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#### Abstract

There are many challenges facing schooling in a typical Nigerian rural setting, hence this study was undertaken to verify how these challenges could be managed in some rural settings which are quite close to an urban centre. This is a non-experimental study. Simple random sampling was used to select 45 teachers and 150 students from 5 secondary schools in Egbeda and Lagelu Local Government Areas of Ibadan Less City of Oyo State, Nigeria. Two structured questionnaires were administered respectively on the two categories of subjects. The data so gathered were analysed using percentages and chi-square. Findings included: trekking long distance to get to school, teachers' unwillingness to live among the people in these communities and their often refusal to get posted to these communities due to lack of social amenities and the concomitant unbearable living conditions in these settings. The roads are also "un-motorable" with its consequent hardship in accessing these areas. The school buildings are equally in a state of dilapidation. It was discovered that if schooling in these settings were to be effectively managed, then, stakeholders would have to invest in the provision of social amenities such as "motorable" roads, provision of rural electricity, mini-markets, as well as hospitals. It was thus suggested that both government and other stakeholders should provide the necessary social amenities to attract teachers to rural areas, as well as provide extra perquisites to attract teachers to these communities.


## Introduction

There are many achievements to celebrate in rural education, but a number of issues need to be addressed to ensure that quality schooling remains a reality for children and young people in rural and remote areas of Ibadan, Nigeria. Rural schools have provided generations of children and young people with knowledge, skills and attitudes needed to become autonomous, responsible and productive citizens. Schools play a vital role in developing and sustaining rural communities and are crucial to Nigeria's sustainable growth and development. For many rural areas in Nigeria, accessing quality education in the local area is seemingly becoming increasingly difficult (Onuka, 2009), There are many reasons for this, including major changes to the demographics of rural Nigeria. Studies by Emunemu and Ayeni (1999); Emunemu (2008); Akorede and Onuka (2008); Emunemu and Onuka (2008); and Onuka (2009) have shown that differences exist in the management of urban - and rural schooling due to diverse reasons.

According to Philips (2003), in the United States of America, 'rural' means a small town having a population of twenty-five thousand people and less, whereas in Nigeria, 'rural' is rather defined by the quantum of amenities available or non-existent. Such amenities include electricity, pipe-borne water, 'motorable' roads, health facilities, among others. The Institute for Educational Leadership (2005) in its paper Preparing Leaders for Rural Schools: Practice and Policy Considerations posits that network brings together, keeps together, and informs members across the country working to promote effective school leadership and increased student achievement for all students, even in rural schools. It portends that leadership has much role to play in shaping effective rural schooling. It further stresses to conscientiously identify, recruit, select and train people for leadership in rural schooling. However, while this is possible in rural America because of the little difference between urban and rural America, the situation in Nigeria is the reverse as a wide gulf of difference exists between rural and urban in terms of provision of social amenities.

According to Starr and White (2008), the most commonly raised challenges of rural school principalship in Australia are: workload - proliferation, educational equity issues, the re-defined principalship, escalating role multiplicity, and school survival. These challenges are real in the Nigerian context. They also state that 'paradoxically,
principals in small rural contexts are able to relate to students on a one-to-one basis, yet, do not have the human resources to provide intensive individualized instruction and programming due to work intensification and role plurality'. One other challenge they discovered is lack of adequate funding of rural schooling in Australia. Also, Johnson and Strange (2007) observed that rural schools face unique challenges associated with geographic isolation, racial segregation, and limited school and community resources.

Furthermore, according to Hannum, Irvin, Banks, and Farmer (2009), many rural schools in the United States of America experience difficulties attracting and retaining teachers for a variety of reasons including lower salary levels. They observed that rural school districts can have difficulties offering a comprehensive curriculum that includes upper-level courses, advanced placement courses, and vocational courses because of financial and human capital constraints.

American Association of School Administrators (1999) argues that teacher shortages and attrition are problems facing many school districts. Schools in rural areas find it rather difficult to attract and retain qualified teachers. Collins (1999) supports this by saying that the problem is not so much one of a national teacher shortage, but rather one of distribution in areas where low salaries combined with geographical, social, and professional isolation discourage both prospective and experienced teachers. Dell and Hobbs (2009) therefore suggest that colleges of education should encourage and/or recruit students from rural areas to become teachers. Onuka (2009), in his work on assessment in schools in Ibadan rural areas, found out that rural schooling is almost an abandoned programme in the Nigerian rural setting. This is because of drift of rural population to the urban centre due to lack of social amenities and infrastructures resulting from years of utter neglect by successive governments. As a result, only a few ill-equipped schools are provided in the rural Nigerian setting with little or no attention paid to quality as inspectors abandon their responsibilities of ensuring quality, not only in urban, but also in rural schools. Emunemu (2000) and Akorede and Onuka (2008) discovered that more boys go to school in rural areas of Nigeria than girls, which may be seen as an indicator of the imbalance between the quality of urban and rural school management in Nigeria. This development calls for critical examination of the challenges that the imbalance in the
provision of facilities and infrastructures between urban and rural schools in Nigeria, as well as the provision of inadequate number of quality personnel, poses to rural school management in the country.

## Problem Statement

In the light of the disparity between the quality of urban and rural schooling discussed above, it thus becomes imperative to find out how challenges of rural schooling can be overcome and schooling improved upon in the rural areas through effective management. Therefore, this study investigated the challenges of managing schooling in Ibadan rural settings of Oyo State.

## Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in the study:

1. What are the challenges of rural schools in Ibadan Less City as perceived by school managers and senior teachers with management responsibilities?
2. What are the challenges of rural schools in Ibadan Less City as perceived by the rural students?
3. How can these challenges be effectively managed?
4. Are there differences in the perception of students and the teachers on each of the challenges of schooling in Ibadan rural areas?

## Methodology

This study was a survey research which adopted the ex-post facto procedure to gather data. The study compared the challenges of management of urban and rural schooling in Ibadan city (urban) and Ibadan less city (rural). The population of the study was made up of all principals, vice-principals, as well as heads of sections and the entire students in all the schools in the two local government areas. Five schools were randomly selected from Egbeda and Lagelu Local Government Areas of Ibadan Less Cities of Oyo State, Nigeria. The principals and vice-principals, as well as the heads of sections in all the selected schools, constituted the study sample of managers. One hundred and fifty students were randomly selected from the five

- sampled schools in equal numbers.

Two questionnaires of 25 items each were developed and validated by the researchers using cronbach alpha analytic statistic giving 0.67 and 0.73 coefficients, by administering on a sample of fifteen teachers and a sample of 45 students, both of which did not participate, yet were similar in all respects to the study samples; and 0.65 and 0.68 factor analytic validity coefficients respectively. Third instrument consisting of 15 items was equally developed by the researchers and validated using procedure as the first two instruments. This gave reliability co-efficient of 0.63 and validity coefficient of 0.59 respectively. This instrument was administered on rural school managers.
All the instruments were personally administered by the researchers and two of their doctoral students within a space of three weeks. Data from the investigation were analysed using percentage and chi-square statistics.

## Results and Discussion

Table 1: Management of Rural Schooling: School Managers' Views on Challenges

| SN | ITEMS | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SA } \\ & \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { A } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \mathrm{D} \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SD } \\ & \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | There is acute shortage of qualified teachers in schools | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 2 | Settlements are scattered around the schools | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (28.9) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 3 | Long distances to schools | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & (33.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & (13.3) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 4 | Shortage of infrastructures | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (28.9) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 5 | Roads are often 'unmotorable' | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (28.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 . \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 6 | There is no electricity supply in most settlements | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (28.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 7 | Library facilities are unavailable | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (28.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 8 | Students also do domestic works | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 9 | Students are used on the farms by parents after school | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 10 | Extra lessons are unavailable to the students | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & (33.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & (31.1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6 \\ & (13.3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 45 |
| 11 | Teachers rush back to town | 15 | 11 | 10 | 9(20.00 | 45 |


|  | after school hours | (33.3) | (24.4) | (22.2) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 12 | Social amenities are in short supply | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | 13(28.9) | 45 |
| 13 | Only traditional method of learning is available | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (28.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 12(26.7) | 45 |
| 14 | A lot of the students are not themselves interested in schooling | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & (20.0) \end{aligned}$ | $14(31.1)$ | 45 |
| 15 | Some parents are unwilling to send their children/wards to school | $\begin{aligned} & 13 \\ & (33.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & (20.0) \end{aligned}$ | $11(24.4)$ | 45 |
| 16 | Poor teacher attitude to schooling | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 8 \\ & (17.8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | 13 <br> (28.9) | 14(31.1) | 45 |
| 17 | Poor government attitude to rural schooling | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 15 \\ (33.3) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | (15.5) | 13(28.9) | 45 |
| 18 | Private investors are not interested in schooling | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \\ & (31.1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | 10(22.2) | 45 |
| 19 | Community is not so much concerned about schooling | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 11(24.4) | 45 |
| 20 | Lack of synergy among rural communities | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | 12(26.7) | 45 |
| 21 | Inadequate school funding | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 10(22.2) | 45 |
| 22 | Inappropriate schooling management style | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 10 \\ & (22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 11 \\ & (24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | 13(28.9) | 45 |
| 23 | Lack of quality management: application | $\begin{aligned} & 9 \\ & (20.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 10(22.2) | 15(33.3) | 45 |
| 24 | Neglect of rural school by policy makers and implementers | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12 \\ & (26.7) \end{aligned}$ | 16(35.6) | 6(13.3) | 45 |
| 25 | Lack of policing/supervision of rural schooling by the inspectorate/relevant authorities | $\begin{aligned} & 10 \\ & (22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11 \\ & (24.4) \end{aligned}$ | 10(22.2) | 14(31.1) | 45 |

Table 1 showed the level of responses indicating agreement with suggested challenges of rural schooling when cognizance is taken of the combination of 'SA' and ' $A$ '. It shows that 14 items out of 25 items had agreed responses ranging from $51.1 \%$ to $60.0 \%$. It follows, therefore, that the greater percentage of the rural school managers (headteachers and senior teachers) agreed that they are facing all the challenges of rural schooling in Ibadan rural areas of Egbeda and Lagelu - Local Government Area Councils. They see all but the following items 4, $7,8,12,14,15,22,23$ and 25 as posing challenges to rural schooling
management. This tends to differ a bit from the perception of the students who are actually at the receiving end. Thus, the latter that bear the brunt of the pains of poor management of rural schooling are in a position to reveal the real challenges of rural schooling. However, the fact that this category of the respondents agree with more than half of the suggested challenges confirms that there are really challenges facing rural schools in Ibadan, and by extension, in Nigeria. The finding conforms to the findings of National Rural Health Alliance Inc (2009) of Australia that though there are many achievements to celebrate in rural education, yet some issues should be addressed to engender quality schooling. These results equally agree with the findings of Philips (2003) and Starr and White (2008) that challenges of rural schooling management include: workload proliferation, educational equity issues, the re-defined principalship, escalating role multiplicity, and school survival, thus reducing the effectiveness of the school manager. Some of the challenges are also a product of the inability of the rural school managers and teachers to live among the rural populace because of the unavailability of social infrastructures. Thus, implying that the necessary amenities and infrastructures should be provided, as observation in this study revealed dilapidating infrastructures such as falling school buildings as shown in the pictures below:


Fig. 1: Punctured classroom wall used as chalkboard Fig. 2: Children learning under blown-off roof


Fig. 3: Classrooms with fallen-off roofs
Fig. 4: Classroom walls and roofs are completely off


Fig. 5: A storey building block giving way
Fig. 6: Children learning inside unfit-for-human structure

## Table 2:

Students Views on Challenges of Schooling in Ibadan Rural Settings

| SN | ITEMS | SA $\%$ | A $\%$ | D <br> $\%$ | SD <br> $\%$ | TOTAL |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | There is acute shortage of <br> qualified teachers in <br> schools | 80 <br> $(53.3)$ | 29 <br> $(19.3)$ | 11 <br> $(7.3)$ | 30 <br> $(20.0)$ | 150 |
| Settlements are scattered <br> around the schools | 95 <br> $(63.3)$ | 15 <br> $(10.0)$ | 24 <br> $(16.0)$ | 16 <br> $(10.7)$ | 150 |  |
| 3 | Long distances to schools | 84 <br> $(56.0)$ | 16 <br> $(10.7)$ | 12 <br> $(8.0)$ | 38 <br> $(25.3)$ | 150 |
| 4 | Shortage of <br> infrastructures | 67 <br> $(44.7)$ | 33 <br> $(22.0)$ | 27 <br> $(18.0)$ | 23 <br> $(15.3)$ | 150 |


| 5 | Roads are often <br> 'unmotorable' | 58 <br> $(38.7)$ | 46 <br> $(30.7)$ | 46 <br> $(30.7)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 6 | There is no electricity <br> supply in most <br> settlements | 96 <br> $(64.0)$ | 34 <br> $(22.7)$ | 20 <br> $(13.3)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| 7 | Library facilities are <br> unavailable | 121 <br> $(80.7)$ | 29 <br> $(19.3)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| 8 | Students also do <br> domestic works | 150 <br> $(100.0)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| 9 | Students are used on the <br> farms by parents after <br> school | 125 <br> $(83.3)$ | 25 <br> $(16.7)$ | $10.0)$ | $(0.0)$ <br> Extra lessons are <br> unavailable to the <br> students | 112 <br> $(74.7)$ |
| 11 | Teachers rush back to <br> town after school hours | $19.7)$ | 11 <br> $(7.3)$ | 8 <br> $(46.7)$ | $(24.0)$ | $(8.0)$ |


| 20 | Lack of synergy among <br> rural communities | 99 <br> $(66.0)$ | 51 <br> $(34.0)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 21 | Inadequate school <br> funding | 94 <br> $(62.7)$ | 56 <br> $(37.3)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| 22 | Inappropriate schooling <br> management style | 86 <br> $(57.3)$ | 23 <br> $(15.3)$ | 41 <br> $(27.3)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| 23 | Lack of quality <br> management application | 78 <br> $(52.0)$ | 42 <br> $(28.0)$ | 20 <br> $(13.3)$ | 10 <br> $(6.7)$ | 150 |
| 24 | Neglect of rural school by <br> policy makers and <br> implementers | 97 <br> $(64.7)$ | 53 <br> $(35.3)$ | 0 <br> $(0.0)$ | $(0.0)$ | 150 |
| 25 | Lack of <br> policing/supervision of <br> rural schooling by the <br> inspectorate/relevant <br> authorities | 88 <br> $(58.7)$ | 34 <br> $(22.7)$ | 28 | $(18.7)$ | $(0.0)$ |

Table 2 showed that the combination of those who strongly agree (SA) and those who agree (A) resulted in higher percentages for all but two items, namely: items 14 and 15 ; that is, the majority of the respondents agreed that 23 out of 25 items are challenges to rural schooling. The percentage agreement with these challenges ranged between 60 and 100 for the 23 items as clearly shown by Table 2. It follows, therefore, that students agreed that they are facing all the challenges on the Table except the challenges 14 and 15 on the instrument, which state that 'a lot of the students are not themselves interested in schooling' and that 'some parents are unwilling to send their children/wards to school'. Reason can easily be adduced to this because no one actually wants to be held responsible for anything that may be viewed negative or unpleasant, as not schooling in the context of this study implies. The finding conforms to the finding of Onuka (2009) that rural schooling had been utterly neglected in the Nigerian education environment. The situation in the rural schooling also confirms the fact that the education sector had been generally under-funded by government and the private education sub-sector does not find the rural area attractive as they are . mainly inhabited by the poor peasants (Babalola, 2001; Bakkabulindi, 2005; Onuka, 2005; and Onuka, 2009;). The problem of under-funding
of public education on the continent has become a perennial problem as attested to by the example of Uganda and Nigeria (Bakkabulindi, 2005; Onuka, 2005).

The implication of this finding is that, public education, and in particular, rural schooling, must be well funded in order to arrest the continuous rural drift which further complicates the current alarming rate of unemployment in the country. It also implies that government should ensure the provision of social and rural infrastructures and should not privatise rural schooling.

Table 3 presents results in percentages on the suggested ways of overcoming the challenges facing the management of rural schooling in Ibadan, Nigeria.

Table 3: Ways of Managing the Challenges of Rural Schooling

| SN | ITEMS | SA | $\%$ | A | $\%$ | D | $\%$ | SD | $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Employing of qualified <br> teachers in schools | 12 | 26.7 | 10 | 22.2 | 8 | 17.8 | 15 | 33.3 |
| 2 | Provision of good road <br> network to connect <br> neighbouring <br> communities to the <br> schools | 15 | 33.3 | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 |
| 3 | Provision of requisite <br> infrastructures | 12 | 26.7 | 11 | 24.4 | 12 | 26.7 | 10 | 22.2 |
| 4 | Provision of rural <br> electrification | 13 | 28.9 | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 | 12 | 26.7 |
| 5 | 15 | 33.3 | 12 | 26.7 | 5 | 11.1 | 13 | 28.9 |  |
| 6 | Provision of quality <br> libraries | Constant inspectorate <br> visitation to rural schools | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 | 15 |
| 7 | 24.4 | 14 | 31.1 | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 |  |  |
| Provision of extra <br> lessons after normal <br> school hours | 10 | 22.2 | 12 | 26.7 | 15 | 33.3 | 8 | 17.8 |  |
| 8 | More social amenities <br> should be provided for <br> rural areas | 14 | 31.1 | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 | 11 | 24.4 |
| 9 | Modern techniques of <br> teaching should be <br> evolved in rural <br> schooling | 10 | 20.0 | 13 | 28.9 | 15 | 33.3 | 8 | 17.8 |
| 10 | Rural parents should be <br> educated on the import | 9 | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | of schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | Principals should evolve <br> rural schooling synergy | 12 | 26.7 | 11 | 24.4 | 11 | 24.4 | 11 | 24.4 |
| 12 | Prospective students <br> should be given the <br> necessary <br> encouragement to <br> embrace schooling | 12 | 26.7 | 11 | 24.4 | 10 | 22.2 | 12 | 26.7 |
| 13 | Public-private <br> partnership should be <br> encouraged in rural <br> schooling | 10 | 22.2 | 15 | 33.3 | 10 | 22.2 | 10 | 22.2 |
| 14 | Rural schooling should <br> be adequately funded | 12 | 26.7 | 14 | 31.1 | 10 | 22.2 | 9 | 20.0 |
| 15 | Qualified school <br> managers should be <br> posted to rural schools | 12 | 26.7 | 10 | 22.2 | 8 | 17.8 | 15 | 33.3 |

The Table showed that ' $S A^{\prime}$ ' and ' $A$ ', when combined, have higher percentages for 10 items out of 15 items; the percentages ranging from $51.1 \%$ to $60.0 \%$. It follows, therefore, that managers/teachers did not agree with some of the proffered solutions, though agreed with $2 / 3$ of the suggested solutions. The suggested ways which the majority of them could not come to terms with were items $1,6,8,10$ and 15 which suggested respectively that:

- More qualified teachers should be employed for rural schools;
- There should be constant inspectorate visitation to rural schools;
- More social amenities should be provided for rural areas;
- Rural parents should be educated on the import of schooling; and
- Qualified school managers should be posted to rural schools.

One reason for disagreement with these suggested solutions may have to do with the fact that they perceived them as means of eroding the all important image the rural teachers/managers have built for themselves in the villages. As it is often said: 'in the world of blind people, a oneeyed man is usually the king'. Another reason for this finding might not be unconnected with the fact that if the suggestions should be accepted and implemented, some of their activities which may not be in conformity with the ethics of the workplace such as regular
absenteeism, laxity, and private businesses during working hours, etc may become exposed. Nevertheless, these suggestions and those they readily accepted are aggregately with earlier findings and/or suggestions (Emunemu, 2000; Onuka, 2005; Onuka, 2006; Akorede and Onuka, 2008; Onuka, 2009) respectively that stakeholders should invest more in the education of the Nigerian child; that government provides more funds for the running of public schools; that management training be given to those who hold positions of responsibility in schools; and that rural schools should be given special attention in the provision of qualified personnel and infrastructures, in order to promote quality schooling in general and quality Nigerian rural schooling in particular, since that is the main purpose of management of schooling. They are in consonance with the postulation of Institute for Educational Leadership (2005) that rural schools must be provided the tools requisite for effective school management. They also confirm the findings of Abdulraheem, Ibitoye, Bamiduro and Onen (2008) that school effectiveness has direct relationship with availability of resources in schools. Thus, the revelation calls for urgent need to address lack of infrastructures in the rural schools promptly and squarely.

Table 4:
Differences between the perception of students and managers/teachers on each of the items

| ITEMS | SA | A | D | SD | TOTAL | $\mathrm{X}^{2}$ <br> Sig |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1. Students | $80(53.3)$ | $29(19.3)$ | $11(7.3)$ | $30(20.0)$ | 150 | 0.004 |
| Teachers | $12(26.7)$ | $11(24.4)$ | $10(22.2)$ | $12(26.7$ | 45 | S |
| 2. Students | $95(63.3)$ | $15(10.0)$ | $24(16.0)$ | $16(10.7)$ | 150 | 0.00 |
| Teachers | $10(22.2)$ | $10(22.2)$ | $12(26.7)$ | $13(28.9)$ | 45 | S |
| 3. Students | $84(56.0)$ | $16(10.7)$ | $12(8.0)$ | $38(25.3)$ | 150 | 0.00 |
| Teachers | $15(33.3)$ | $12(26.7)$ | $12(26.7)$ | $6(13.3)$ | 45 | S |
| 4. Students | $67(44.7)$ | $33(22.0)$ | $27(18.0)$ | $23(15.3)$ | 150 | 0.09 |
| Teachers | $12(26.7)$ | $10(22.0)$ | $10(22.0)$ | $13(28.9)$ | 45 | NS |
| 5. Students | $58(38.7)$ | $46(30.7)$ | $46(30.7)$ | $0(0.0)$ | 150 | 0.00 |
| Teachers | $10(22.0)$ | $13(28.9)$ | $11(24.4)$ | $11(24.4)$ | 45 | S |
| 6. Students | $96(64.0)$ | $34) 22.7)$ | $20(13.3)$ | $0(0.0)$ | 150 | 0.00 |
| Teachers | $13(28.9)$ | $11(24.4)$ | $10(22.2)$ | $11(24.4)$ | 45 | S |
| 7. Students | $121(80.7)$ | $29(19.3)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | 150 | 0.00 |
| Teachers | $10(22.2)$ | $12(26.6)$ | $13(28.9)$ | $10(22.2)$ | 45 | S |
| 8. Students | $150(100.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | $0(0.0)$ | 150 | 0.00 |
| Teachers | $10(22.2)$ | $11(24.4)$ | $12(26.7)$ | $12(26.7)$ | 45 | S |


| 9. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 125(83.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 25(16.7) \\ & 12(26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 11(24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 10(22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & \mathrm{~S} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 112(74.7) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19(12.7) \\ & 15(33.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 11(7.3) \\ & 14(31.1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8(5.3) \\ & 6(13.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 11. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 70(46.7) \\ & 15(33.3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36(24.0) \\ & 11(24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12(8.0) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32(21.3) \\ & 9(20.00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.054 \\ & \text { NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 146(97.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4(2.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 13(28.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45^{\prime} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 13. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 91(60.7) \\ & 13(28.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29(19.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 13(8.7) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 17(11.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & s \end{aligned}$ |
| 14. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 50(33.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22(14.7) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42(28.0) \\ & 9(20.0) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36(24.0) \\ & 14(31.1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.359 \\ & \text { NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| 15. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 31(20.7) \\ & 13(33.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23(15.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58(38.7) \\ & 9(20.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38(25.3) \\ & 11(24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.077 \\ & \text { NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| 16. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 50(33.3) \\ & 8(17.8) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50(33.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36(24.0) \\ & 13(28.9) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 14(9.3) \\ & 14(31.1) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.001 \\ & \mathrm{~S} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 17. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 59(39.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31(20.7) \\ & 15(33.3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30(20.0) \\ & 7(15.5) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30(20.0) \\ & 13(28.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.078 \\ & \text { NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| 18. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 150(100.0) \\ & 14(31.1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 10(22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 11(24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 10(22.2) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 19. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 89(59.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41(27.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20(13.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 11(24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 99(66.0) \\ & 12(26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 51(34.0) \\ & 11(24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 12(26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 94(62.7) \\ & 12(26.7) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56(37.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 11(24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & S \end{aligned}$ |
| 22. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 86(57.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23(15.3) \\ & 11(24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41(27.3) \\ & 11(24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 13(28.9) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & \mathrm{~s} \end{aligned}$ |
| 23. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 78(52.0) \\ & 9(20.0) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 42(28.0) \\ & 11(24.4) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20(13.3) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10(6.7) \\ & 15(33.3) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 5 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 24. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 97(64.7) \\ & 11(24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 53(35.3) \\ & 12(26.7) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 16(35.6) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 6(13.3) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| 25. Students Teachers | $\begin{aligned} & 88(58.7) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 34(22.7) \\ & 11(24.4) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 28(18.7) \\ & 10(22.2) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0(0.0) \\ & 14(31.1) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 150 \\ & 45 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.00 \\ & \mathrm{~S} \end{aligned}$ |

From the Table above, the differences between the perceptions of the students and teachers/managers are not significant in 5 out of the 25 items, which are items $4,11,14,15$ and 17 . Others showed significant difference both at 0.05 and 0.01 . The items where there were no significant differences state that: there is shortage of infrastructures; teachers rush back to town after school hours; a lot of the students are not themselves interested in schooling; some parents are unwilling to send their children/wards to school; and poor government attitude to rural schooling. It means both school managers/teachers are agreed on
the items where there were no significant differences between the perceptions of the students and the school managers/teachers, and as such they do occur as pointed above in the Table and should be immediately dealt with to ensure better management of rural schooling in Ibadan, Nigeria. This congruence shows that challenges exist in rural schooling, confirming the finding of Onuka (2009) who did a study in a similar rural setting on the challenges of implementing continuous assessment in Ibadan, Nigeria. It equally corroborates the findings of Adedeji, Okemakinde and Ssempebwa (2008) that availability of physical results in academics is what effective school is all about, that is to achieve academic excellence. Thus, availability of physical resources facilitates effective management of rural schooling.

However, the significant differences in the perceptions of both the students and the managers/teachers in the other items only indicate that they saw the same challenges differently, even though both sample sets agree that the challenges exist. Their existence calls for immediate action on the part of the appropriate authorities to address the issues at stake.

## Conclusion

There is no doubting the fact that rural schooling is essential in Nigeria when cognizance is taken of the large population in the Nigerian rural setting. Yet, this study has revealed that no serious attention was being given to the management of rural schooling in Ibadan, Nigeria. This is because schools in such areas are not provided with the requisite quantum and quality of both infrastructures and personnel to manage the schools effectively, in order to engender quality learning which results from quality teaching. Quality teaching and learning cannot obviously be engendered in the absence of social amenities like good 'motorable' roads, good quality school buildings, with good and adequate furnishing, equipped with quality learning materials, cottage hospitals and industries to attract dedicated and quality teachers. It thus becomes imperative to enhance effective managing of rural schooling in Ibadan, Nigeria in order to engender quality education. Therefore, consequent upon this observation being an outcome of the study, the following recommendations were made.

## Recommendations

The recommendations proffered as a consequence of the outcome of the study were as follows:

- Government and other interested stakeholders should embark on massive rural development to attract qualified and dedicated teachers to the rural areas and stem the tide of ruralurban drift, thereby making the setting conducive for effective management of rural schooling in Ibadan in particular and Nigeria in general.
- Employers of teachers should give special incentives to those who are posted to rural schools and choose to continue to work in such settings.
- Schools in rural areas should be rehabilitated and equipped to compare favourably with those in the urban areas in order to attract students and teachers to stay in rural communities.
- Government and other employers of teachers in rural areas should build well furnished houses for teachers in the rural areas at subsidized and affordable rates.
- Rural communities should be encouraged to provide some of the social amenities in order to attract more hardworking, qualified and committed teachers to their homesteads. This can assist in propelling the teachers in rural areas to take extra time and efforts at ensuring that quality education is given to the pupils/students.
- Deliberate government-initiated and community-based policy and programme of uninhibited comprehensive rural development should be evolved and sustained.
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