

## **ADEQUACY AND SUITABILITY OF MATERIAL RESOURCE INPUTS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF SOCIAL STUDIES CURRICULUM AT UPPER BASIC11 EDUCATION LEVEL IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN ENUGU STATE**

\*Dr. Lawretta, Ebere Ovute, Dr. Udodirim Angela Igwe & Prof. U.P.N. Amadi  
Department of Adult and Continuing Education, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike.

\*E-mail: [lawrettaebereovute@gmail.com](mailto:lawrettaebereovute@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The study was carried out to evaluate the adequacy and suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of Social Studies curriculum at upper basic11 education level in secondary schools in Enugu state. The design of the study was evaluative survey research design. The population of the study consisted of all the social studies teachers in both urban and rural schools at Upper Basic 11 Education Level in Secondary Schools in Enugu State. The census sampling technique was applied to sample all 192 social studies teachers at Upper Basic 11 Education Level in the three education zones that made up Enugu State. The instrument for data collection titled, 'Examining the Adequacy and Suitability of Material Resource for Teachers Implementing Social Studies Curriculum Questionnaire (EASMRTISSCQ)' was developed by the researcher. The instrument was validated by three experts, two in curriculum studies and one in measurement and evaluation, all from College of Education, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike. The overall reliability index of the instrument was 0.73. The data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation to answer the research questions. Also, t-test statistics was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Some of the major findings include; the material resources inputs for implementation of the social studies curriculum were moderately adequate and there was no significant difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on adequacy of the material resources inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu State; the available resource inputs for implementation of social studies at upper basic education level were all moderately suitable with the items mean ranging from 2.50-3.49 and there was no significance difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on the extent of suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education in Enugu state. Based on the findings, it was recommended that adequate modern material resource inputs should be provided by Enugu State ministry of Education among others.

**Keywords:** Adequacy, Curriculum, Material resources, Social Studies, Upper Basic ducation

### **Introduction**

Material resource input comprises all available and accessible theoretical, practical and skill oriented instructional materials which facilitate learning. Ojo (2012) stated that material resource inputs are facilities and tools necessary for effective implementation of a programme. In this study, material resource input will include all the material resource inputs contained in curriculum for Social Studies Education Programme as recommended in the universal basic education guidelines.

Social studies is one of the basic education subjects in Nigerian education system. Social studies as a school subject deals with the study of man in relationship with his social and physical environment (Nnamani, 2009). Environment is anything that surrounds man which influences man's thinking and ideas positively or negatively. The environment of man could

be social, economic, political, cultural and physical DUBY in (Ndan, 2002). Social environment refers to people in the society and their relationship with each other, how man interacts, provides his needs and solves his problems while physical environment refers to physical things that surround man and that influence his behavior (Odele & Egotanwa, 2006). However, Engle (2003) defines social studies as a discipline on its own right, drawing knowledge from all the social science disciplines, dealing with social ideas and problems as they occur to the average person. Social studies is the aspect of learning which deals with how to get on with one's environment, both physical and human which involves development of skills, knowledge, attitude and values that characterize responsive and responsible citizenship in a free and democratic society.

The philosophy of Social Studies in Nigerian schools is to make students competent in decision making, problem solving, dealing with change and developing attitudes appropriate for effective citizenship (Okobia, 2012). This philosophy cannot be achieved without effective implementation of designed curriculum. Social studies at junior secondary school level (upper basic education) derives its contents from broad range of subjects such as Economics, Anthropology, Philosophy, Geography, and History in addition to Elementary or Basic Science (Bozimo & Ikwumelu, 2008). Hence, Okobia (2012) maintained that social studies at the junior secondary school level is an important subject because it is meant to prepare citizens for active participation in the society and help students to acquire basic knowledge, positive attitudes, values and social skills needed for responsible citizenship and contributing member of the society.

Curriculum consists of the entire situation that the school may select and consistently organize for the purpose of bringing changes in behavior of individuals (Obanya, 2004). Offorma (2002) also defined curriculum as a total experiences involving the school in the process of educating the young people. It includes the teacher, subjects, contents, methods of teaching and evaluation as well as the physical and psychological dimension of the experiences. This shows that curriculum is a document or instrument planned by policy makers which contains what to learn and how to learn and who should learn. Kanno (2012) added that curriculum is a plan or blue print or instructional guide used for teaching and learning to bring about positive and desirable learner's behaviour change. In the context of this study, curriculum consists of all the activities engaged by teachers and students of social studies in Basic Education level in order to achieve the stated objectives.

The objectives of the social studies curriculum for Basic Education level have been adjudged as laudable and there is evidence to show that even though students find social studies interesting, many of them obtain poor results as shown by previous results of Basic Education examination in many states, including Abia State. Students that scored credit and above are regarded as those that achieved well. Achievement is seen in this study as the learning outcome of the students in social studies. Majority of the students however scored less than credit in Basic Education Certificate Examination (BECE) between 2014-2017.

Some educators like Offorma (2002) and Obanya (2002) among others have expressed some doubts as to whether the Basic Education Social Studies curriculum is being well implemented in schools in Nigeria. Also, an observation of the attitudes, behaviour and value orientation among the students tend to suggest questions as to whether the objectives of Social Studies are being achieved through proper implementation of the curriculum. This and other issues ought to be empirically investigated rather than speculated upon, hence the need to evaluate the implementation of Basic Education level Social Studies curriculum.

Curriculum implementation involves all the day-to-day activities which the school management and classroom teachers undertake in pursuit of the objectives of a given programme (Obanya, 2004). Nnadi (2004) defines curriculum implementation as the act of curriculum delivery. It is the transformation of curriculum policies into action.

In the context of this study, curriculum implementation entails the interaction between the teacher, the learner and the learning environment. How well the teacher implements the curriculum is determined by the teachers' knowledge, professional training, competence, initiative, interest and motivation. Though such factors as student's interest and readiness as well as availability and utilization of learning materials and equipment may be constraining, a knowledgeable and competent teacher can always make the best out of any situation.

Although Social Studies at basic education level is regarded as an important core subject, its implementation seems to face some challenges. For instance, Akomolaofe (2005) pointed out that teaching materials are not adequate for teaching social studies in Nigerian schools and even the available ones are not used but stored in principal's offices as some teachers see them as time consuming. This practice could affect the implementation of social studies curriculum at the Basic Education level negatively. The Federal Republic of Nigeria, (2014), has also outlined the minimum qualification for teaching social studies in Basic Education levels as Nigerian Certificate in Education, Bachelor in Education (B.Ed.) in lower and upper Basic Education levels respectively and students-teacher ratio of 1:50. Experience and observation have shown that most teachers employed to teach social studies seem not qualified and even the seemingly qualified ones may not be specialists of social studies (Akinsolu, 2003).

Furthermore, the curriculum document of social studies for Basic Education level has outlined the instructional materials for effective implementation of the subject. These include costumes, maps, atlases, newspaper, dictionary, conducive classroom, among others. Nonetheless, observation and experiences tend to show that students learn social studies in dilapidated classroom and with little or no instructional materials. This situation if it exists, may affect students' learning negatively. Thus, there is need to check and control the seeming current practices, if not, it may mar the effective implementation of social studies curriculum at the junior secondary school level.

Though some instructional materials may be available, yet the extent of adequacy of the available resources seemed to be in doubt and the extent of the suitability of the resources was also in doubt. The challenges of the implementation of social studies using the resource inputs were also uncertain. These unanswered questions on the issues of the resource inputs in the implementation of social studies curriculum necessitated researcher's interest in this study. Moreover, the implementation of social studies curriculum may be faced with some challenges. The identification of such challenges may be necessary for the adequate implementation of social studies at the Upper Basic Schools. Available literature seemed to suggest that there were inadequate studies on the evaluation of the challenges in the process of the implementation of social studies curriculum at the Basic Education level in Nigeria. In view of the importance of social studies in Nigerian educational system and considering the poor performance of students in the subject at the Basic Education level, the curriculum of social studies deserves to be adequately implemented to achieve the set goals. Therefore, the need for the researcher to embark on the evaluation of resources inputs in the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic education level, bearing in mind the outlined unanswered questions, particularly in Enugu State. In an attempt to carry out the study, the influence of school location on the responses of the social studies teachers were considered worthy of investigation. Schools could be located in rural or urban setting and this might have influence

on the resource inputs adequacy and suitability in the implementation of Social Studies Curriculum at the Upper Basic Education Level.

In spite of the laudable objectives and design of social studies curriculum for the Basic Education level in Nigeria, the performances of students in the subject at Basic11 Education Certificate Examination (BECE) in Enugu State schools have been poor. Also, the central philosophy of social studies which is to make students competent in decision making, problem solving, dealing with change and developing attitudes appropriate for effective citizenship do not seem to be achieved. Both poor achievement in social studies in Basic Education Certificate Examination and the none attainment of the philosophy of social studies as exhibited by the students in Enugu State schools may be attributed to some issues of resource inputs in the implementation of social studies curriculum also that the resource inputs were inadequate, that the resource inputs were not suitable for the implementation of the social studies curriculum.

The problem of this study was therefore to evaluate the materials, human and infrastructural facilities resources inputs' adequacy and suitability. for the implementation of social studies curriculum at the upper basic education level in Enugu state.

### **Purpose of the study**

The purpose of this study was to evaluate the adequacy and suitability of material resources inputs in the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II Education level in Enugu state. Specifically, the study sought to:

2. determine the adequacy of material resource inputs available for implementation of Social Studies curriculum at Upper Basic II Education Level in Enugu State.
3. ascertain the suitability of the available resource inputs for implementing Social Studies Upper Basic II Education Level in Enugu State.

### **Research questions**

The following research questions guided the study.

1. To what extent are material resource inputs adequate for implementation of Social Studies curriculum at upper basic education level in Enugu state?
2. To what extent are the available resource inputs suitable for implementing Social Studies at upper basic education level?

### **Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses were formulated to guide the study and were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

1. There is no significance difference between mean ratings of teachers in urban schools and those in rural schools on adequacy of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu state.
2. There is no significance difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on the extent of suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education in Enugu state.

### **Method**

The design of the study was evaluative survey research design. According to Nworgu (2006), survey research is one which a group of people are studied by collecting and analyzing data from only a few groups. The area of study is Enugu State. The population of the study was all teachers of social studies at Upper Basic11 Education level in Enugu State comprising 192 (88 urban and 104 rural teachers of social studies (Planning, Research and Statistics Department, Secondary Education Management Board, Enugu State (2022)). The sample size of the study was 192 Social Studies teachers. A purposive sampling technique was used to select all the social studies teachers from the three educational zones that made up Enugu state. This was because the population size was small as the study was survey type that required large sample size for generalization of the findings (Ovute, 2021). Also, all the 192 social studies teachers were stratified according to school location. This was because the study investigated the influence of school location on the ratings of social studies teachers on all the variables of the study. Accordingly, 104 social studies teachers were located in rural schools while 88 were located in urban schools in Enugu state. The instrument for data collection was titled “Examining the Adequacy and Suitability of Material Resource for Teachers Implementing Social Studies Curriculum Questionnaire (EASMRTISSCQ).” The instrument was arranged in sections A and B. Section A was on personal bio-data of the respondents (urban/rural school) while section B, was subdivided divided into two parts, namely: Part 1 (Extent of adequacy of material resource inputs) and Part 2 (Extent of suitability of material resource inputs). The instrument was structured on CIPP evaluation format. The CIPP evaluation format consists of four different categories namely, content, input, process and products. There were four response options in all the subsections rated 4 points, 3 points, 2 points and 1 point respectively for positive items and the reverse for negative items. The instrument was validated by one expert in Measurement and Evaluation in the Department of Science Education and two Curriculum Education experts from Adult and Continuing Education from Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, Umudike. The Social Studies Implementation Questionnaire was administered to 20 social studies teachers in secondary schools in Abia State. The same questionnaire was administered to the same group after two weeks interval. Their responses were rated, scored and used to determine the test-retest reliability. The reliability of the instrument was established by using Pearson product moment coefficient reliability index. The subgroup reliability indices were 0.74, 0.86, respectively for parts 1 and 2. A total reliability coefficient of 0.73 was established. The researcher used three briefed research assistants. She briefed the research assistance on how to distribute and collect the questionnaire. The research assistants comprise one each from each three selected Education Zone of the State. A total of one hundred and ninety two (192) copies of questionnaire were distributed and returned after the respondents had completed the copies. Mean, standard deviation and improvement needs index were used to answer the research questions while t-test statistic was employed in testing the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Mean values was employed in analyzing data on resource input suitability.

In taking decision on the level of adequacy of resource input of social studies teachers in Secondary Schools, the following percentages were used: 70% or above - highly adequate, 60% - 69% - moderately adequate, 50% - 59% - slightly adequate, Below 50% - Very slightly adequate

## Results

**Research Question 1:** What is the extent of adequacy of material resources inputs available for implementation of Social Studies curriculum?

**Table 1: Mean ratings of teachers in Urban and Rural schools on adequacy of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu State**

| S/N | Resource                  | Urban Teachers<br>n= 88 |                 | Rural Teacher<br>n=104 |                 | $\bar{x}_G$ | SD <sub>G</sub> | Remark |
|-----|---------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|
|     |                           | $\bar{x}_1$             | SD <sub>1</sub> | $\bar{x}_2$            | SD <sub>2</sub> |             |                 |        |
| 1.  | Chart                     | 2.87                    | 0.56            | 3.22                   | 1.09            | 3.04        | 0.82            | MA     |
| 2.  | Picture                   | 2.79                    | 0.62            | 3.25                   | 0.62            | 3.02        | 0.62            | MA     |
| 3.  | Documentary               | 2.47                    | 0.62            | 3.23                   | 1.01            | 2.85        | 0.81            | MA     |
| 4.  | News Paper                | 2.61                    | 0.74            | 3.68                   | 0.65            | 3.14        | 0.69            | MA     |
| 5.  | Nigerian coat of arms     | 2.54                    | 0.60            | 3.20                   | 1.10            | 2.87        | 0.85            | MA     |
| 6.  | posters                   | 2.57                    | 0.63            | 2.61                   | 0.99            | 2.59        | 0.81            | MA     |
| 7.  | Story books               | 2.77                    | 0.69            | 2.74                   | 1.10            | 2.75        | 0.89            | MA     |
| 8.  | Social studies book       | 2.78                    | 0.55            | 3.15                   | 1.15            | 2.96        | 1.35            | MA     |
| 9.  | Photographs               | 2.87                    | 0.56            | 3.13                   | 1.11            | 3.00        | 0.83            | MA     |
| 10. | Art works and drawing     | 3.06                    | 0.39            | 3.04                   | 1.05            | 3.05        | 0.72            | MA     |
| 11. | Social studies curriculum | 2.96                    | 0.41            | 3.22                   | 1.01            | 3.09        | 0.71            | HA     |
| 12. | World map, map of Africa  | 2.72                    | 0.58            | 3.25                   | 0.91            | 2.98        | 0.74            | MA     |
| 13. | Nigeria constitution      | 2.67                    | 0.60            | 2.94                   | 0.98            | 2.80        | 0.79            | MA     |
| 14. | Journal of social studies | 2.84                    | 0.50            | 3.03                   | 0.84            | 2.93        | 0.67            | MA     |
| 15. | Models                    | 2.87                    | 0.56            | 3.18                   | 0.82            | 3.02        | 0.69            | MA     |
| 16. | Radio sets                | 2.97                    | 0.50            | 3.05                   | 0.74            | 3.01        | 0.62            | MA     |
| 17. | Magazines                 | 2.76                    | 1.10            | 2.90                   | 0.98            | 2.83        | 1.08            | MA     |
| 18. | Films and videos          | 2.82                    | 0.57            | 2.99                   | 1.11            | 2.90        | 0.84            | MA     |
| 19. | Hand bills                | 3.02                    | 0.30            | 3.31                   | 0.97            | 3.16        | 0.63            | MA     |
| 20. | School flag               | 2.87                    | 0.56            | 3.00                   | 1.07            | 2.93        | 0.81            | MA     |

|                    |                         |             |             |             |             |             |             |           |
|--------------------|-------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| 21.                | Chalk board             | 2.75        | 0.68        | 3.06        | 1.05        | 2.90        | 0.86        | MA        |
| 22.                | Flip charts             | 2.47        | 0.62        | 3.39        | 2.77        | 2.93        | 0.81        | MA        |
| 23.                | Strip chart             | 2.79        | 0.55        | 2.96        | 0.98        | 2.87        | 0.76        | MA        |
| 24.                | Simple chart            | 2.54        | 0.74        | 3.10        | 0.96        | 2.84        | 0.85        | MA        |
| 25.                | Tree charts             | 3.02        | 0.30        | 3.21        | 1.10        | 3.11        | 0.70        | MA        |
| 26.                | Time and sequence chart | 2.68        | 0.76        | 2.88        | 1.04        | 2.79        | 0.90        | MA        |
| 27.                | Stream chart            | 2.92        | 0.55        | 3.14        | 0.93        | 3.03        | 0.74        | MA        |
| 28.                | Graphs                  | 2.65        | 0.72        | 3.36        | 0.90        | 3.00        | 0.81        | MA        |
| 29.                | Cartoons                | 2.65        | 0.85        | 3.17        | 1.10        | 2.91        | 1.95        | VSA       |
| 30.                | Cornices                | 2.85        | 0.51        | 2.88        | 1.30        | 2.86        | 0.90        | MA        |
| 31.                | Billboards              | 2.57        | 0.85        | 3.32        | 0.96        | 2.94        | 0.90        | MA        |
| 32.                | Pictorial graph         | 2.87        | 0.56        | 3.30        | 0.39        | 3.08        | 0.73        | VSA       |
| 33.                | Simple bar graph        | 3.06        | 1.39        | 3.32        | 0.97        | 3.19        | 0.68        | MA        |
| 34.                | Atlases                 | 2.87        | 0.49        | 2.67        | 0.82        | 2.96        | 0.78        | VSA       |
| <b>Pooled mean</b> |                         | <b>3.36</b> | <b>0.84</b> | <b>3.11</b> | <b>1.09</b> | <b>2.95</b> | <b>0.85</b> | <b>MA</b> |

Where  $\bar{X}$  = Mean, SD= Standard deviation HA=Highly Adequate, MA= Moderately Adequate, SA= Slightly Adequate, VSA= Very Slightly Adequate,  $\bar{X}_G$ =Grand mean and  $SD_G$ =Grand standard deviation

Data in Table1 show that the pooled mean response values of both urban and rural teachers was 3.36 and 3.11 with standard deviation of 0.84 and 1.09 respectively. The grand mean of the respondents was 2.95 with standard deviation of 0.85. This is within the real limit of number range of 2.50-3.49 which implied moderately adequate. This indicated that the teachers agreed that there was moderately adequacy of material resource inputs for implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic education level in Enugu State.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significance difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on adequacy of material resources inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu State.

**Table 2: t-test analysis of Mean rating scores of teachers in urban and rural schools on adequacy of material resources inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level**

| Teachers | N   | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df  | t-calculated | t-critical | Remark |
|----------|-----|-----------|------|-----|--------------|------------|--------|
| Urban    | 88  | 3.36      | 0.84 | 190 | 1.73         | 1.96       | NS     |
| Rural    | 104 | 3.11      | 1.09 |     |              |            |        |

Where N=Number of respondents,  $\bar{X}$  = Mean, SD= Standard deviation, df= degree of freedom, NS=Not significant

Data in table 2 revealed that the calculated t- value is 1.73 and the critical t-value is 1.96 at degree of freedom 190 at 0.05 level of significant. Since the t-calculated value of 1.73 is less than t- critical value of 1.96, the null hypothesis stated was not rejected. Thus, there was no significance difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on adequacy of material resources inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu State

**Research Question 2:** To what extent are the available resource inputs suitable for implementing Social Studies at upper basic 11 education level?

**Table 3: Mean ratings of teachers in Urban and Rural schools on suitability of the available resource inputs for implementing social studies at upper basic education level**

| S/N | Resource                  | Urban Teachers |                 | Rural Teacher |                 | $\bar{x}_G$ | SD <sub>G</sub> | Remark |
|-----|---------------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|
|     |                           | $\bar{x}_1$    | SD <sub>1</sub> | $\bar{x}_2$   | SD <sub>2</sub> |             |                 |        |
| 1.  | Chart                     | 2.85           | 0.57            | 2.94          | 0.60            | 2.90        | 0.58            | MS     |
| 2.  | Picture                   | 3.14           | 0.57            | 3.30          | 0.81            | 3.22        | 0.69            | MS     |
| 3.  | Documentary               | 3.10           | 0.83            | 3.09          | 1.02            | 3.09        | 0.92            | MS     |
| 4.  | News Paper                | 3.62           | 0.76            | 3.60          | 0.71            | 3.11        | 0.73            | MS     |
| 5.  | Nigerian coat of arms     | 2.98           | 0.76            | 3.16          | 1.10            | 3.07        | 0.88            | MS     |
| 6.  | posters                   | 2.95           | 0.77            | 2.55          | 0.95            | 2.75        | 0.86            | MS     |
| 7.  | Story books               | 2.78           | 0.70            | 2.91          | 0.99            | 2.85        | 0.84            | MS     |
| 8.  | Social studies book       | 2.79           | 0.57            | 3.07          | 2.14            | 2.93        | 0.96            | MS     |
| 9.  | Photographs               | 3.18           | 0.71            | 3.03          | 1.09            | 3.10        | 0.90            | MS     |
| 10. | Art works and drawing     | 3.31           | 0.55            | 3.04          | 0.98            | 3.17        | 0.76            | MS     |
| 11. | Social studies curriculum | 3.13           | 0.64            | 3.20          | 0.98            | 3.16        | 0.81            | MS     |
| 12. | World map, map of Africa  | 2.86           | 0.80            | 3.43          | 0.85            | 3.14        | 0.82            | MS     |

|     |                           |             |             |             |             |             |             |           |
|-----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| 13. | Nigeria constitution      | 3.23        | 0.81        | 2.98        | 1.06        | 3.10        | 0.92        | MS        |
| 14. | Journal of social studies | 3.45        | 2.14        | 3.06        | 0.90        | 3.26        | 1.52        | MS        |
| 15. | Models                    | 3.30        | 0.71        | 3.12        | 0.79        | 3.21        | 0.75        | MS        |
| 16. | Radio sets                | 3.03        | 0.83        | 3.01        | 0.78        | 3.02        | 0.80        | MS        |
| 17. | Magazines                 | 3.09        | 0.96        | 2.94        | 0.97        | 3.01        | 0.96        | MS        |
| 18. | Films and videos          | 3.27        | 0.85        | 2.97        | 1.09        | 3.12        | 0.97        | MS        |
| 19. | Hand bills                | 3.26        | 0.71        | 3.11        | 0.93        | 3.18        | 0.82        | MS        |
| 20. | School flag               | 3.20        | 0.81        | 2.81        | 0.95        | 3.00        | 0.88        | MS        |
| 21. | Chalk board               | 3.04        | 0.92        | 2.92        | 1.02        | 2.98        | 0.97        | MS        |
| 22. | Flip charts               | 3.12        | 1.22        | 3.30        | 1.78        | 3.21        | 1.50        | MS        |
| 23. | Strip chart               | 3.09        | 0.72        | 3.02        | 0.91        | 3.05        | 0.81        | MS        |
| 24. | Simple chart              | 2.81        | 1.00        | 3.13        | 0.78        | 2.97        | 0.89        | MS        |
| 25. | Tree charts               | 3.03        | 0.46        | 3.15        | 1.09        | 3.09        | 0.77        | MS        |
| 26. | Time and sequence chart   | 2.90        | 0.91        | 2.88        | 1.04        | 2.89        | 0.97        | MS        |
| 27. | Stream chart              | 3.14        | 0.71        | 3.15        | 0.93        | 3.14        | 0.82        | MS        |
| 28. | Graphs                    | 3.10        | 0.60        | 3.37        | 0.89        | 3.13        | 0.74        | MS        |
| 29. | Cartoons                  | 3.01        | 0.38        | 3.21        | 1.06        | 3.11        | 0.72        | MS        |
| 30. | Cornices                  | 2.97        | 0.71        | 2.90        | 1.28        | 2.93        | 0.99        | MS        |
| 31. | Bill boards               | 2.93        | 0.62        | 3.32        | 0.96        | 3.08        | 0.79        | MS        |
| 32. | Pictorial graph           | 3.05        | 0.70        | 3.30        | 0.91        | 3.17        | 0.80        | MS        |
| 33. | Simple bar graph          | 3.32        | 0.52        | 3.38        | 0.89        | 3.30        | 0.70        | MS        |
| 34. | Atlases                   | 3.05        | 0.70        | 3.16        | 1.08        | 3.10        | 0.88        | MS        |
|     | <b>Pooled mean</b>        | <b>2.93</b> | <b>1.01</b> | <b>2.90</b> | <b>1.03</b> | <b>2.92</b> | <b>1.02</b> | <b>MS</b> |

Where  $\bar{X}$  = Mean, SD= Standard deviation HA=Highly Suitable, MS= Moderately Suitable, SS= Slightly Suitable, NS=Not Suitable,  $\bar{X}_G$ =Grand mean and  $SD_G$ =Grand standard deviation

Data in Table 3 show that the pooled mean response values of both urban and rural teachers were 2.93 and 2.90 with standard deviation of 1.01 and 1.03 respectively. The grand mean of the respondents was 2.92 with standard deviation of 1.02. This is within the real limit of number range of 2.50-3.49 which implied moderately suitable. This indicated that the teachers agreed that there was moderately suitable of material resource inputs for implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic education level in Enugu State.

### **H<sub>02</sub>:**

There is no significance difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on the extent of suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education in Enugu state.

**Table 4: t-test analysis of Mean rating scores of teachers in urban and rural schools on the extent of suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education**

| Teachers | N   | $\bar{X}$ | SD   | df  | t-calculated | t-critical | Remark |
|----------|-----|-----------|------|-----|--------------|------------|--------|
| Urban    | 88  | 2.93      | 1.01 | 190 | 0.20         | 1.96       | NS     |
| Rural    | 104 | 2.90      | 1.03 |     |              |            |        |

**Where N=Number of respondents,  $\bar{X}$  = Mean, SD= Standard deviation, df= degree of freedom, NS=Not significant**

Data in Table 4 revealed that the calculated t- t-value is 0.20 and the critical t-value is 1.96 at degree of freedom 190 at 0.05 level of significance. Since the t-calculated value of 0.20 is less than t- critical value of 1.96, the null hypothesis stated was not rejected. Thus, there was no significant difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on the extent of suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education in Enugu state.

### **Discussion of findings**

The results revealed that the material resources inputs for implementation of the social studies curriculum were moderately adequate and there was no significant difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on adequacy of the material resources inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum. The study disagreed with Yusuf, Agbonna and Onipe (2014) in their investigation of the adequacy of social studies curriculum for the security component of Nigeria's seven-point agenda using multi-cultural perspectives. They found out that the basic school social studies curriculum did not adequately take care of some vital issues of political and economic development. On the other hand, Igwe (2012) reported that resource inputs and materials for teaching of chemistry are not adequately available. These materials make the teaching and learning processes easy, more meaningful and understandable. Sadly, the instructional materials are lacking in most Nigeria secondary schools and as a consequence, chemistry teachers take to chalk and talk method as they have no instructional materials (visual or audio-visual) which the students can see, touch, smell and hear in the process of teaching and learning. This must have informed Ojo (2012) who observed that when

instructional materials are not available learners do not do well. Ifeakor (2016) reported that some material resources are adequate but are partly used in teaching and learning chemistry.

It was found from the study that the available resource inputs for implementation of social studies at upper basic education level were all moderately suitable with the items mean ranging from 2.50-3.49 and there was no significance difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on the extent of suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education in Enugu state. This finding was in agreement with Ezeudu (2018) who stated that the materials used in teaching of chemistry were suitable based on the curriculum but the problem remains its availability. She further stated that the material needed is not adequately available but if available it can enhance effective teaching and learning of Chemistry.

### **Summary of the study**

This study evaluated the adequacy and suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu State. The study adopted evaluative survey research design. The sample size of the study was 192 Social Studies teachers drawn using purposive sample technique. The instrument for data collection was questionnaire which was validated and its reliability established. The data was collected and analyzed using mean, standard deviation used to answer the research questions while t-test statistic was employed in testing the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The result showed that the material resources inputs for implementation of the social studies curriculum were moderately adequate and the available resource inputs for implementation of social studies at upper basic education level were moderately suitable.

### **Conclusion**

The study evaluated the adequacy and suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu State. Based on the analysis carried out and the results of the study, it could be concluded that:

1. The material resources inputs for implementation of the social studies curriculum were moderately adequate and there was no significant difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on adequacy of the material resources inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education level in Enugu State.
2. The available resource inputs for implementation of social studies at upper basic education level were all moderately suitable and there was no significance difference between the mean ratings of teachers in urban and rural schools on the extent of suitability of material resource inputs for the implementation of social studies curriculum at upper basic II education in Enugu state.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings the following recommendations were made;

1. Enugu state education administrator should source funds to provide adequate number of the necessary resources inputs materials. This fund raising could take the form of buying shares from reputable banks, establishing fund generating businesses like filing stations, e t c which will be yielding money to the school on regular bases.
2. Workshops, seminars and conferences aimed at training the social studies teacher on the techniques and importance of improvisation of necessary resources inputs should be organized by the school administrators on regular basis.

## References

- Aguokogbuo, C.A. (2000). *Curriculum development and implementation for Africa*. Nsukka: Mike Social Press.
- Akinsolu, A.O. (2003). Availability and utilization of resources in influencing the teaching and learning of social studies in Ibadan. Retrieved from [www.ir.library.ku.ac.ke/bitstream/hand](http://www.ir.library.ku.ac.ke/bitstream/hand).
- Akomolafe, C.O. (2005). Principals time management abilities in secondary schools in Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Educational Administration and Planning*, 5(1), 58-67. *Appraisal of the Mode of Implementation of Nigerian Secondary School Curriculum: Toward socio-economic empowerment of Youth*.
- Awaobudu, V.Y (2005). Material Resource utilization for Teaching Science. *Journal of Nigerian Association of Technical Teachers*, 204-207.
- Bozimo, G. & Ikwumelu, S.N. (2000). *Social studies in a changing society*. Warri: Stable Publishers. Press by Universal Basic Education Commission (UBEC).
- Chikumbi, T.J. & Makamure, R. (2000). Curriculum theory, design and assessment. The common-Wealth of Learning, Module 13. Retrieved from [www.co/int/stamp/module13.pdf](http://www.co/int/stamp/module13.pdf). (Accessed 18 August, 2012)
- Engle, S.H. (2003). *Teaching in elementary school*. New York: John Willy and Sons.
- Ezenwa, V.I. and Patrick, S (2018). A Focal Assessment of Human, Physical and Material Resources Development for Universal Basic Education. *Journal of Nigerian Association of Technical Teachers*, 186-192.
- Ezeudu, F.U. (2018). Human Resource, finding and material Resources: Strategic Issues in Secretarial Studies Resource Management in Nigeria. *Business Education Journal*, 3(2), 86-95.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Policy on Education*. (4th edition) Lagos: NERDC
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2014). *National Policy in Education*. Lagos; Nigeria Educational
- Ifeakor, E.N. (2016). *Teachers qualification in social studies programmes in secondary schools in Enugu State*. (An unpublished M.ED Thesis), ESUT, Enugu.
- Igwe, I.D. (2012) Emerging Issues and Problems of Vocational/Technical Education: Nigerian. *Vocational Association Journal*, 6 (1), 24-60.
- Kanno, T. N (2012), The Image of an Effective Teacher in Contemporary Nigerian Society. Being a Guest lecture at the First College Seminar of the Federal College of Education Technical, Umunze, Anambra State, held at the College Multipurpose Auditorium on Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> June, 2012
- Ndan, E.O. (2002). Elements of Social Studies in Ololobou, J. and Ndazhaga (ed), *Dimensions of Social Studies*. Jos: WALIS Printing Press.
- Nnadi, E.L. (2004). Resources in Primary Education Curriculum Delivery. Enugu: *Journal of the Institute of Ecumenical Education*, 3(2), 106-124.
- Nnamani, S.C. (2009). Democratic Classroom Interaction for an Effective Teaching of Social Studies. *Journal of Arts and Social Science Education*, 1(1), 100-105.
- Nworgu, B.G. (2006). *Evaluation Research: Basic Issues and Methodology*. Ibadan: Wisdom publisher Ltd.
- Obanya, P.A.I. (2004). *The Dilemma of Education in Africa*. Ibadan: Heinemann educational Books Nigeria Plc.

- Odele, M.O.A. & Egotanwa, N. (2006). Basic factors in General Social Studies for Junior Secondary Schools. Onitsha: Elites Publications of Education. Owerri: unpublished M.Ed. thesis University of Ibadan, Nigeria
- Offorma, G.C. (2002). *Curriculum Implementation and Institutions*. Onitsha: Uni-World Educational Publishers Ltd.
- Ojo, W.R (2012). Application of Low-cost Technology to teachers learning Process.
- Okobia, E.O. (2012). The Teacher Factor in Enhancing Quality Assurance in the Teaching/Learning of Social Studies, *Review of European Studies* 4(4) 1-13. Retrieved from <https://dx.doi.org/10.5539/res.v4p148>.
- Olayide, S.O, and Heady, E.O. (2007). *Introduction to Agricultural Production Economic*. Ibadan: Universities Press Publication. Oni Publishing House.
- Onifade, N. (2014). Techniques of teaching and learning for the beginning teacher. In Agwu, S.N., Ogwu, R.A. & Akuma, N. (eds). A hand books for beginning teachers in Nigeria. Enugu: Pan-Afic Publisher.
- Osiyale, A.O (2008). Cost Reduction Strategies for Management Resources in Education in Nigeria. *African Journal of Education*, 1 (11), 35-43.
- Ovute, A. O. (2021). Definition of Implementation Retrieved on September 2nd, 2021.
- Provus, M. A. C. (1971). Methodology of evaluation. In perspectives of Curriculum Evaluation AERA monograph series on curriculum evaluation, No. 1 (Chicago, Rand Mc. Nally, 29-82).
- Scriven, M. (1972). Pros and cons about goal-free evaluation. *Evaluation comment Journal*, 3(4, 1-4.)
- Stufflebeam, D.L. (1971). The CIPP mode for Evaluation. *The international Handbook of educational Evaluation*. Boston: M.A: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Universal Basic Education, (2007). *Universal Basic Education for Junior Secondary Schools Social Studies*. Lagos Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council (NERDC): NERDC Press.
- Usman, L.K (2015). Effective Planning and Management of Resources as an Essential ingredient to the Success of Universal Basic Education. *Journal of National Association of Technical Teachers*, 193-198.
- Within, S. I. (1971). Education and Decision making in Education Illinois E.E., Pea cook Publishing Inc. [www.rocare.org/www.ernwaca.org.25/03/2013](http://www.rocare.org/www.ernwaca.org.25/03/2013).
- Yusuf, A., Agbonna, S.A. & Onaifade, O.B. (2010). Adequacy of Social Studies Curriculum for National Security in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Social Studies*. XIII, (1 & 2), 245- 260. Published by Social Sciences Association of Nigeria, (SOSAN).