



Effect of Democratic Governance on Access and Quality of Basic Education in Zamfara State

Shehu Sani, PhD^{1,*}, Lurwanu Usman, PhD², Wasilat Ahmed Kabir³, Ibrahim Salisu¹

¹ Department of Public Administration, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, Nigeria

² Department of Public Administration, Kaduna State University, Nigeria

³ Department of Public Administration, Umaru Musa Yar'adua University, Katsina State, Nigeria

* Corresponding author: Shehusani1982@gmail.com

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 22 August 2026

Accepted: 29 September 2026

Published: October 2026

ARTICLE INFO



Vol. 1, No. 2 (2026), pp. 563–574

ISSN: 3141-6268 (Print)

3156-5077 (Online)

DOI: 10.67523/aujmss.v1i2.026

License: CC BY 4.0

HOW TO CITE

Sani, S., Usman, L., Kabir, W. A., & Salisu, I. (2026). Effect of democratic governance on access and quality of basic education in Zamfara State.

Azman Univ. Int. J. Manag. Soc.

Sci., 1(2), 563–574. <https://doi.org/10.67523/aujmss.v1i2.026>

ABSTRACT

This study assessed the effect of democratic governance on access and quality of basic education in Zamfara State, Nigeria. Persistent challenges in educational access, quality and literacy despite government interventions motivated the study. It focused on Gusau, Kaura Namoda and Talata Mafara Local Government Areas and examined how governance practices influence basic education outcomes. A descriptive survey design was adopted. The study population comprised stakeholders involved in basic education governance, including Parent-Teacher Associations, School-Based Management Committees, Local Government Education Authority officials and SUBEB officials. A sample of 327 was determined; 311 properly completed questionnaires were used for the analysis, complemented by 13 key-informant interviews. Data were analysed using descriptive statistics, thematic analysis and linear regression. The findings indicate a strong positive relationship between democratic governance and access to basic education. Regression results showed that democratic governance significantly predicted access ($R = .701$, $R^2 = .612$, $\beta = .433$, $p = .003$), leading to rejection of the first null hypothesis. For quality education, democratic governance also showed a strong positive effect ($R = .901$, $R^2 = .812$, $\beta = .493$, $p < .001$), leading to rejection of the second null hypothesis. Descriptive findings further show that stakeholders perceive government policy support and school-level participation but also identify weaknesses in public consultation, budgetary transparency, infrastructure and literacy practices. The study concludes that democratic governance provides an important institutional foundation for improving basic education, but governance gains must be translated into sustained investment, effective monitoring, inclusive participation, teacher development, infrastructure improvement and literacy interventions.

Keywords: Access; Basic Education; Democratic Governance; Literacy; Quality; Zamfara State

1. Introduction

Education is a major foundation of sustainable development because it contributes to poverty reduction, social equity, human capital development and active citizenship. Basic education provides the essential knowledge and skills required for lifelong learning and participation in social and economic life. In Nigeria, the Universal Basic Education (UBE) programme represents a major policy commitment to widening access and improving educational outcomes.

Democratic governance is relevant to education because transparency, accountability, participation, responsiveness and the rule of law shape how public resources are allocated and how policies are implemented. Since Nigeria's return to democratic rule in 1999, successive governments have pursued education reforms, including UBE. However, implementation varies across states because of differences in governance capacity, resources, political commitment and local conditions.

Zamfara State provides an important setting for examining this relationship. The state continues to face challenges involving enrolment, gender disparity, infrastructure, teacher availability, literacy and insecurity. These problems are compounded by poverty and socio-cultural constraints. Democratic governance can potentially address them through participatory decision-making, accountable resource allocation, effective policy implementation and community involvement. This study therefore examines the effect of democratic governance on pupils' access to and quality of basic education in Zamfara State.

1.1 Statement of the Research Problem

Despite policy reforms and interventions, basic education in Zamfara State continues to experience inadequate funding, infrastructure deficits, teacher shortages, insecurity and weak literacy and numeracy outcomes. The central problem is not simply the existence of education policies, but the extent to which governance institutions translate those policies into equitable and effective service delivery. The relationship between democratic governance and basic education outcomes in the state therefore requires empirical examination.

Access remains a major concern. Persistent problems include enrolment, retention, transition and completion, dropout, inadequate facilities and shortages of teachers. These concerns raise questions about political accountability, inclusiveness, stakeholder participation and the capacity of government to implement education policies effectively. Security challenges further affect attendance, school availability and the ability of teachers and pupils to participate safely in education.

Available SUBEB data indicate substantial fluctuations in enrolment. Total enrolment rose to 735,095 in 2020/2021 but declined to 568,457 in 2022/2023 and recovered only to 617,428 in 2023/2024, which remained below the earlier peak. Gender disparity also widened: female enrolment fell from a peak of 327,710 in 2020/2021 to 130,707 in 2023/2024, while the male–female gap increased substantially. These trends demonstrate the continuing need to examine how governance affects access and quality (SUBEB, 2024).

The research gap addressed by the study is therefore the limited empirical evidence on whether democratic governance practices, including political accountability, inclusiveness, participation, transparency and resource management, translate into measurable improvements in access and quality of basic education in Zamfara State.

1.2 Research Questions

- i. To what extent has democratic governance affected pupils' access to basic education in Zamfara State?
- ii. To what extent has democratic governance affected pupils' quality of basic education in Zamfara State?

1.3 Objectives of the Study

- i. To assess the effect of democratic governance on pupils' access to universal basic education in Zamfara State.
- ii. To determine the effect of democratic governance on pupils' quality of basic education in Zamfara State.

1.4 Hypotheses

- H_0 i: Democratic governance has no significant effect on access to universal basic education in Zamfara State.
- H_0 ii: Democratic governance has no significant effect on pupils' quality of basic education in Zamfara State.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Concept of Democratic Governance

Democratic governance refers to the exercise of public authority through institutions and processes that reflect participation, accountability, transparency, rule of law and responsiveness. Dahl (1971) emphasises popular

participation and legitimate political authority, while Fukuyama (2013) extends the concept to institutional capacity and rule of law. Participation gives citizens opportunities to influence decisions; accountability requires public officials to explain and justify their actions; and transparency makes government decisions open to scrutiny (Arnstein, 1969; Bovens, 2007).

In public service delivery, democratic governance is expected to improve the allocation and use of resources by making institutions more responsive to citizens. Rothstein and Teorell (2008) emphasise impartiality, competence and responsiveness as elements of quality government, while Grindle (2007) notes that inadequate funding, bureaucratic weakness and political interference can undermine service delivery. Decentralisation can also bring decision-making closer to communities, although its success depends on local capacity, accountability and financial autonomy (Rondinelli, 1981; Faguet, 2012).

For education, democratic governance is particularly important because citizens require information and institutional channels through which they can participate in policy processes and hold authorities accountable. Education itself strengthens democratic governance by improving citizens' knowledge, critical thinking and ability to engage public institutions (Bratton et al., 2005; Fritz, 2016). Thus, democratic governance and education are mutually reinforcing: effective governance can improve educational service delivery, while education can strengthen democratic participation.

2.2 Concept of Universal Basic Education

Universal Basic Education comprises nine years of formal schooling (six years of primary education and three years of junior secondary education) together with early childhood care, adult literacy, non-formal education, skills acquisition and education for special and underserved groups. The UBE framework emphasises removing barriers related to distance, infrastructure, gender, socio-economic status and social exclusion. Its broader purpose is to reduce illiteracy and ignorance and support national development, political consciousness and social integration (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2000, 2004).

2.3 Concept of Access to Basic Education

Access to basic education extends beyond enrolment to the ability of children to enter, attend, remain in and progress through school. UNESCO (2015) and Lewin (2007) emphasise that meaningful access requires removal of physical, financial, social and institutional barriers. Indicators include enrolment, attendance, retention, completion and progression. Physical distance, insecurity, poverty, hidden schooling costs, gender norms and inadequate facilities can all restrict access.

Inclusive access requires attention to girls, children with disabilities, rural communities and other marginalised groups. Access is also meaningful only when pupils benefit from learning; therefore, qualified teachers, learning materials, appropriate infrastructure and supportive school environments are necessary. Government programmes such as UBE and school-support interventions can expand access, but their effectiveness depends on adequate funding, transparency, monitoring and community participation (UNESCO, 2015).

2.4 Concept of Quality Education and Literacy

Quality education involves learning that enables pupils to acquire useful knowledge, skills and competencies. Literacy is a core indicator because reading, writing, comprehension and communication provide the foundation for learning across subjects. UNESCO (2017) distinguishes basic literacy from broader functional, digital and critical literacy. Functional literacy enables individuals to apply reading and writing to everyday activities, while critical literacy supports analysis, interpretation and informed decision-making.

In basic education, literacy outcomes depend on teacher preparedness, instructional materials, reading opportunities and the learning environment. Strong literacy supports academic progression, critical thinking and participation in social and economic life, whereas weak literacy can limit educational achievement and reinforce social inequality. Consequently, quality education requires sustained attention to teachers, instructional resources, reading culture, libraries and learner engagement.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study adopted a descriptive survey design because it enabled the researcher to obtain information directly from relevant stakeholders and examine perceptions of democratic governance and basic education within a defined period. The survey was complemented by document analysis and key-informant interviews to strengthen interpretation of the quantitative findings.

3.2 Population and Sample Size

The population comprised stakeholders directly or indirectly involved in basic education governance in Zamfara State. The population was 2,135, comprising PTAs, SBMCs, LGEA officials, SUBEB officials and other stakeholders. A sample of 327 was determined using a sample-size calculator at conventional confidence and precision levels.

Table 1: Population and Sample Distribution

S/N	Population Category	Population Size	Sample Size
1	Parent–Teacher Associations	2,009	305
2	School-Based Management Committees	79	9
3	Officials in the LGEA head offices	21	6
4	Officials in SUBEB head office	5	1
5	Other stakeholders	21	6
	Total	2,135	327

Source: Field survey, 2026.

3.3 Sampling Technique

A combination of multi-stage, stratified, simple-random and systematic sampling techniques was used. One LGA was selected from each of the three senatorial zones. Within the selected LGAs, urban, semi-urban and rural schools were selected systematically, giving nine schools. Research assistants fluent in local languages supported questionnaire administration and interviews.

3.4 Sources of Data

Primary data were obtained through questionnaires, interviews and observation, while secondary data were obtained through relevant policy documents, UBE/SUBEB materials, journals and archival sources. Thirteen key-informant interviews covered SUBEB, SBMC, PTA, LGEA and AGILE stakeholders. The interviews were considered adequate because thematic repetition emerged during the interviews.

4. Results

4.1 Questionnaire Return, Interview Respondents and Respondent Profile

Table 2: Questionnaire Return and Distribution of Interview Respondents

Description	Frequency
Total sample size	327
Total questionnaires distributed (plus 27 [10%] buffer)	354
Total questionnaires returned	326
Rate of return (%)	98
Total questionnaires properly completed and used for analysis	311
Key-informant interviews conducted	13

Source: Field survey, 2026. Reproduced exactly as given — $326/354 = 92.1\%$, not the stated 98%; see module docstring.

Table 3: Distribution of Interview Respondents

S/N	Position	Organisation/Location	Code
1	Director, Planning, Research and Statistics	State Universal Basic Education Board	R1
2	Chairman SBMC	Gusau LGA	R2
3	Chairman SBMC	Talata Mafara LGA	R3
4	Chairman SBMC	Kaura Namoda LGA	R4
5	PTA Chairman	Gusau LGA	R5
6	PTA Chairman	Talata Mafara LGA	R6
7	PTA Chairman	Kaura Namoda LGA	R7
8	Education Secretary	Gusau LGA	R8
9	Education Secretary	Talata Mafara LGA	R9
10	Education Secretary	Kaura Namoda LGA	R10
11	Desk Officer AGILE	Gusau LGA	R11
12	Desk Officer AGILE	Kaura Namoda LGA	R12
13	Desk Officer AGILE	Talata Mafara LGA	R13

Source: Field survey, 2026.

A total of 354 questionnaires were distributed and 326 were returned, with 311 properly completed questionnaires retained for analysis. The interviews involved 13 key informants. The respondent profile indicates broad representation of education stakeholders and substantial sector experience.

Table 4: Socio-Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Age	18–30	40	16
	31–45	131	40
	46–60	134	42
	60 and above	7	2
	Total	311	100
Sex	Male	241	79
	Female	70	21
	Total	311	100
Highest educational qualification	O/Level	75	30
	ND/OND/NCE or equivalent	70	21
	Bachelor's/HND	100	30
	Postgraduate	54	15
	Others	12	3
	Total	311	100
Role in education sector	Teacher	90	29
	Parent	89	28
	Government official	59	20
	Other	71	23
	Total	311	100
Years of experience	0–5	9	3
	6–10	89	30
	11–15	180	59
	16 and above	33	9
	Total	311	100

Source: Field survey, 2026. Reproduced exactly as given — the Age row's frequencies sum to 312 and its percentages do not reconcile against either 311 or 312; see module docstring.

The socio-demographic profile indicates that respondents were drawn from different age groups, educational backgrounds, roles and levels of experience in the education sector. A substantial proportion had considerable experience in the sector, with respondents having 11–15 years of experience constituting the largest reported category. The respondents therefore provided perspectives based on varying levels of involvement in basic education governance and service delivery.

4.2 Responses on Democratic Governance

Table 5: Respondents' Assessment of Democratic Governance and Basic Education

S/ N	Statement	SA n (%)	A n (%)	U n (%)	D n (%)	SD n (%)
1	Government policies support the implementation of basic education.	153 (49)	45 (14)	15 (5)	80 (27)	16 (5)
2	Government ensures political accountability by enforcing education-related policies such as the UBE Act.	80 (26)	154 (49)	3 (1)	43 (13)	31 (10)
3	Town hall meetings/surveys are regularly conducted to gather citizens' input on education issues.	56 (17)	78 (25)	8 (3)	145 (46)	24 (8)
4	Public opinions on basic education issues are considered in policymaking.	25 (7)	56 (16)	13 (4)	108 (42)	109 (31)
5	A significant portion of the state budget is allocated to basic education.	14 (4)	35 (11)	40 (13)	124 (40)	98 (32)
6	Financial statements for education projects are regularly published and accessible to the public.	20 (6)	25 (7)	14 (4)	102 (33)	150 (50)
7	PTAs and SBMCs actively participate in decision-making on basic education.	36 (11)	115 (44)	22 (7)	87 (26)	51 (15)
8	State legislators effectively monitor the implementation of basic education policies.	21 (8)	11 (4)	148 (47)	20 (7)	111 (34)
9	Democratic governance promotes equal educational opportunities for all children.	154 (49)	139 (45)	3 (1)	4 (1)	11 (4)

Source: Field survey, 2026.

The governance results show a mixed pattern. Most respondents recognised government policy support and enforcement of education policies, while participation and fiscal accountability were weaker. Only 42% perceived regular town-hall or survey mechanisms, and about 73% disagreed that public views were adequately considered in policymaking. Similarly, 72% disagreed that a significant budget share was allocated to basic education, while 83% disagreed that education financial statements were regularly published and accessible. PTAs and SBMCs showed comparatively stronger participation, with 55% agreement, but legislative oversight attracted substantial uncertainty and disagreement. At the same time, the responses indicate a strong perception that democratic governance promotes equal educational opportunities. Overall, the evidence suggests that the institutional principles of democratic governance are recognised, but implementation is uneven, particularly in participatory and fiscal accountability dimensions.

4.3 Responses on Access to Basic Education

Table 6: Respondents' Assessment of Access to Basic Education

S/ N	Statement	SA n (%)	A n (%)	U n (%)	D n (%)	SD n (%)	Total
1	Provision of adequate manpower affects access to primary education.	147 (47)	146 (47)	13 (4)	5 (2)	0 (0)	311 (100)
2	Democratic governance improves quality of basic education.	146 (47)	162 (52)	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	311 (100)
3	Democratic governance provides adequate primary schools.	144 (46)	127 (41)	2 (1)	31 (10)	7 (2)	311 (100)
4	There is sufficient school infrastructure to support basic education.	106 (34)	99 (32)	3 (1)	73 (23)	30 (10)	311 (100)
5	Teachers are adequately trained.	170 (55)	82 (26)	9 (3)	42 (14)	8 (3)	311 (100)

Source: Field survey, 2026.

The access-related evidence indicates strong perceived effects of governance on manpower, school provision and teacher development. Table 6 records 94% agreement that adequate teaching personnel affects access. The responses also show almost universal agreement that democratic governance improves quality. However, infrastructure remains a major constraint. Although respondents acknowledged school provision, interview and observation evidence identified dilapidated buildings, inadequate furniture, hygiene facilities and insufficient instructional materials in some schools. Teacher training was viewed more positively, with 81% agreeing that teachers were adequately trained, although continued professional development remains necessary.

4.4 Responses on Quality of Education and Literacy

Table 7: Respondents' Assessment of Literacy and Learning Practices

S/ N	Statement	SA n (%)	A n (%)	U n (%)	D n (%)	SD n (%)	Total
1	Pupils read books often.	42 (14)	8 (2)	9 (3)	170 (55)	82 (26)	311 (100)
2	Pupils summarise the last books they read.	20 (6)	15 (5)	25 (8)	160 (51)	91 (30)	311 (100)
3	Pupils write stories/essays outside school.	18 (6)	22 (7)	20 (6)	155 (50)	96 (31)	311 (100)
4	Pupils can write a short paragraph about their favourite topics.	25 (8)	30 (10)	21 (7)	145 (47)	90 (29)	311 (100)
5	Pupils visit the library often.	15 (5)	18 (6)	20 (6)	160 (51)	98 (32)	311 (100)
6	Pupils discuss books with friends/family members.	28 (9)	25 (8)	18 (6)	150 (48)	90 (29)	311 (100)
7	Pupils feel excited when asked to write/read in class.	30 (10)	35 (11)	25 (8)	135 (43)	86 (28)	311 (100)

Source: Field survey, 2026.

The literacy indicators reveal substantial weaknesses in pupils' reading and writing culture. For reading frequency, summarisation, creative writing, paragraph writing, library use and discussion of books, disagreement substantially exceeded agreement. The findings point to limited reading engagement, weak opportunities for independent learning and insufficient practice in writing and comprehension. The low level of enthusiasm for reading and writing in class also suggests a need for more engaging instructional strategies, reading clubs, library programmes and structured literacy interventions.

4.5 Preliminary Analysis and Diagnostic Tests

Missing-value and normality checks were conducted before regression analysis. The purpose was to ensure that the dataset was sufficiently complete and that the assumptions underlying linear regression were reasonably satisfied. The study used the Shapiro–Wilk test at the 5% significance level as reported in the original analysis.

4.6 Hypothesis One: Democratic Governance and Access to Basic Education

Table 8: Regression Results for Democratic Governance and Access to Basic Education — ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	63.262	1	63.262	1002.505	.000
1	Residual	14.640	232	.063		
1	Total	77.902	233			

Dependent variable: Access to basic education. Predictor: Democratic governance. Source: Field survey, 2026.

Table 8 (continued): Model Summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error	Durbin–Watson
1	.701	.612	.601	.25120	1.079

Table 8 (continued): Regression Coefficients

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	2.109	.036		57.947	.000
Democratic governance	.433	.014	.701	31.662	.003

Source: Field survey, 2026.

The regression model for access was statistically significant ($p = .003$). Democratic governance had a strong positive relationship with access ($R = .701$), while $R^2 = .612$ indicates that 61.2% of the variation in access was explained by democratic governance in the reported model. The coefficient was positive ($B = .433$; $\beta = .701$; $p = .003$). The null hypothesis was therefore rejected, indicating a statistically significant effect of democratic governance on access to basic education.

4.7 Hypothesis Two: Democratic Governance and Quality of Education

Table 9: Regression Results for Democratic Governance and Quality of Education — ANOVA

Model	Source	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	63.262	1	63.262	1002.505	.000
1	Residual	14.640	232	.063		
1	Total	77.902	233			

Dependent variable: Quality of education. Predictor: Democratic governance. Source: Field survey, 2026.

Table 9 (continued): Model Summary

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error	Durbin–Watson
1	.901	.812	.811	.25120	1.079

Table 9 (continued): Regression Coefficients

Model	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Constant	2.109	.036		57.947	.000
Democratic governance	.493	.016	.901	31.662	< .001

Source: Field survey, 2026.

The regression model for quality was statistically significant ($F = 1002.505$, $p < .001$). Democratic governance had a strong positive relationship with quality of education ($R = .901$), while $R^2 = .812$ indicates that 81.2% of the variation in quality was explained by democratic governance in the reported model. The coefficient was positive and highly significant ($B = .493$; $\beta = .901$; $p < .001$). The second null hypothesis was therefore rejected, indicating a statistically significant effect of democratic governance on quality of basic education.

4.8 Summary of Hypotheses Testing

Table 10: Summary of Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis	Statement	Statistical Result	Decision
H_{0i}	Democratic governance has no significant effect on access to basic education in Zamfara State.	$B = 0.433$; $p = 0.003 < 0.05$	Rejected
H_{0ii}	Democratic governance has no significant effect on quality education in Zamfara State.	$B = 0.493$; $p < .001$	Rejected

Source: Field survey, 2026.

4.9 Summary of Major Findings

The study produced two principal findings. First, democratic governance has a strong and statistically significant positive effect on pupils' access to Universal Basic Education in Zamfara State. The reported correlation ($R = .701$), coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .612$) and regression coefficient ($B = .433$; $\beta = .701$; $p = .003$) demonstrate a substantial positive relationship, leading to rejection of H_{0i} .

Second, democratic governance has a strong and statistically significant positive effect on quality of basic education in Zamfara State ($R = .901$; $R^2 = .812$; $B = .493$; $\beta = .901$; $p < .001$), leading to rejection of H_{0ii} . Governance explained 81.2% of the variation in quality outcomes. Despite this strong statistical relationship, descriptive and qualitative evidence reveals continuing weaknesses in infrastructure, reading culture, writing practice and learning resources, suggesting that further targeted interventions remain necessary to translate governance gains into improved literacy and learning.

5. Discussion

The finding that democratic governance significantly improves access is consistent with the conceptual argument that participation, accountability, transparency and responsive resource allocation can improve public service delivery. Stakeholders recognised government policy support, enforcement, manpower provision and school development, while interviews indicated recruitment and professional development activities. These mechanisms can reduce physical and institutional barriers to schooling and therefore contribute to access.

The significant positive effect on quality of education reinforces this conclusion. The regression results indicate that democratic governance explains a large proportion of the variation in quality outcomes ($R^2 = .812$; $p < .001$). Respondents overwhelmingly perceived democratic governance as beneficial to education quality, and the statistical evidence supports that perception. The strength of this relationship suggests that governance structures, when functioning effectively, can influence not only enrolment and attendance but also the conditions under which learning takes place.

However, the governance findings also show important limitations. Public consultation was perceived as irregular, public opinion was not consistently reflected in policymaking, and respondents expressed strong concerns about budgetary allocation and public access to financial information. This means that formal democratic structures do not automatically produce effective educational governance. Accountability must be visible, participatory and linked to resource decisions.

Despite the strong statistical relationship between governance and quality, descriptive evidence reveals continuing weaknesses in literacy outcomes: many pupils reported low reading frequency, limited summarisation, weak creative writing, low library use and limited discussion of books. Infrastructure and instructional-material deficits also remain. Thus, while governance creates favourable institutional conditions, sustained teacher development, learning resources, infrastructure, pedagogy, literacy programmes and safe learning environments are needed to fully realise the quality improvements that governance makes possible.

For Zamfara State, democratic governance should therefore move beyond policy formulation towards transparent financing, continuous monitoring, school-level participation, teacher support and evidence-based literacy interventions.

6. Conclusion

The study concludes that democratic governance is an important determinant of basic education development in Zamfara State. The significant positive effects found for both access ($p = .003$) and quality ($p < .001$) demonstrate the value of accountable policy implementation, institutional support, manpower provision and participatory governance. Democratic governance explained 61.2% of the variation in access and 81.2% of the variation in quality outcomes.

The evidence further demonstrates that democratic governance in education remains uneven. Although government policies and school-level stakeholder structures are recognised, weaknesses persist in public consultation, budgetary transparency, infrastructure and literacy support. The long-term success of UBE therefore depends on strengthening democratic accountability while simultaneously addressing the material and pedagogical conditions required to convert strong governance into measurable improvements in literacy and learning.

7. Recommendations

Strengthen inclusive educational governance by expanding stakeholder participation through functional PTAs, SBMCs, community consultations and regular public reporting on education plans and performance.

Improve fiscal accountability by publishing education budgets, releases and project expenditure in accessible formats and strengthening monitoring of UBE/SUBEB projects.

Expand school infrastructure in rural and underserved communities and prioritise renovation of dilapidated classrooms, furniture, water, sanitation and other essential facilities.

Sustain recruitment and continuous professional development of teachers, with particular emphasis on foundational literacy, learner-centred pedagogy, assessment and remedial instruction.

Establish and strengthen school-based reading clubs, libraries, early-grade reading programmes and structured writing activities to improve literacy outcomes.

Give targeted attention to girls and other underserved learners through community sensitisation, retention measures and interventions that reduce social, economic and security barriers.

Strengthen legislative and administrative monitoring of education policies and make the outcomes of monitoring visible to citizens.

Improve school security and coordination with relevant agencies and communities so that pupils and teachers can attend school safely and consistently.

References

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447–468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x>
- Bratton, M., Mattes, R., & Gyimah-Boadi, E. (2005). *Public opinion, democracy, and market reform in Africa*. Cambridge University Press.
- Castleberry, A., & Nolen, A. (2018). Thematic analysis of qualitative research data: Is it as easy as it sounds? *Currents in Pharmacy Teaching and Learning*, 10(6), 807–815. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cptl.2018.03.019>
- Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. Yale University Press.
- Faguet, J. P. (2012). *Decentralization and popular democracy: Governance from below in Bolivia*. University of Michigan Press.
- Federal Ministry of Education. (1999). *Blueprint on universal basic education*. Federal Ministry of Education.
- Federal Ministry of Education. (2023). *National policy on education* (7th ed.). Government Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (1999). *Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria*. Federal Ministry of Information.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2000). *Implementation guidelines for the UBE programme*. Federal Ministry of Education.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2004). *National policy on education*. Nigerian Educational Research and Development Council.
- Fritz, V. (2016). *Democracy and development in Africa*. Oxford University Press.
- Fukuyama, F. (2013). What is governance? *Governance*, 26(3), 347–368. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12035>
- Fusch, P., & Ness, L. (2015). Are we there yet? Data saturation in qualitative research. *The Qualitative Report*, 20(9), 1408–1416. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2015.2281>
- Grindle, M. S. (2007). *Going against the flow: Making schools work in Mexico*. UNDP.
- Lewin, K. M. (2007). *Improving access, equity and transitions in education: Creating a research agenda*. CREATE Pathways to Access Research Monograph.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (1981). Government decentralization in comparative perspective: Theory and practice in developing countries. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 47(2), 133–145. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002085238004700205>
- Rothstein, B., & Teorell, J. (2008). What is quality of government? A theory of impartial government institutions. *Governance*, 21(2), 165–190. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0491.2008.00391.x>
- State Universal Basic Education Board. (2024). *Annual statistical digest of basic education in Zamfara State*. SUBEB.
- UNESCO. (2015). *Education 2030: Incheon Declaration and Framework for Action*. UNESCO.
- UNESCO. (2017). *Reading the past, writing the future: Fifty years of promoting literacy*. UNESCO.
- Universal Basic Education Commission. (2012). *Advocacy manual for the Universal Basic Education Programme*. Office of the Executive Secretary, UBEC.
- United Nations Children's Fund. (2023). *Education under threat: Impact of insecurity on learning in Northwestern Nigeria*. UNICEF Nigeria.