment to its vigorous promotion;
- The provision of free, universal basic education for every Nigerian child of school-going age; reducing drastically the incidence of drop-out from the formal school system (through improved relevance, quality and efficiency); and
- Ensuring the acquisition of appropriate levels of literacy, numeracy, manipulative, communicative and life skills, as well as ethical, moral and civic values needed for laying a solid foundation for life-long learning.

Universal Basic Education (UBE) was formally launched by President Olusegun Obasanjo on 30th September 1999. The UBE programme is intended to be universal free and compulsory. According to the implementation guidelines for the Universal Basic Education programme published by the Federal Ministry of Education Abuja, in February 2000, due attention would be given to public enlightenment and social mobilization. The document also states that teachers will always be an integral part of the process of conceptualization, planning and executing.

The security challenges basically affect almost every national development. The security challenges that bedeviled Nigeria as a nation is now a subject of discussion in every sector of the
country. It makes every sector vulnerable. Education which is the most important social service that should be provided by collective effort of every citizen is now facing a serious challenge.

Insecurity in different parts of Nigeria especially the kidnapping of school children in the northwest, north central and north east has serious adverse effect in the implementation of curriculum. The effect of this insecurity makes many states to become vulnerable. This creates fear among teachers, children and all other stakeholders in the educational sector. Katsina state as a state in the North West is seriously affected with this insecurity challenge with about 17 local governments out of 34, as vulnerable areas. Many factors are said to be responsible for this problem. Some of these factors include lack of sound education, unemployment, corrupt practices by some politicians and weak rule of law.

Theoretical Framework

This research intends to use structural oriented theory of curriculum. This theory focuses on identifying elements in curriculum and their interrelationship as well as the structure of decision making. This theory is concerned with essential concepts and making decision on them. It further deals on how the curriculum should be analyzed and implemented. The theory further helps in analyzing selection of contents learning experience and how to evaluate them. Posner and Stoke 1976 were among the proponents of this theory. The major principle in the theory revolves in sequencing all issues related to teaching and learning in micro and macro levels. The theory therefore places more concern on curriculum development and implementation. The teacher and all other stakeholders are therefore considered very important. The theory emphasizes that curriculum should be geared to solving problems through all the elements of curriculum.

Methodology

The research design is descriptive survey, as the research focused on teachers, principals and school Based Management Committee members. This therefore shows that the data will be acquired form a big population covering vulnerable areas of Katsina state. The data to acquire and interpret from this population and opinion makes the application of a survey design as stated by Abinbola (1999).

Instrumentation

Four Fingered Likert scale questionnaire was used to seek the opinion of respondents. The questionnaire an adopted type comprised strongly agree, agree, disagree and strongly disagree and descriptive analysis and ANOVA were used to test the hypothesis.

Population

The target population of the research comprised five hundred and seventy six (576) teachers of Junior Secondary Schools in the vulnerable areas, forty five principals from forty five schools (45) and ninety (90) School Based Management Committee members from Katsina, Safana and Funtua Zonal Inspectorate and Quality assurance Departments. ANOVA, analysis of variance, was used to analyze the significant differences in the opinion of the three groups of respondents. According to David (2010) ANOVA is used to test differences between two or more means in different groups.

Sample and Sampling Technique

Using the research advisors Table (2006) the sample of the research stands as two hundred and seventeen teachers (217), forty four (44) principals and eighty (80) school Based management Committee Members. Cluster sampling techniques was employed to group the sample giving each individual respondents the chance of selection.

Findings

Discussion of Results of the Research
This research presents the summary of findings of the research. The study is built on a single hypothesis and five research questions. The hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the opinion of principals, teachers and members of the School Based Management Committee on curriculum implementation in Upper Basic Secondary Schools in vulnerable areas of Katsina state. The respondents consisted of two hundred and seventeen teachers with two hundred and seven returning, forty four principals with forty retrieved and eighty questionnaires administered on school based management committee members to return seventy five.

The data acquired showed that the hypothesis was rejected to infer that there was significant variation in the opinion of the respondents on the curriculum implementation in upper basic secondary schools in vulnerable areas of Katsina. This disposition on the opinion is not unconnected with the respondents experience and maturity on the prevailing circumstances in the vulnerable areas of Katsina. The method of data analysis used to arrive at the decision was Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) as shown on the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Analysis of Significant Difference in Respondents Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The P-value remained .000 while the alpha level was 0.05

In the same vein, similar results were obtained in all the five curriculum implementation area from where the single null hypothesis was derived. The areas included level of curriculum implementation, coverage of content and acquisition of relevant learning experience. Others were evaluation of contents and community role in curriculum implementation. The results indicated significant variation in the opinions of the three groups of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Analysis of variance on significant differences in respondents’ opinions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage of content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of RLE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Role in CI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the five aspects of curriculum implementation the F-Cal and P-value have been established to reject the hypothesis. This implied variations in the respondents dispositions in the five aspects of curriculum implementation. The F-Cal in the five areas differed significantly while the P-value remained .000.

In the descriptive analysis of the data, there exists a corresponding resemblance of both the mean and standard deviation of the respondents opinions in the three groups i.e teachers, principals and school based management committee members. In table 3, the calculated mean and standard deviation of the groups is presented to show a little variation in the total mean and deviation at a confidence level of 95%. The total calculated mean remains as 53.25 for teachers, 51.80
principals and 49.61 School Based Management Board. The standard deviation stands as 3.445, 3.897 and 3.979 respectively.

**Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation for Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% confidence interval for mean</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>66.25</td>
<td>3.445</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>54.78 - 55.72</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51.80</td>
<td>3.697</td>
<td>.588</td>
<td>50.61 - 52.96</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMB</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>49.81</td>
<td>3.979</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>48.90 - 50.73</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>53.53</td>
<td>4.515</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>53.06 - 54.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This clearly infers a close variation in the respondents opinion on the five areas of curriculum implementation in the vulnerable areas of Katsina state as a result of banditry.

In table four of the descriptive analysis, the level of coverage and evaluation of the respondents opinion as per the curriculum implementation in the five different areas is shown. The calculated and standard deviation using one way analysis demonstrates variations in the group responses in the areas. The total calculated mean for level of curriculum implementation stands as 10.66, coverage of content 10.90, acquisition of relevant learning experiences 10.86, evaluation of contents 10.88 ad 10.24 for community base in curriculum implementation. The standard deviation also stands as 1.422, 1.639, 1.608, 1.675 and 1.631.

**Table 4: Descriptive Analysis for Respondents in Five Areas of Curriculum Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Level of Curriculum Implementation Mean</th>
<th>Coverage of Content Mean</th>
<th>Acquisition of RLE Mean</th>
<th>Evaluation of Contents Mean</th>
<th>Community Role in CI Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>11.06</td>
<td>11.60</td>
<td>11.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>1.779</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>1.466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>11.09</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>1.235</td>
<td>.954</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>1.661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMB</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>9.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std deviation</td>
<td>1.231</td>
<td>1.300</td>
<td>1.119</td>
<td>1.437</td>
<td>1.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10.66</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>10.86</td>
<td>10.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std Deviation</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>1.639</td>
<td>1.608</td>
<td>1.675</td>
<td>1.631</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data analyzed in the five aspects of curriculum implementation in both the descriptive and ANOVA analyses show little variation in the respondents opinion to reject the hypothesis. The hypothesis was framed taking into cognizance the prevailing conditions of curriculum implementation in vulnerable areas of Katsina state. There is no doubt that upper basic education curriculum has suffered a serious setback due to lack of stable environment for teaching and learning.

The five research questions raised were directly intended to reflect the key areas of curriculum implementation. However, the respondents opinions in the five areas show slight variation to infer that differences that exist in the opinion of the three groups of respondents. This might not be unconnected with the respondents background and level of maturity exhibited in responding to the issues raised in the questionnaire.

**Conclusion**

Curriculum implementation in every community exists in a stable atmosphere, devoid of anarchy and rancor. It requires total commitment of both the community and the individual learner. It leads to acquisition of relevant learning experiences by learners which will in future result to overall societal growth and development.

In Katsina state, banditry has caused incessant closure of schools, reduced punctuality and made
pupils to learn in traumatic conditions. It has seriously affected curriculum implementation in the upper basic education schools in the vulnerable areas of the state as teachers find it very difficult to attend classes on regular basis to conduct classes coupled with irregular pupils attendance. This unhealthy condition cannot promote stable scenario for effective curriculum implementation to attain the goals of Universal Basic Education. However, attempts are currently perused by the government to find amicable solutions to the problem so that regular classes could continue to properly implement curriculum in the vulnerable areas.

Recommendations

In line with the findings of the study as well as the research questions and hypothesis, the following recommendations are proffered:

1. Although the government is making considerable effort to tackle the security challenges, it is necessary that more robust and proactive measures are taken to address the issue so that deserted areas could come back to life and pupils could go back to class to acquire education.

2. The affected communities should assist the government through devising means of surveillance so that activities of the bandits could be checked and controlled. The traditional institutions in the affected areas in collaboration with the state security should be mandated to provide security to the schools in the affected areas.

3. Curriculum implementation can be done electronically. Lessons can be organized and presented in the air through radio and television by relevant education agencies for the affected communities. This was done by State Universal Basic Education Board in 2020 during Corona-Virus Pandemic. Similar effort can be organized for the affected communities.

4. Special education programme should be organized at various refugee camps and re-settlement areas for the affected communities as remedial programmes to make for areas of the curriculum not covered as a result of the activities of the bandits.

5. Parents should be mobilized and encouraged to comfort their children and instill confidence in their minds by taking them to recreational centres, watching films, praying and reading Holy scriptures.

6. There is need for government to hasten the supply of relief materials to the affected communities so that displaced students could be encouraged to attend schools. Philanthropies organizations should be persuaded to deliver more relief materials to the communities. This will go a long way in making pupils realize that everybody in the state is sympathizing with their plight.

7. Finally, military, police, vigilante groups and other security officers should continue to work in synergy in the affected communities to discourage the banditry.
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