



Input Evaluation of Undergraduate Economics Education Degree Programme in Universities in the South-South Geopolitical Zone in Nigeria

KEMGBARA, J. D. PhD

**Department of Educational Foundations, Rivers State University,
Port Harcourt, Nigeria.**

Email: ikgebara2016@gmail.com.

Phone no. 08067967944 , 09061279685

ABSTRACT

The study investigated undergraduate's economics education degree programme in selected Nigerian universities. The study employed the utilitarian (practical) evaluation research design. The population of the study consisted of 2,297 respondents selected from the seven universities in the south – south geopolitical zone of Nigeria. The sample consisted of 492 subjects (324 students, 36 lecturers, and 132 senior staff of government establishments representing employers of economics education graduates) drawn from the seven universities and the establishments where they are located. The samples were drawn through stratified random sampling technique. Seven research questions and seven hypotheses were formulated and tested to guide the study. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. The study focused on variables such a context (objectives and curriculum contents), inputs quality of students at the point of entry in terms of admission requirements, facilities and equipments, and teaching staff quantity and qualifications), process evaluation (effective methods of teaching undergraduate economics education), and products (skills acquired by first-degree graduates of economics education programme as perceived by the employers of economics education graduates).The instruments for data collection for this study were checklists and rating scales. Five set of research instruments were used for collecting data for this study. Mean scores were computed and used to answer seven research questions. Seven hypotheses were used to determine the degree of significant difference existing between required and observed variables at 0.05 alpha (α) levels. One-way Analysis of Variance was adopted to analyze the data and test the seven hypotheses. The results of the investigation revealed that the objectives, curriculum contents, quality of students in terms of admission requirements, facilities and equipments, teaching methods used in implementing undergraduate economics education programme, teaching staff quantity and qualifications, and the skills acquired by first-degree graduates of economics education were adequate and meet the required minimum academic standards for University of Port Harcourt (PHC), University of UYO (UYO), and Delta State University (DELSU). The results also revealed that the curriculum contents, facilities and equipment, and skills acquired by the first-degree graduates were not adequate for University of Benin (BENIN), Ignatius Ajuru University of Education (IAUE), Niger Delta University (NDU) and University of Calabar (CALABAR) in particular. It was recommended that facilities and equipments be provided to encourage innovations in teaching/learning in universities where the facilities are available but not functioning, the university's administration should practice a good maintenance culture for such facilities.

Keywords: economics education, evaluation, programme,

INTRODUCTION

The input into education is the use of the buildings and the equipment that is contained in them, the time of the teachers, social workers, assistants, secretaries, administrators, inspectors, voluntary workers of all kinds, the time of the pupils; all that is the 'input' (Vaizey, 1971).

Kpolovie (2012) said that input evaluation is a form of evaluation adopted for determination of resources and the best ways that the resources can be blended or combined to produce the most desirable objectives. The potency and utility of financial, human and physical inputs or resources in the actualization of the programme goals is a necessary step. Evaluation of input is done for identification of designs, agents and strategies that will be most useful for implementation of the programme.

According to Ubulom (2006), inputs are simply the resources used for effective implementation of any education programme of which economics education is no exception. The resources include quality of students at the point of entry into the programme in terms of admission requirements, and qualifications of teaching staff, non-teaching staff, head of department/discipline/sub-discipline and staff development; physical facilities, which are laboratory/clinic /studio facilities (area per student) and equipment, classroom facilities and equipment, laboratories size (area per student), equipment, safety and environmental sanitation as well as financing of the programme. Inputs represent the resources (human and material) available to the system or school (Asuru, 2006). They are made up of the pupils enrolled in school showing their net and gross enrollment ratio (NER, GER), net attendance ratio (NAR), etc. others are pupils characteristics in terms of gender, age, location (urban/semi-urban and rural locations). The level of funding constitutes an important component of school material resource. Facilities are made up of building, furniture, textual and instructional materials. These components provide insight into what is available for the implementation of the programme (Obanya, 2002, Tahir, 2003). Their level of availability goes a great extent to determine the extent of readiness for the programme and indeed its success or failure (Asuru, 2008).

“The theory of economics is a method rather than a doctrine, an apparatus of the mind, a technique of thinking which helps its possessor to draw correct conclusions” (Keynes, 1921). Economics education involves the use of methods in explaining economic theories. The problem of classroom teaching and learning of economics is the methodical explanation of economic theory. The two methods of explaining economics theory are: the inductive and the deductive methods of reasoning. First and foremost, the researcher examines the explanation of theoretical economics, that is, the deductive aspect of economics reasoning. The classroom explanation must take account of the deductive nature of an economist’s explanation (Oliver, 1973). Otherwise the student is not receiving an economic training. For instance, if we present the result of economics’ deductions as received doctrine, it will be contrary to the modern conception of the nature of economics or a method leading, at best, to tentative conclusions. Teaching economics in this way cannot achieve the goal of imparting an economic training.

Secondly, if a student does not reason for himself, but is simply presented with perhaps, the principle of comparative cost in international trade as something to remember and understand, it is likely that he will do neither of these better than he would have done if he had been made to reason out the principle for himself.

Thirdly, when the students are made to reason for themselves they will initially meet some difficulties, but provided the material is suitably selected, they will overcome the difficulties. This makes them learn to understand fully what is already known as training for the discovery of what was previously unknown. If students are made to reason for themselves, it is more likely that they will remember the economics theory, realize its significance, have confidence in it and be able to make use of it. Successful explanation therefore lies in a distinction between knowledge and understanding. The relevant difference between the two can be illustrated in this example. You can present a student with the information that profits are maximized where marginal costs and revenue are equated. He might be persuaded to remember the information and believe it. But he has had no training as an economist to explain why profits are maximized at the output level where marginal costs equal marginal revenue. He therefore needs to understand why profits are maximized not where total revenue is highest but where marginal costs and revenue are equal. It is this understanding that will arm the student with the principle he needs for wider applicability. This approach will be illustrated further in the later section.

Meaning of evaluation

Evaluation of an educational programme is an applied method of determining the worth or value of an institution or organization. Programme evaluation has been defined as Systematic process used to

determine the merit or worth of a specific programme, curriculum, or strategy in a specific context (Guskey, 2000). Programme evaluation, according to Omoru-Onuka (2001). 'determines the responsiveness of a Programme clientele by answering some questions as to how it has been responsible for achieving its goals, thus obvious; programme evaluation becomes on appropriate means of determining programme accountability. For Scriven (1991), programme evaluation is defined as judging the worth or merit of something or the product of the process. French, Bell, and Zawacki (2000) stated that the stakeholders are interested in assessing the effects of programme by asking questions like 'what changes occurred?' or 'are we satisfied with the results?' The point here is to ensure that programme are accomplishing their intended purpose.

In evaluating programme, various models of evaluation are adopted. Evaluation model means the application of a general theory in a specific context (Lipsey & Chrystal, 2004). The various models are goal-oriented model (Tyler, 1958), Countenance model (Robert Stake, 1963), Discrepancy model (Malcom Provus, 1967), goal-free and goal-based evaluation models (Scriven, 1967), and CIPP models (Guba and Stufflebeam, 1970). For the sake of this research, only four (4) of the evaluation models, viz; Goal-free evaluation model, Countenance model, Discrepancy model and the CIPP model will be reviewed and the evaluation of this programme will be anchored on the CIPP model. This is because the main characteristic of CIPP is the collection of data for the purpose of decision-making, hence, it is all-encompassing.

Models of Evaluation

An educational programme is made up of such components as content, facilities and methodology for delivery. It aims at enabling the citizens, recipients or clients to acquire attitudes, knowledge and skills for harnessing human and material resources so as to improve their living standard and that of their environment. It therefore implies that an evaluation of such programme must take cognizance of these varied components. It is in the light of this that different evaluation models have been propounded by evaluation experts (Asuru, 2008). These are the goal-free evaluation model, countenance model, discrepancy model, and the CIPP model. For the evaluation of undergraduate economics education degree programme in selected Nigerian Universities, various parts of the programme must be discussed and made subject matter of the evaluation as discussed below:

Goal-Free Evaluation Methods

Goal-Free Evaluation (GFE) is the evaluation of interim and ultimate outcomes, regardless of whether they were intended. Scriven (1978) states that goal-free evaluation involves conducting an evaluation of outcomes without the evaluator being exposed to, or contaminated by, awareness of the purposes or goals. Interest in studying side effects in evaluation did not originate with Scriven's proposal of GFE. He and other specialists in evaluation had noted earlier a need to attend to side effects (Scriven, 1957; Glass, 1969) or unintended outcomes (Cronbach, 1963; Stake, 1967) as well as to the objectives of educational programs. It was Scriven, however, who coined the term goal-free evaluation and articulated and popularized the concept.

Scriven did not propose that GFE be the only strategy used to evaluate a programme's worth; other evaluative data (including objectives-referenced data) should also be used. His point was that goal-free information would be less subject than goal-based information to contamination by the evaluator's prior knowledge of programme goals, and that it should supplement rather than replace other goal-based evaluation methods.

Scriven's approach to GFE forces the evaluator into serious needs assessment. The evaluator does not look to see if the performance matches the project director's goals. Instead, criteria against which the project is compared reflect the needs of the target population.

Thus GFE begins when the evaluator and client first meet. Assuming interest, the first consideration is the feasibility of using GFE. The evaluator should avoid any questions that would lead the client to disclose the goals or objectives of the project. Instead, the evaluator must determine the context and scope of the project being evaluated by asking questions like these:

Where is the project being implemented? If the project is being implemented in inaccessible sites or over a wide geographical area, then the goal-free approach may not be feasible.

How long has the project been running? How long will it run? If the project has been running a long time, or is almost over, the goal-free approach may not be appropriate.

What is the total number of participants in the project? The number of participants gives the evaluator some indication of the relative size of the project and corresponding budget and personnel requirements.

What is the evaluation's cost constraints? Determining cost constraints early is essential in assessing feasibility. For instance, the GFE may require site visitations that prove prohibitively costly given available resources.

Can written permission and site-access be obtained? If not, the goal-free approach may not be feasible.

What other evaluation work is planned? In most cases, the GFE approach should be used in conjunction with other evaluation strategies.

Countenance Evaluation Model - Stake (1967) postulated another evaluation model known as countenance Model, which emphasized that, the role of an evaluator should be to provide description and judgment data of educational programme based on formal inquiry techniques. To provide description is to delineate the variables in a phenomenon and to describe all the activities under each variable, while to provide judgment is to provide data on which judgment is to be based. To Stake, it is not the responsibility of an evaluator to pass judgment on a programme; rather his job is to provide data, which will help a decision maker to pass judgment. This purpose statement forms the pivot around which his model is built.

Stake presented three (3) classes of data collection in his model. They are antecedents, transactions and Outcomes. He stressed that there must be logical contingencies among the intended antecedents, transactions and outcomes as well as empirical contingencies among the observed data. Antecedents are simply the conditions that have existed prior to the implementation of the programme or instruction, which may relate to outcomes. They are also data that were brought together to create a programme (input materials). Transactions are simply all that transpired in the programme. Stake viewed them as the "succession of engagements" that constitutes the process of instruction. Outcomes as conceived by Stake encompass the traditional student's learning outcomes. They include immediate, long-range, cognitive, affective, person and societal outcomes (Rose and Nyre, 1977), the impact, which programme have on the learners, teachers, administrators and others as well as wear and tear on equipment and facilities in its conduct. Stake classified descriptive information according to whether they are referred to what was intended or what was actually observed. He emphasized that intentions and what actually took place must be fully described. Stake therefore divided judgmental information according to whether they refer to standards used in reaching judgments or to the actual judgments themselves. He assumes the existence of some kind of rationale guiding the design of an educational programme (Popham, 1975).

In effect, there must be congruence between the intents and the observed data between the relative and absolute criteria (Dike, 1998). Ensuring consistency and congruence means that the variables must not contradict one another.

In his later work on responsive evaluation, Stake (1967) added that rather than personally passing judgement, the evaluator should collect samples of the judgments of many people in the programme – the clients, staff, community and others. His emphasis on the evaluators needed to be fully aware of the concerns and sensitivity of many people affected by the programme became the central theme in several "process-only" evaluation approaches.

From the foregoing therefore, this researcher observed that two (2) bases for judging the characteristics of a programme exist in Countenance Model of Stake. These are the evaluation of a programme either on the basis of absolute standards or relative standards. This implies either standards reflecting personal opinion concerning what the programme should be or standards reflecting other similar programme. That being so, judgment is involved in making a choice of which set of standards to use, whether absolute or relative, to obtain an overall rating of merit upon which to base recommendations regarding the future of the programme. Countenance evaluation Model was found to be relevant and applicable to this study but it was not adopted for the study.

Discrepancy Evaluation Model

Provus (1969) proposed another systematic approach to evaluation known as the Discrepancy Model. His major emphasis was to identify any discrepancy that may exist between posited programme standards and programme performance. Malcolm Provus did not lay emphasis on rendering judgment during programme evaluation rather he based his argument on the fact that evaluation involves the comparison of performance with standards. According to him, programme evaluation entails the process of:

Defining Programme Standards;

Determining whether a discrepancy exists between some aspects of programme performance and the standards governing the aspect of the programme; and

Using discrepancy information either to change performance or to change programme standards.

The discrepancy model is consisting of five stages of programme comparison namely; design, installation, process and product of the programme. Each of the stages involves a comparison between reality and performance. Based on this premise, standards and discrepancies are determined by examining the three content categories of input, process and output at each stage and comparing the programme performance information with these defined standards at each stage.

The first stage of Discrepancy Model, which is known as the design of the programme deals with the documentation of the nature of the programme taking into consideration the objectives of the programme, the students, staff and other resources that must be present before the programme objectives can be achieved and the instructional activities presumed to promote attainment of the objectives. The second stage is the installation of the programme, which involves an effort to examine whether an implemented programme is congruent with its installation plans. Process is the third stage of discrepancy Model in which the evaluator serves in a formative role, comparing performance with standards and focusing on the extent to which the interim or enabling objectives have been achieved. The fourth stage, which is the product stage, is concerned with comparing actual attainments against the standards (objectives) derived during the first stage and noting the discrepancies. The fifth and the final stage are concerned with the question of cost. At this stage, a cost-benefit is made of the programme and compared with other similar programme in nature.

Since the primary function and orientation of the discrepancy Model is to provide information for decision makers, Popham (1975) classified it as a decision-facilitation model. However, he acknowledged that there is an overlap between the categories and the discrepancy Model, which is subject to the same criticisms leveled against the goal-attainment models of evaluation. Discrepancy Evaluation Model is discovered to be a useful model to evaluate the undergraduate economics education degree programme but it was not used for this study.

CIPP Evaluation Model

CIPP is one of the best-known decision-management-oriented evaluation schemes, Daniel Stufflebeam originated in 1971. Stufflebeam (1971) pointed out that since evaluation is performed in the service of decision-making, its emphasis should be on the provision of useful information to those who make decisions. In this Model, more emphasis is place on data collection and storage of information to aid decision makers with less emphasis place on judgement. His model is made up of three steps, namely delineating, obtaining and providing information. In all Stufflebeam believed that delineating and providing operations are carried out collaboratively between evaluator and decision-maker, whereas the obtaining of information is a technical activity carried out mainly by the evaluator.

CIPP is an acronym representing the four (4) types of evaluation, which this model identifies, namely: context evaluation, input evaluation, process evaluation and product evaluation. Context evaluation is mainly for decision planning while input evaluation is for decision structuring. Process evaluation and product evaluation are mainly for decision implementation and decision recycling respectively.

Context evaluation provides rationale for determining programmes' objectives by defining relevant environment which the programme operate, describing what should transpire or exist within the setting, identify needs, unmet needs and unused opportunities and finding out or diagnosing cause for unmet needs and used opportunities. At this point of evaluation, an evaluator relies on conceptual analysis, empirical studies as well as authoritative opinions and theory of experts in order to delineate the problem

areas to be solved. For the input evaluation, its aim is to determine resources and how to utilize the available resources in order to achieve the programme's objectives by identifying appropriate agent, strategies for achieving objectives and assessing designs for implementing selected strategies.

Process evaluation takes place at the stage a programme has been installed and its purpose is to provide periodic feedback to persons responsible for implementing plans and procedures. This can be achieved by detecting or predicting defects in the procedural designs or its implementation during the implementation stage, providing information for programme decision and maintaining a record of the procedure as it occurs. In fact, what happens at this point are installation and process stages of programme. Also, the purpose of product evaluation is to measure and interpret attainments not only at the end of a programme circle but as often as necessary during the duration of the programme. This is done by providing operational definition of objectives, measure criteria associated with objective, compare these measurements with predetermined absolute or relative standards and make rational interpretation of the outcomes using the recorded context, input and process information.

With each of the types of evaluation, data are delivered, obtained, provided and used for decision-making. Data from context evaluation helps to determine if programme meet the laid down objectives while data from input evaluation assist to identify strategies for desired changes in the programme. Data from process evaluation helps to examine the procedural designs for programme implementation while data from product evaluation assists to examine the quality standards of the programme. At this juncture, this researcher observed that in order to evaluate undergraduate economics education degree programme of some Nigerian universities, there is the need for any of the examined evaluation models to be used. This is because of their relevance and easy application. However, CIPP Evaluation Model was used to carry out the evaluation study of the undergraduate economics education degree programme of the universities investigated.

Stufflebeam's CIPP model is the most preferred in this evaluation study because it serves as a "decision facilitation or decision-management-oriented" model which this study is more concerned about. According to Dike (2016) this model places more emphasis on data collection and storage to aid decision makers.

Stufflebeam (1971) sees "decision" as the "act of making up one's mind". Thus, in order to make up one's mind, an evaluator has to use systematic techniques to obtain data on alternatives. Dike (2016) described Stufflebeam's attempt to bring in an element of decision setting within which decisions occur" in his model as a change. He identified and discussed the type of change needed for this decision alternative as the homeostatic change. The homeostatic change is one whose objective is to maintain equilibrium in a system. It is restorative in nature and the commonest of all the changes in education. Homeostatic decisions are intended to correct a programme and change it back to its normal balance. In this decision setting, the amount of change required is small but to be accompanied by high level of information grasp. This is typical of a programme evaluation in education.

Statement of the Problem

Economics is a very important discipline or endeavour as it deals with how basic resources are transformed by producers into all the many commodities that modern consumers want. It is a branch of the social sciences offered as a conventional programme in most Universities in the South-South Geopolitical Zone in Nigerian. Some universities with the oldest department of economics education are; University of Ibadan, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, University of Nigeria, Nsukka, University of Lagos, and Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile Ife. These economics education departments were established by the government to play a prominent role in producing generations of Nigerian economics teachers. But it all end there, as the Nigerian economists and the economics departments in the various universities remain shadows of their expectations; these departments are known for producing critical thinkers and famous scholars who at one time or the other have contributed to formulating government policies.

In Nigeria today, there are so many departments of economics in the new generation universities (both private and public). The high expectation by both government and the society is that the knowledge of economics acquired by products of our universities would salvage the recessive economy. Hence, the

questions: How does the undergraduate economics education programme in Nigeria universities impact on the well-being of society, and can the decline in the status of the department of economics education in Universities in the South-South Geo-Political Zone in Nigerian result in the absence of quality economics teachers. Again, could the problem be as a result of the curriculum content not being relevant, or could it be as a result of the paucity of professors in the department of economics in our universities? Furthermore, could the problem be traceable to students not admitted on merit, inadequate facilities for staff and students, and the use of reprehensible teaching methods? It is against this background that this research was carried out.

Purpose of the Study

1. To determine if the available facilities used in implementing undergraduates economics education degree programme in Nigerian Universities meet the required minimum standards of the National Universities Commission.
2. To establish whether the teaching staff quantity and qualifications used by Nigerian universities to run undergraduate economics education degree programme meet the required minimum academic standards of the National Universities Commission.

Research Questions

1. How do the available facilities used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme in Universities in the South-South Geo-Political Zone meet the required minimum standards of the National Universities Commission?
2. How do the teaching staff quantity and qualifications meet the required minimum academic standard of the National Universities Commission?

Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme in Universities in the South-South Geo-Political Zone as specified by the NUC.
2. There is no significant difference in teaching staff quantity and qualifications as specified by the National Universities Commission.

Scope of the Study

This study was carried out in universities in South-South geo-political zone of Nigeria. The geographical scope of this study covered the University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt in Rivers State, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, in Rivers State, University of Calabar, Cross River State, University of Uyo, Uyo in Akwa-Ibom State, Delta State University, Abraka in Delta State, University of Benin, Benin in Edo State, and Niger-Delta University in Bayelsa State.

The study covered the following areas: context, input, process and product evaluation of undergraduate economics education degree programme. Context evaluation Seeks for information concerning quality of students at the point of entry into the programme alongside the admission requirements, quantity and qualifications of teaching staff, the available facilities, methods of teaching, the undergraduate economics education degree programme. Process evaluation seeks for data about skill (or ability) of economics education lecturers in using resources (or input) factors, such as method of teaching, materials for the teaching and method of implementing curriculum content of the undergraduate economics education degree programme. Product evaluation collects data on quality of skill and performance of economics education graduates.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study adopted utilitarian evaluation research design, Kpolovie (2010) defines utilitarian evaluation research design as a research methodology that satisfies both scientific and ethical requirements for arriving at and passing value judgments on the way that a programme is planned and executed or implemented for actualization of related societal needs.

Utilitarian evaluation research design investigates the effectiveness, efficiency and accountability of an educational programme as planned and executed for the overall good of the society. It allows for the

understanding of the aims and interest of the evaluators, operators of the programme, subjects of the study and the members of the society from their different perspectives or standpoint.

Thus, with utilitarian evaluation design, the interest of even disadvantaged or powerless groups are represented and accorded priority as an ethical matter that the programme should serve or address.

The CIPP model of evaluation was employed in this investigation. The CIPP model developed by Stufflebeam consists of four components, viz: C= context, I = input, P = process, and P = Product. This model is preferred because it is all encompassing. The aforementioned aspects of CIPP are adopted in the evaluation of undergraduate economics education degree programme in Nigerian universities.

Area of Study

The study was carried out in Port Harcourt, Calabar, Uyo, Abraka, Benin and Amasoma, These cities are located in the south-south of Nigeria. Especially, the department of economics education Ignatius Ajuru University of education, Port Harcourt, Department of Economics Education University of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Department of Economics education university of Calabar, Calabar, Department of economics education University of Uyo, Department of Economics education, Delta State university, Abraka, Department of Economies education, University of Benin, and Department of Economics education, Niger Delta university, Amasoma, were used as area of the study. Also, organizations such as secondary schools, ministries and parastatals located at Port Harcourt, Calabar, Uyo, Abraka, Benin, and Amasoma that employ the services of economics education first-degree graduates were randomly sampled from a list of such organizations and used for the study. The rationale for using these organizations for the study is that they are the major employers of graduates of economics education programme.

Population for the Study

The population for this study consisted of thirty six lecturers of economics education including their heads of departments, and two thousand, two hundred and ninety seven (2,297) undergraduates of economics education degree programme of the universities investigated. The breakdown of the population- that is, universities with their lecturers and students, are presented in table 3 below.

Table 1: Population for the Study

UNIVERSITIES	LECTURERS	RESPONDENTS 400 LEVEL STUDENTS	CITIES	EMPLOYERS OF ECONOMICS EDUCATION GRADUATES	TOTAL
PHC	2	230			
IAUE	2	172	PH	36	442
DELSU	11	256	ABRAKA	34	301
CALABAR	4	247	CALABAR	32	283
BENIN	8	221	BENIN	33	262
UYO	5	510	UYO	32	547
NDU	4	425	AMASOMA	33	462
Total	36	2,061		200	2,297

The population of this study also consisted of 200 senior staff such as principals, vice principals, heads of departments from secondary schools, senior civil servants from ministries and agencies (Post Primary and UBE Board) located in Port Harcourt, Calabar, Uyo, Benin, Abraka, and Amasoma where the government establishments that employ economics education graduates in the south-south geo-political zone of Nigeria are located. These public establishments are the employers of economics education graduates.

Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample of the study was divided into three groups. The first group consisted of seven heads of departments of economics education and 29 lecturers from university of Port Harcourt (PHC), Ignatius Ajuru University of Education (IAUE), Port Harcourt, University of Calabar (CALABAR), University of

Uyo, Uyo, University of Benin (BENIN), Delta State University (DELSU), Abraka, and Niger Delta University (NDU), Amasoma.

The 29 economics education lecturers were chosen as follows—two from PHC, two from IAUE, four from Calabar, five from Uyo, eight from BENIN, eleven from DELSU, and four from NDU). The second group of subjects consisted of 324 economics education students at 400 level were chosen as follows—36 from PHC, 27 from IAUE, 39 from CALABAR, 80 from UYO, 35 from BENIN, 40 from DELSU, and 67 from NDU these group of students were chosen because they have passed through the experience at all other levels of their study (i.e, from level 100 to 400). The third group of samples consisted of 132 senior staff drawn from government - owned secondary schools, senior civil servants from ministries and agencies (Post Primary and UBE Boards) located in Port Harcourt, Calabar, Uyo, Benin, Abraka, and Amasoma.

Table 2: Respondents (or samples) from federal and state universities in the South-South region of Nigeria

UNIVERSITY	LECTURERS	SAMPLES OF 400 LEVEL STUDENTS	CITIES	EMPLOYERS OF ECONOMICS EDUCATION GRADUATES	TOTAL
PHC	2	36			
IAUE	2	27	PH	24	91
DELSU	11	40	Abraka	22	73
CALABAR	4	39	Calabar	21	64
BENIN	8	35	Benin	22	65
UYO	5	80	Uyo	21	106
NDU	4	67	Amasoma	22	93
Total	36	324		132	492

Because of the unpopular nature of economics education curriculum which has also reduced the size of lecturers and heads of departments that formed the first set of the subjects, the whole population of lecturers and heads of departments were used as the sample in one part of the study. The sample for the second set of subjects consists of 324 students from the population across the seven universities which make up the undergraduate students of economics education degree programme.

The heads of departments and lecturers of economics education degree programme used in this study will help to give accurate data as they carry out the implementation of the academic programme.

At this juncture, they were able to attest to the components of the context, input, and process aspects of undergraduate economics education degree programme if it meets the minimum academic standards stipulated by the National Universities commission (NUC) or not. The undergraduates of economics education degree programme were used as respondents since they are benefiting from the programme. The students involved were able to express their opinion as to whether the programme meets their aspirations, if the input needed for effective implementation of the programme are adequate or not and whether instructional procedures are adequate or not. The population of senior staff of government establishments used for this study was subjected to the Fluid Sample Survey Calculator. They were chosen randomly from Port Harcourt, Calabar, Uyo, Benin, Abraka and Amasoma, which are the locations for these government establishments and the senior staff were used as respondents.

The samples that were used for this investigation consisted of 492 respondents. Stratified random sampling technique was used to select the sample of respondents (492). This method is used because every member of the population belongs to a group. The stratified and purposive sampling technique requires that the entire population be divided into blocks of three (3), then the selection or sampling is carried out in each block or group using fluid sample size formula.

Development of Research Instruments

Two major techniques were used for collecting data for this study. They are observation and inquiry techniques. For the observation technique, five sets of checklist and four sets of rating scales were used for this study. Input Evaluation of Economics Education Checklist (IEEEEC), Economics Education Facilities and Equipment Checklist (EEFEC), Economics Education Teaching Staff Quantity and Qualifications Observation Checklist (EETSQ²OC), Economics Education Input Observation Rating Scale (E²IOERS)

The IEEEEC is a Checklist modified from the Programme Evaluation form developed by the National Universities Commission (NUC, 2015) and adapted by the researcher for this study. The National Universities Commission (NUC) uses the programme Evaluation form as a checklist in gathering data for the purpose of accrediting academic programme of Nigerian Universities. The EEFEC is a research instrument drawn from the list of facilities and equipment required for use in running undergraduate economics education degree programme as contained in the National Universities Commission’s Minimum Academic Standards documents of 2015 and adopted by the researcher for this study. The EETSQ²OC is a checklist designed by the researcher for the purpose of gathering data for this study.

Items of this research instrument are structured such that the researcher and the respondents were able to use them to observe the context components (objectives, curriculum contents, and the quality of students at the point of entry in terms of admission requirements into undergraduate economics education degree programme of the universities investigated. Input Evaluation of Economics Education Checklist (IEEEEC): The IEEEEC is a 13-item, of four-point numerical scale with the options of 4, 3, 2 , and 1.

This researcher used the instrument to personally observe and identify the inputs used in implementing the undergraduate economics education degree programme of the universities investigated.

Economics Education Facilities and Equipment Checklist (EEFEC): The EEFEC is a 37-item scale, designed for effective implementation of the programme with response options of number available, number functional, number fairly functional and number not functional. The researcher used the instrument to record information as observed on the facilities and equipment’s used for the implementation of undergraduate economics education degree programme of the universities investigated.

Economics Education Teaching Staff Quantity and Qualifications Observation Checklist (EETSQ²C). The EETSQ²OC comprises of two sections, viz; sections A and B. section ‘A’ records information concerning the quantity of economics education lecturers that are available at the universities investigated. This section contains seven items with options of available numbers of lecturers in each of the universities ranging from 1-10. This researcher used the instrument to directly and personally observe, investigate and tick the number of lecturers that were available at the universities with respect to their current ranks. Section ‘B’ was used by the researcher to record information at the universities investigated about the academic qualifications of economics education lecturers. The section consists of seven items indicating ranks of lecturers ranging from Graduate Assistants to Professor. In all, the instrument contains 14 items (Ubulom, 2006).

Reliability of the Instruments

To establish the reliability of CEEEC, IEEEEC, PEEERS, test retest method was used. The IEEEEC, and PEEERS were tested through test re-test method, using 10 economics education lecturers (5 from University of Port Harcourt Rivers State and 5 from Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rivers State) and 40 economics education students (20 from University of Port Harcourt and 20 from Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt).

The internal consistency of IEEEEC, and PEEERS were determined using the Cronbrach Alpha method with the formula:

$$\alpha = \frac{n}{n-1} \left(\frac{\alpha^2 - \sum vi}{\alpha^2} \right) = \text{which yielded } 0.87 \text{ and } 0.89 \text{ respectively. The CEEEC and PEEERS were}$$

tested through test re-test method, using 10 senior staff of government-owned secondary schools, ministries and agencies that employ economics education graduates in Port Harcourt, Uyo, Benin, Calabar, Abraka, Amasoma. The internal consistency of CEEEC and PEEEC were determined using

Cronbach Alpha which yielded 0.85 and 0.86 respectively which mean that the instruments are reliable. The reliability of the instruments were calculated using Pearson product moment correlation (PPMC).

Administration of the Instruments

The instruments for this study were administered to 400 level undergraduate students of economics education in university of Port Harcourt, Port Harcourt, Ignatius Ajuru university of Education, University of Calabar, University of Uyo, Uyo, University, of Benin, Delta State University, Abraka, and Niger-Delta University, University, Amasoma. Other group of respondents were lecturers in the department of economics education of the aforementioned universities and senior staff selected from government-owned secondary schools, ministries and agencies in the cities/towns where the universities are located.

The researcher chose and trained 21 research assistants to support him in administering these instruments to the respondents. The research assistants were chosen from the area of study in order to facilitate the administration of the instruments. The reason for their choice was because of their familiarity with the study environment.

Method of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics was used to answer the seven research questions. These research questions were analyzed item-by-item with the use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), to show the categories of respondents. Hypotheses one to seven were tested at 0.05 level of significance with the use of One- way analysis of variance (ANOVA). ANOVA as it is commonly called compares the influence of the independent Variables (IV) on the dependent variable (s) (DV) at the same time. It measures the variance among variables in different groups and the variance within groups (individual differences). ANOVA can be used for analysis when the variables involve have at least two factors or levels.

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

Research Question 1: *How are the available facilities used in implementing the undergraduate economics education degree programme in Universities in the South-South Geo-Political Zone in Nigeria meet the required minimum standards of National Universities Commission?*

Table 3: Mean and Standard Deviation computation of the available facilities used in implementing Undergraduate Economics Education Degree Programme of the Universities are adequate and meet the required Minimum Academic Standards of the National Universities Commission.

Universities	No. of items	Rating score	Mean (\bar{x})	Standard deviation	Remarks
PHC	13	51.61	3.97	0.18	Adequate
UYO	13	51.48	3.96	0.20	Adequate
DELSU	13	51.35	3.95	0.22	Adequate
CALABAR	13	26.26	2.02	0.16	Inadequate
BENIN	13	26.52	2.04	0.19	Inadequate
IAUE	13	26.65	2.05	0.22	Inadequate
NDU	13	26.39	2.03	0.16	Inadequate
Total	91	26.26	2.86	0.18	Adequate

Table 3 shows that the mean and standard deviation scores of the researcher’s observation of how the facilities used for implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme are 3.97 (0.18), 3.96 (0.20), and 3.95(0.22) respectively across PHC, UYO, and DELSU. This reveals that the mean scores are greater than the average point of 2.5. For this reason, the facilities used in implementing the programme across these three universities are adequate and meet the required minimum academic standards of the NUC.

The table also shows that the mean and standard deviation scores of the researcher’s observation of how the facilities used for implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme are 2.02(0.16), 2.04(0.19), 2.05(0.22), and 2.03(0.16) respectively across CALABAR, BENIN, IAUOE, and

NDU. This indicates that the mean scores are smaller than the average point of 2.5. For this reason, the facilities used for implementing the undergraduate economics education degree programme at CALABAR, BENIN, IAUOE, and NDU as presented are inadequate and does not meet the required academic standards of the National Universities Commission.

Research Question 2

How do the teaching staff quantity and qualifications meet the required minimum academic standards of the National Universities Commission?

To answer this research question, items 1-14 on the Economics Education Teaching Staff Quantity and Qualifications Observation Checklist (EETQ²C) provide the data required. The researcher’s observation rating scores are analyzed and the results presented in Table 5.

Table 4: Mean and Standard Deviation computation of the teaching staff quantity and qualifications used for implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme meet the required minimum academic standards of the National Universities Commission.

Universities	No. of items	Rating score	Mean (\bar{x})	Standard deviation	Remarks
PHC	14	53.76	3.84	0.36	Adequate
UYO	14	54.04	3.86	0.34	Adequate
DELSU	14	53.90	3.85	0.35	Adequate
CALABAR	14	28.84	2.06	0.25	Inadequate
BENIN	14	28.56	2.04	0.22	Inadequate
IAUE	14	28.84	2.06	0.24	Inadequate
NDU	14	28.70	2.05	0.22	Inadequate
Total	98	276.64	2.82	0.28	Adequate

Table 4 reveals that the mean and standard deviation scores of the researcher’s observation of how the teaching staff quantity and qualifications used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme at PHC, UYO, and DELSU respectively are 3.84 (0.36), 3.86 (0.34) and 3.85 (0.35). This indicates that the mean scores for the three universities are greater than the average point of 2.5. For this reason, therefore, the teaching staff quantity and qualifications used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme across PHC, UYO, and DELSU are adequate and meet the required minimum academic standards of the National Universities Commission.

The table also indicate that the mean and standard deviation scores of the researcher’s observation of how the teaching staff quantity and qualifications used for implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme across CALABAR, BENIN, IAUOE, and NDU are 2.06 (0.25), 2.04 (0.22), 2.06 (0.24), and 2.05 (0.22) respectively. This revealed that the mean scores are smaller than the average point of 2.5. For this reason, the teaching staff quantity and qualifications used in implementing the undergraduate economics education degree programme at CALABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU are inadequate and do not meet the required minimum academic standards of the NUC.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme in Universities in the South-South Geo-Political Zone in Nigeria as specified by the National Universities Commission.

To test this hypothesis, items 1 – 13 on the Input Evaluation of Economics Education Checklist (IEEEEC) provide the data required. The responses are analyzed and the result is presented in Table 7.

Table 5: F-ratio Computation Summary of One-way Analysis of Variance of the available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme in Nigerian universities

Source of Variation	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F-ratio	Sig.
PHC					
Between Group	0.605	6	0.101	3.188	0.005
Within Group	10.022	317	0.032		
Total	10.627	323			
UYO					
Between Group	1.091	6	0.182	4.683	0.000
Within Group	12.304	317	0.039		
Total	13.395	323			
DELSU					
Between Group	1.391	6	0.232	4.992	0.000
Within Group	14.717	317	0.046		
Total	16.108	323			
CALABAR					
Between Group	0.324	6	0.054	2.291	0.035
Within Group	7.478	317	0.024		
Total	7.802	323			
BENIN					
Between Group	0.891	6	0.149	4.065	0.001
Within Group	11.587	317	0.037		
Total	12.478	323			
IAUE					
Between Group	1.825	6	0.304	6.752	0.000
Within Group	14.283	317	0.045		
Total	16.108	323			
NDU					
Between Group	0.511	6	0.085	3.276	0.004
Within Group	8.239	317	0.026		
Total	8.750	323			

N= 324 P < 0.05 df = (6,317)

The sum of square and mean square of the researcher's observation rating scores on the available facilities (econometric and audio-visual laboratories, Computers, television, Desktops, Printers etc.) used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme in Nigerian universities investigated in this study were presented on Table 5. With N = 324, based on a degree of freedom of 6 and 317 for the universities at 5% level of significance, the calculated F-ratio were 3.188, 4.683, 4.992, 2.291, 4.065, 6.762, and 3.276 respectively across PHC, UYO, DELSU, CALABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU. At this point, therefore, the calculated F-ratio is statistically significant at $\alpha=0.05$ level of significance, since P is less than 0.05 (i.e. P < 0.05). The hypothesis (H₀₄) is thus rejected in favour of adequacy of available facilities (computers, econometric and audio-visual laboratories, photocopiers, projectors, television, and video cameras) used in teaching economics education courses at the undergraduate level and the conclusion is that there is significant difference in the observed and available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme in Nigerian Universities. It makes a difference

with regards to the observed available facilities (computers, econometric and audio–visual laboratories, photocopiers, projectors, television and video-cameras) used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme in Nigerian Universities.

Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in the teaching staff Quantity and Qualifications as specified by the National Universities Commission.

To test this hypothesis, items 1-14 on the Economics Education Teaching staff quantity and qualifications Observation Checklist (EETSQ²OC) provide the data required. The researcher’s observation rating scores are analyzed and the results presented in Table 8.

Table 8 F – ratio Computation Summary of a One-way Analysis of Variance of the observed quantity and qualifications of teaching staff used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme in the seven universities.

Table 6: F-ratio Computation Summary of One-way Analysis of Variance of the required and observed teaching methods used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme by the seven universities

Source of Variable	Sum of square	df	Mean square	F-ratio	Sig.
PHC					
Between Group	1.341	6	0.223	2.773	0.017
Within Group	6.769	84	0.081		
Total	8.110	90			
UYO					
Between Group	1.956	6	0.326	3.236	0.007
Within Group	8.462	84	0.101		
Total	10.418	90			
DELSU					
Between Group	1.758	6	0.293	2.623	0.022
Within Group	9.385	84	0.112		
Total	11.143	90			
CALABAR					
Between Group	1.451	6	0.242	1.737	0.122
Within Group	11.692	84	0.139		
Total	11.143	90			
BENIN					
Between Group	1.385	6	0.231	1.853	0.099
Within Group	10.462	84	0.125		
Total	11.847	90			
IAUE					
Between Group	0.132	6	0.022	0.667	0.667
Within Group	2.769	84	0.033		
Total	2.901	90			
NDU					
Between Group	1.648	6	0.275	2.000	0.075
Within Group	11.538	84	0.137		
Total	13.187	90			
N= 91, P < 0.05(Sig.) df=(6,84) P > 0.05 (Not sig.)					

The sum of square and mean square of the researcher's observation rating scores on the observed quantity and qualifications of teaching staff used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme of Nigerian universities investigated in this study were presented in Table 6. with $N = 91$, based on a degree of freedom of 6 and 84, for the universities at 5% level of significance, the calculated F-ratio were 2.773, 3.236 and 2.623 respectively across PHC, UYO, and DELSU. At this juncture therefore, the calculated F-ratio is statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance since P is less than 0.05 (i.e $P < 0.05$). The hypothesis (HO3) is thus rejected in favour of adequacy of quantity and qualifications of teaching staff used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme of these universities. It makes a difference with regards to the observed quantity and qualifications of teaching staff used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme among the three universities.

On the other hand, $N=91$, based on a degree of freedom of 6 and 84, for CALABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU at 5% level of significance, the calculated F-ratio were 1.737, 1.853, 0.667, and 2.000 respectively across CLABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU. At this juncture therefore, the calculated F-ratio is not statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$ level of significance since P is greater than 0.05 (i.e $P > 0.05$).The hypothesis (HO3) is thus accepted in favour of the observed quantity and qualifications of teaching staff used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme and the conclusion is that there is no significant difference in the observed quantity and qualifications of teaching staff used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme of the universities as observed by the researcher.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

(a) Facilities used in Implementing Undergraduate economics Education Degree Programme

The responses to research question two and hypothesis two indicated that the available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme in Nigerian universities as specified by the NUC is adequate to a large extent. Table 1 revealed that the mean scores for PHC, UYO, and DELSU are greater than the average point of 2.5. It also indicates that the mean scores for CALABAR, BENIN, IAUOE and NDU are less than the average point of 2.5. Table 1 revealed that the available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme of PHC, UYO, and DELSU are adequate while those of CALABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU are inadequate and do not meet the required minimum academic standards of the National Universities Commission because they are not functional, inadequate and not available at all in most cases. The required and available facilities used in teaching the undergraduate economics education degree programme are not accessible by the students and the academic staff teaching this course in the various institutions understudy.

Despite this problem identified with the available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education, it meets the required minimum academic standards of NUC for PHC, UYO, and DELSU. Thus, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the available facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education degree programme as specified by the NUC was rejected (Table 1), the calculated F-ratio values of 3.188, 4.683, 4.992, 2.291, 4.065, 6.752, and 3.276 respectively across PHC, UYO, DELSU, CALABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU are statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance since $P < 0.05$. This shows that the facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education has to be provided, upgraded and maintained. This indicates that the required facilities used in teaching undergraduate economics education should be provided in the departments of economics education in the universities where this programme is taught. This finding is in agreement with Laurillard (1993, P. 26) who claims that "every academic subject faces this kind of challenge, to help students go beyond their experience, to use it and reflect on it, and thereby change their perspective of it, and therefore change the way they experience the world".

(b) Quantity and Qualifications of Teaching Staff used in implementing Undergraduate Economics Education Programme

The responses to research question two and hypothesis two (Table 1 and 2) indicated that the teaching staff quantity and qualifications as specified by the National Universities commission is adequate and

meet the required minimum academic standards of the NUC to a large extent. Table 3 revealed that the mean scores for PHC, UYO and DELSU are greater than the average point of 2.5. it also indicates that the mean it scores for CALABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU are inadequate and do not meet the required minimum academic requirements of NUC because they have few teaching staff with the required degrees in economics education from first degree to Ph.D. The required and observed teaching staff quantity and qualifications used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme are very few in the universities investigated rather what they have are teaching staff with degrees in economics and related courses.

Despite this problem identified with the observed teaching staff quantity and qualifications used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme, it is adequate and meets the required minimum academic standards of NUC for PHC, UYO, and DELSU. Thus, the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference in the observed teaching staff quantity and qualifications used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme as specified by the NUC was rejected. The calculated F-ratio of 2.773, 3.236, and 2.623 across PHC, UYO, and DELSU are statistically significant at 0.05 level of significance since P is less than 0.05 (i.e, $P < 0.05$). This indicates that the observed quantity and qualifications of teaching staff used in implementing undergraduate economics education degree programme are adequate and meet the required minimum academic standards of NUC. The calculated F. ratio of 1.1737, 1.853, 0.667, and 2.000 respectively across CALABAR, BENIN, IAUE, and NDU are not statistically significant since P is greater than 0.05 (i.e. $P > 0.05$). This indicates that the departments of economics education in the various universities need to improve on the quantity and qualifications of their teaching staff. This finding is in agreement with Ukeje (1988) who stated that quality education is not possible without quality human and material resources.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher concluded that many deficiencies exist in the undergraduate economics education degree programme in the universities located in the south-south geo-political zone of Nigeria. The deficiencies are common in the areas of inadequate/qualified teaching staff of economics education, inadequate, non-functional and unavailable facilities and equipment, and inadequate curriculum contents of undergraduate economics education degree programme. These deficiencies were discovered in the course of evaluating the undergraduate economics education degree programme of these universities, it is glaring that most of the undergraduate economics education degree programme offered by the universities in the South-South geo-political zone of Nigeria are not accredited or are partially accredited.

The researcher observed that despite the deficiencies that are common to the undergraduate economics education degree programme, the first-degree graduates were able to acquire adequate skills. This is an indication that the stated objectives of the undergraduate economics education degree programme of the universities investigated have been adequately achieved.

From the findings of this study, the researcher noted that apart from PHC, UYO and DELSU other universities offering the undergraduate economics education degree programme do not have the required facilities and adequate teaching staff for the implementation of this programme. For this reason they depend on the economics department in the faculty of social sciences for successful implementation of the undergraduate economics education degree programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

Universities offering undergraduate economics education degree programme should engage the services of experts in educational evaluation to constantly evaluate and ensure that all components of the programme are updated regularly to meet the required minimum academic standards of the National Universities Commission.

Universities offering undergraduate economics education degree programme should ensure that the objectives are adequately stated. This will assist the programme implementers to work efficiently towards

achieving the objectives by producing graduates who will be able to acquire the necessary attitudes, knowledge, skills and competencies in economics education.

Universities offering undergraduate economics education degree programme should ensure that the admission policy of the programme is maintained. This will assist the universities to maintain the quality standards of students admitted into the programme. It will also help the universities to comply with the carrying capacity standards of the commission based on the available facilities at the universities as well as the Teacher/Student ratio.

Universities offering undergraduate economics education degree programme should engage the services of experts in educational evaluation and curriculum studies to constantly review the curriculum contents of their programme to ensure that existing courses meet the current trends of employment and the needs of the beneficiaries and employers of labour. If the curriculum of undergraduate economics education degree programme is constantly being reviewed, it will assist the graduates of the programme for easy employment.

Universities offering undergraduate economics education degree programme should ensure that facilities and equipments are available, adequate and functional for effective implementation of their programme.

Universities offering undergraduate economics education degree programme should adopt teaching methods that will consider the heterogeneity of students in terms of aptitudes, prerequisite knowledge, motivation, experience and learning styles for effective implementation of the undergraduate economics education degree programme.

Universities offering undergraduate economics education degree programme should always adhere to the National Universities Commission's Policy for the engagement of qualified teaching staff in economics education. They should ensure that the required quantity of teaching staff is engaged to match with the students' population for effective implementation of the programme.

REFERENCES

- Alade, O. M. (2001). *An Evaluation of the Inspectorate Department of the Lagos State Ministry of Education*. Unpublished Ph.D Research Proposal. International Centre for Educational Evaluation, University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
- Alonge, M. F. (2004). *Measurement and Evaluation in Education and Psychology*. Ado-Ekiti. Adedayo Printing (Nig). Ltd.
- Asuru, V. A. (2006). *An Evaluation of Implementation of the Universal Basic Education Programme in Rivers State, Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis, University of Ibadan.
- Asuru, V. A. (2006). *Measurement & Evaluation in Education and Psychology*. 2nd edn. Port Harcourt: Minson Publishers.
- Asuru, V. A. (2008). *Programme Evaluation: an Imperative for Successful Basic Education Reform in Nigeria*. Ibadan. WAJE.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1963). Course Improvement Through Evaluation. *Teachers' College Record*. 64, 672-683.
- Dike, H. I. (1998). *Evaluation of Educational Programmes: Needs Analysis, Formative and Summative Evaluations*. Port Harcourt: Paragraphics.
- French, W. L., Bell, C. H. & Zawacki, R. A. (2000). *Organizational Development and Transformation: Manage Effective Change*. (5thed.) New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Glass, G. V. (1969). *The Growth of Evaluation Methodology* Boulder, Co: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research.
- Guskey, T.R. (2000). *Evaluating Professional Development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin press, Inc.
- Kpolovie, P. J. (2010). *Advanced research methods*. New Owerri: Springfield Publishers Ltd.
- Kpolovie, P. J. (2012). *Education Reforms Without Evaluation Designs: Nigeria at Risk*. New Owerri: Springfield Publication.
- Kpolovie, P.J. (2002). *Test, Measurement and Evaluation in Education*. Port Harcourt: Emhai Books.
- Laurillard, D. (1993). *Rethinking University Teaching: A Framework for the Effective use of Educational Technology*. London: Routledge.

- Lipsey, R. G. & Chrystal, K. A. (2004). *Oxford Economics*. (10th edn.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mehrens, W. A. & Lehman, I. J. (1978). *Measurement & Evaluation*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.
- Obanya, P. (2002). *Revitalizing Education in Africa*. Ibadan: Stirling Holden Publishers.
- Okoro, O. M. (2005). *Programme Evaluation in Education*. Uruowulu-Obosi: Pacific Publishers Ltd.
- Popham, W. J. (1975). *Educational Evaluation*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Provus, M. (1969). "Evaluation of Ongoing Programmes in the Public School System". In B. R. Worthen and J. R. Sanders (1973). *Educational Evaluation: Theory and Practice*. Belmont, California. Wadsworth Publishing Coy, Inc. 170-209.
- Rose, C. & Nyre, G. F. (1977). *The Practice of Evaluation*. New York. McGraw-Hill.
- Scriven, M. (1967). *The Methodology of Evaluation*. In R. E. Stake (Ed.), *Curriculum Evaluation*. American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Evaluation, No. 1. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Scriven, M. (1976). *The Methodology of Evaluation*. In R.E. Stake (Ed.), *Curriculum Evaluation*. American Educational Research Association Monograph Series on Evaluation, 1. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Scriven, M. (1978). *Goal-Free Evaluation in Practice*. Paper Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- Scriven, M. (1991). *Evaluation thesaurus* (4th editions). Newbury Parks, CA: Sage.
- Stake, R. E. (1967). The countenance of educational evaluation. *Teachers' College Record*, 68, 532-540.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1971). The relevance of the CIPP Evaluation model for education accountability. *Journal of Research and Development in Education*. 5 (1), 19-25.
- Tahir (2003). *Basic education in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Stirling Holden Publishers.
- Ubulom, W. J. (2006). *Evaluation of Undergraduate Business Education Degree Programmes in Selected Nigerian Universities*. Unpublished Ph.D Thesis. Department of Science Education, University of Nsukka.
- Ukeje, B. O. (1988). *Education for the Survival of the Nigerian Nation*. An Inaugural Lecture Delivered at the University of Port Harcourt on Wednesday, 3rd December, 1986.
- Vaizey, J. (1971). *The Production Process and Education*. In D. Adams, (Eds.) *Education in National Development*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Walberg, H.J. & Haertel, G. D. (1990). (Eds). *The International Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation*. Oxford, England: Pergamon.
- Wilde, J. & Sockey, S. (1995). *Evaluation Handbook*. New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM. Evaluation Assistance Center.