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Abstract. This study examined the relationship between equal opportunity to learning, provision of basic needs, teacher preparation of lesson and students’ development in Kwara State, Nigeria. Proportional sampling procedure was used to select participants from sample public senior secondary schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. Questionnaire titles “Social Justice and Management of Students’ Development Questionnaire (SJMSDQ) was used to gather data and analysed with the use of quantitative statistics tools. The outcomes shown that there is no significant difference between equal opportunity to learning, provision of basic needs, teacher preparation and management of students’ development in Nigeria. The researcher recommended that educational managers should provide equal access to schooling for all learners irrespective of their age so as to encourage students empathize with others and develop the skill of critical thinking. Also, government should ensure adequate provision of basic needs to facilitate effective teaching and learning in order to make students think effectively and develop the skills for relevant judgement. Subsequently, government should encourage teachers to improve on the effective preparation of lesson so as to help in the growth and development of the students’ cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains as well as helps to promote the overall personality development of the students.
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A. INTRODUCTION

The educational standards of a school are significantly influenced by the students’ growth in cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains. The integration of the three domains determine how learners participates in social life and therefore influences their social sustainability and the generation of new ideas. Nigeria nowadays is flooded with violence, kidnapping, drug abuse, sexual abuse, mental illness, poverty, bandicts, Boko haram and many other fundamental issues that are pertinent to the nation’s politics, economy and culture. The purpose of social justice, thus, should be judgmentally addressed to safeguard students’ development. Throughout the world, social justice issues have turned out to be deeply embedded in the fabric of society and vital part of everyday discourse in education despite the tendency of eliminating gaps between the poor and rich.

Education has crucial role to make students develop by equipping learners positively for their entire life sojourns, careers and challenges. Secondary education is subdivided into two different segment that are seamlessly connected (junior and senior secondary education) base on the framework of National Policy on Education (2013) and the duration shall be six years. Secondary schooling plays necessary roles in making an individual to be self-developed and self-reliant toward evolving the country. Secondary education is defined as the schooling learners acquire after primary schooling and earlier than higher education. It is at this phase of training that students are prepared for higher institutions.
Several studies have been conducted on social justice and education system. Cho (2017) embarked on the navigation of social justice and diverse education. Congo-Poottafen and Sohawon (2014) investigated the enactment social justice and professional development. Guerra et al (2013) conducted their research on the development of enlightening leaders for social justice, paying attention to the programmatic elements that work or need improvement. Zhang, Goddard and Jakubiec (2018) investigated education and social justice leadership: A suggested survey was adopted to gather data. Mixed methods technique was used to analyze data. The results showed that there is a momentous and positive relationship between just and friendly school leader and the community setting. There are numerous areas on social justice and education that are so far not conducted by these researchers. These parts comprise of social justice issues in education and management of students’ development in Nigeria. Likewise, to the best knowledge of researcher, there have been no researches in Nigeria up till now that have focused on the equal opportunity to learning, provision of basic needs and teacher preparation as serious indices to measure social justice. Hence, this study attempts to seal the holes open by the extant researchers.

The subsequent objectives have been framed to guide the conduct of the study.

a. Determine the relationship between equal opportunity to learning and management of students’ development
b. Investigate the relationship between provision of basic needs and management of students’ development
c. Examine the relationship between teacher preparation and management of students’ development.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were framed and tested:

1. There is no positive difference between the mean scores of principals and teachers on provision of basic needs and management of students’ development.
2. There is no positive difference between the mean scores of principals and teachers on teacher preparation and management of students’ development.

3. There is no positive difference between the mean scores of principals and teachers on teacher preparation and management of students’ development.

B. LITERATURE REVIEW

1. Social Justice in Education

Social justice in education is concerned with education equality and a desire to raise educational attainment and improve students’ development (Dover, 2015). It implies that social justice in education facilitates ethical discourse that gives room for high academic attainment and sustaining relations with learners from all backgrounds as well as keeping value orientation towards learners’ development. Social justice in education can be seen as the process, principles and policies adopted by government or institutions to ensure that students welfarism is accorded optimum attention in order to ensure maximization of students’ development (Cho, 2017). It is very clear that, if students were given equal opportunity to learning, provided with basic needs as well as taught by prepared teacher they would perform reasonably better for their development. Social justice in this study refers to equal opportunity to learning, provision of education basic needs and teacher preparation of lesson for effective management of students’ development.

2. Equal Opportunity to Learning and Management of Students’ Development

Equal opportunity to learning can be seen as a way of making educational services accessible to every child irrespective of their background, abilities and interest (Aksu & Canturk, 2015). In general, equal opportunity to learning is seen as equality of being able to access available resources and being able to utilize them toward achieving the stated educational goals and objectives. Equal opportunity to learning is required in a democratic system which can create and contribute to develop understanding, acceptance and human security. Education should be essential, free, reachable, acceptable, adaptable to social change and to the best interest the child which is responsive.
towards the development of student knowledge. In a democratic system, learners should have the opportunity to achieve the highest possible standards by having equal access to learning irrespective of their culture, religion, background, age, ethnicity, language or gender.

3. Provision of Basic Needs and Management of Students’ Development

Education basic facilities play crucial role in the actualization of the educational objectives. In order to satisfy the physical and emotional needs of students, there should be provision of conducive learning environment, guidance and counselling services, health service, safe structure, drinkable water, sufficient shelter space for work and play as well as health services for the overall development of students and achievement of educational system as stated in the National Policy on Education (2013). Therefore, these cannot be fully achieved without addressing the issues of social justice in education system. Counselling and guidance services is important for development of the learners because it is a desirable advisory technique used in helping the students in achieving their goals and aspiration. It is a harmonizing means of controlling students’ emotional disturbances, frustration and vaulting ambition to create a conducive learning for them to develop positively (Abdullahi, 2017). The school environment is characterized by a conflicting fusion of behavioural problems resulting from differential attitudes of students which call for intervening devices for a conducive learning environment as well as help students effect positive desirable behavioural changes.

4. Teacher Preparation and Management of Students’ Development

Teacher preparation of lesson provides a guide for managing the learning environment. It is an act by which teacher makes wise decisions about the strategies and methods to employ in teaching students systematically in the classroom towards their development (Olorundare, 2015). This means that the more prepared a teacher is, the livelier the teaching and learning will be. Preparations of lessons provide the basic information, components, objectives, lesson details including steps which describe actions to be undertaken by the teacher. In addition, it provides a framework for an effective teaching and learning process, allows teacher to focus on one objective at a time and communicate to learners what they will learn as well as provides additional support to students. Ideal teacher does not just go to the classroom to teach, since the textbook available in the market are of different qualities and not all of them may meet required standards of promoting effective learning.

5. Management of Students’ Development

Management of secondary schools should be geared towards achieving the objectives of educating the students to become useful and respected citizens. This could only be achieved by proper arrangement in form of planning, controlling, coordinating of the education system by government, principals, staff and stakeholders in order to realize the desired objectives of producing good quality. Great emphasis is placed on services rendered to students, because the school are not built to cater for the interest of teachers, parents and school administrators alone but also for students’ development (Onye, 2010).

C. THEORETICAL CONTRIBUTION

The theoretical basis of this study focused on hierarchy of needs theory posited by Maslow (1954) as mentioned in Abdullahi (2017). He believes that human beings always have some needs which they want to satisfy. He categorized human need into five different levels and that the needs are arranged in hierarchical order: Physiological needs (such as water, food, shelter, rest, clothing, exercise & air); safety needs (the need to be safe from danger & physical harm) acceptance needs (the need of individual to have intimate relationship with a group and accepted as a member of social group); self-esteem needs (the need for prestige, recognition and admiration from others) and self-actualization needs (the need to become what an individual want to be). Maslow posits that as one lower need is satisfied, another higher need will be emerged and become operative in one’s life. The educational manager must ensure that the needs of the students are satisfied from the
basic level to the higher level of needs so as to realize the specified educational goals and objectives.

Figure 1. theoretical framework (Adapted from Maslow Abraham (1954)).

This theory is applicable in education setting such that physiological needs such as food, water, clothes, shelter, guidance and counselling services and the likes are needs that have to do with the survival of students. The security needs in terms of teachers’ preparation of lesson and safety from any danger in order to keep student safe. Social needs are the needs for affiliation, identify with group by giving equal opportunity to leaning. Esteem needs and self-actualization needs which has to do with recognition, prestige, power as well as fulfilment of one’s dream, emotion and aspiration (students’ development). This study anchored on the Maslow hierarchy of needs because it is very necessary for government to provide basic needs for students in terms of breakfast and lunch programme, drinkable water, provision of safety and conducive environment, equal opportunity to learning in order to allow them reach the highest level and become skilled graduates (students’ development).

D. METHODS

This study adopted the use of quantitative research design. The design was considered proper for this research since it will help the investigator to survey the collaboration that occur between social justice and management of students’ development. It also gives the chance to obtain the view of the participants, analyze the data gathered with the use of proper data analysis procedure and reach a cogent decision about the participants through this study findings (Punch, 2005; George, & Mallory, 2001).

The population of the study comprised of all principals and instructors in government owned secondary schools. The target population of this study comprised of 310 principals and 6,894 instructors in public senior secondary schools in Kwara State. Sample of 175 principals and 364 instructors were chosen proportionately throughout the three senatorial Districts by getting the population of participants and selecting the sample proportionately as shown in Table 1 using Research Advisor (2006) table of defining sample size of a known population. In addition, stratified random sampling procedure was adopted to choose the participants so as to safeguard that all classes of school administrator and teachers were given alike opportunity of actually chosen.

Table 1. Sample Population

| Senatorial Districts | Overall figure of Principals | Selected figure of Principals | Overall figure of teachers | Selected figure of teachers |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| Kwara Central        | 82                          | 46                           | 1023                      | 54                        |
| Kwara North          | 108                         | 61                           | 2307                      | 122                       |
| Kwara South          | 120                         | 68                           | 3564                      | 188                       |
| Overall              | 310                         | 175                          | 6,894                     | 364                       |

Self-constructed questionnaire titled “Social Justice and Management of Students’ Development Questionnaire” (SJMSDQ) and modified questionnaire was used as an instrument for this study. An overall of 15 items were used to measure social justice with (three) sub-variables: equal opportunity to learning (5 items), provision of basic needs (5 items) and teacher preparation (5 items). The questionnaire concerning management of students’ development was concluded from were concluded from Karani (2018) on self-
esteem (9 items), Shahab, Sobari and Udin (2018) on empowerment (10 items), and Abdullahi (2019) on good citizenship (6 items). Participants answered to Likert scale of four-point: Strongly Agree (4), Agreed (3), Disagree (2) as well as Strongly Agree (1). The condition mean is given thus: \(1 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 2\frac{1}{2} \) (2.50). The condition mean portrays that any item higher or equivalent to condition mean value of (2.50) is agreed while the item lower than the condition mean value is disagreed by the participants. Bond and Fox (2015) posits that Likert scale off our-point answer set-ups faster and easier to complete than five- and seven-point scales.

To confirm the rationality of the instrument, draft copies were given to three specialists in educational management and three professionals in measurement and evaluation. Germane improvements and modification were made based on professionals’ comments and recommendations. Similarly, 30 amended copies were further distributed to participants who were part of the samples to detect their clearness of instructions, items phrasings as well as scaling of the questions so as to detect any difficulties that might arise in filling the questionnaire. Thus, some suggestions provided were corrected accurately prior the distribution of concluding copies. Table 2 shown the reliability of the instrument using Cronbach’s alpha, the value for Cronbach’s alpha for this study was confirmed to be suitable and tolerable.

Table 2. Reliability Test for SJMSDQ

| Variable | Sub-variables | N | Cronbach’s Alpha | Decision of items |
|----------|---------------|---|------------------|-------------------|
| Social Justice | Equal Opportunity to learning | 5 | 0.80 | suitable and tolerable |
| | Basic needs | 5 | 0.82 | suitable and tolerable |
| | Teacher preparation | 5 | 0.84 | suitable and tolerable |
| Students | Self-esteem | 9 | 0.83 | suitable and tolerable |
| Development | Empowerment | 1 | 0.86 | suitable and |

Table 2 reveals that there are 5 items under equal opportunity to learning of social justice with Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.80. Also, there are 5 items under provision of basic needs with Cronbach alpha of 0.82 and 5 items on teacher preparation with Cronbach’s alpha of 0.84. For students’ development construct, the Cronbach’s Alpha value for the sub-constructs are 0.83 for self-esteem, 0.86 for empowerment, and 0.84 for good citizenship. Values above 0.70 are considered reliable and acceptable and values above .8 are preferable and represent a good reliability (Bond & Fox, 2015; Brannen, 2017). Hence, all the 3indices of social justice and 3 indices of students’ development were around Cronbach’s alpha of 0.83. Consequently, the values display an excellent constancy reliability for all the items of questionnaire and found suitable and tolerable.

The data were collected from respondent (principals & teachers) by means of questionnaire. The questionnaires were dispersed to participants with the aid of two qualified research assistant. To guarantee maximum reply rate, the purposes of the research and directives on how to reply the questions were plainly clarified to participants. This effort boosted full contribution of the participants. The exercise of data gathering was efficiently completed within two weeks because questionnaires were personally administered by researchers, qualified research assistants and with the assistance of contemporaries in the selected schools in Kwara State. These contributors were contacted in their individual workplace to talk about the aim of the research prior the circulation of the questionnaire. In the recommendation supplied by Stanley and Wise (2010), this study highlighted the ethical problems in guaranteeing secrecy and privacy of their replies.
The data accrued for this research were analyzed via descriptive statistics like mean and standard deviation to examine the purposes of the research which was intended to analyze principals and teachers’ responses on social justice based on three sub-constructs. Inferential statistics was used to test hypotheses. The t-critical value was compared to the significance level of (0.5) to determine the rejection or acceptance of the hypothesis.

E. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

RESULTS

1. Demographic Profile of Contributors

This segment presents a broad outcome of collected data analyzed. It started with an analysis of the demographic data of participants who participated using descriptive statistics and the result of the findings were organized based on research purposes.

Table 3. Demographic Information of the Participants

| Sex (N = 539) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|----------------|
| Female        | 309            | 57%           |
| Male          | 230            | 43%           |

| Age (N = 539) | Percentage (%) |
|---------------|----------------|
| 21-30         | 130            | 24%           |
| 31-40         | 200            | 37.2%         |
| 41-50         | 153            | 28.4%         |
| 51 above      | 56             | 10.4%         |

| Qualification (N = 539) | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------------|----------------|
| NCE                     | 281            | 52%           |
| B.Ed.                   | 243            | 45%           |
| Master degree           | 15             | 3%            |

| Year of Experience (N = 539) | Percentage (%) |
|-----------------------------|----------------|
| 1-10 years                  | 270            | 50%           |
| 10-20 years                 | 150            | 28%           |
| 21 years                    | 119            | 22%           |

Table 3 shows the demographic data of participants involved in this study. The table shown that 309 participants (57%) are female and 230 participants are male (43%). In terms of usual age of the participants, the majority 200 of the participants (37%) are between ages of 31-40 years while 56 participants (10.4%) are between ages 51 above. Based on the qualification of the participants, majority 281 participants (52%) are NCE holder whereas 15 participants (3%) are master degree holder. In the aspect of year of experience, majority 270 participants (50%) have 1-10 years of experience, while 119 participants (22%) have 21 years above experience in the sampled schools.

2. Equal Opportunity to Learning

Objective 1: Determine the equal opportunity to learning and management of students’ development

Table 4 portrays the descriptive statistics of data collected from the sampled schools. Table 4 produced outcomes of the analysis.

Table 4: Equal Opportunity to Learning

| S/ | Equal Opportunity to Learning | Prici | Teach | Decisio |
|----|--------------------------------|-------|-------|---------|
|    |                                | nals’ | ers’ | n       |
|    |                                | Resp | Resp | onse    |
|    |                                | Mean | Mean | onses   |
|    |                                | SD   | SD   |         |
| 1  | Equal opportunity to learning | 2.930| 2.950| Agreed  |
|    | encourage students to empathize with others and develop the skill of critical thinking. | .966 | .966 |
| 2  | Equal opportunity to learning | 2.870| 2.890| Agreed  |
|    | allows students to achieve the level of success and self-respect to which they are entitled. | .924 | .956 |
| 3  | Equal opportunity to learning | 2.930| 2.800| Agreed  |
|    | helps students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively with others. | .914 | .982 |
| 4  | Equal opportunity to learning | 2.820| 2.781| Agreed  |
|    | helps students with opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities that foster positive | 1.014| .048 |
development.

Table 4 shows the general insight of the participants on the equal opportunity learning toward improving students’ development is taken as “Agreed” (M = 2.89, SD = 0.954) and (M = 2.87, SD = 0.997). This displays that the principals and teachers agreed that equal opportunity to learning enhance students’ development. Similarly, all the responses found mean values higher than the condition mean value of 2.50. This displays that the principals and teachers agree that equal opportunity i) encourage students to empathize with others and develop the skill of critical thinking (M = 2.93, SD =0.966) and (M = 2.95, SD = 0.966), ii) allows students achieve the level of success and self-respect to which they are entitled (M = 2.87, SD = 0.924) and (M = 2.89, SD = 0.956), iii) helps students acquire the social skills needed to interact effectively with others (M = 2.93, SD = 0.914) and (M = 2.80, SD = 0.982), iv) helps students with opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities that foster positive development (M = 2.82, SD = 1.014) and (M = 2.78, SD = 1.048), v) helps learners have more control over their life positively (M = 2.90, SD = 0.952) and (M = 2.92, SD = 1.032). The results show that the principals and teachers agreed that when students are giving equal opportunity to learning, they will invariably be furnished with the needed skills to enhance their development.

3. Provision of basic needs

Table 5 reveals the analysis of the participants’ response for the construct of provision of basic needs and management of students’ development.

As shown in Table 5, the general insight of the participants on the provision of basic needs towards improving students’ development is interpreted as “Agreed” (M = 2.83, SD = 0.990) and (M = 2.89, SD = 0.976). This reveals that participants agreed that the provision of basic needs brings about the effective management of students’ development. Furthermore, all the replies attained mean values higher than the condition mean value of 2.50. This shows that participants agree that provision of basic needs i) makes students think effectively and develop the skills for relevant judgement (M = 2.90, SD = 0.971) and (M = 2.84, SD = 1.004),
ii) makes students understand and appreciate their role as citizens (M = 2.71, SD = 1.004) and (M = 2.93, SD = 0.973), iii) makes students understand the basic facts about sanitation needed to promote good health condition (M = 2.79, SD = 0.974) and (M = 2.95, SD = 0.912), iv) helps students take right decision on how to make use of available resources at the appropriate time to improve their knowledge (M = 2.86, SD = 0.988) and (M = 2.90, SD = 0.964), v) helps students in satisfying their needs in accordance with the institutional goals (M = 2.89, SD = 0.990) and (M = 2.98, SD = 0.971). The results indicate that the principals and teachers agree that when there is adequate provision of education basic needs, students will maintain favourable setting for improving their learning and overall development.

4. Teacher preparation

Table 6 displays the analysis of the participants answer for the construct of teacher preparation and management of students’ development.

Table 6: Teacher Preparation as Answered by the Participants

| S/ | Teacher Preparation | Principal Response Mean | Teacher Response Mean | Decision |
|----|---------------------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| 1  | Teacher preparation helps in the growth and development of the students cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains. | 2.870 | 2.93 | Agreed |
| 2  | Teacher preparation helps in making adequate provision for student activities. | 2.771 | 3.010 | Agreed |
| 3  | Teacher preparation helps to generate enthusiasm for learning among students. | 2.960 | 2.920 | Agreed |
| 4  | Teacher preparation helps to ensure continuous intellectual and social development of the learners. | 2.960 | 2.911 | Agreed |
| 5  | Teacher preparation helps to encourage | 2.860 | 2.901 | Agreed |

Table 6, revealed the general perception of the participants on the teacher preparation of lesson toward enhancing students’ development is interpreted as “Agreed” (M = 2.87, SD = 0.949) and (M = 2.93, SD = 0.973). This reveals that participants agreed that teacher preparation improve effective management of students’ development. Also, entirely answers gotten mean values higher than the condition mean value of 2.50. This shows that participants agree that teacher preparation of lesson i) helps in the growth and development of the students cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains (M = 2.87, SD = 0.949) and (M = 2.93, SD = 0.973), ii) helps in making adequate provision for student activities (M = 2.77, SD = 1.038) and (M = 3.01, SD = 0.936), iii) helps to generate enthusiasm for learning among students (M = 2.96, SD = 0.974) and (M = 2.92, SD = 0.965), iv) helps ensure continuous intellectual and social development of the learners (M = 2.96, SD = 0.931) and (M = 2.91, SD = 1.003), v) helps encourage development of learners’ personality (M = 2.86, SD = 0.984) and (M = 2.90, SD = 1.005). The results show that the principals and teachers agree that when teachers prepare their lesson effectively, it will arouse students’ interest in learning and prepare them for better future.

Hypotheses Testing

T-test statistical analysis was used in this study to test the set hypotheses as follow:

H01: there is no significant difference between the mean scores of principals and teachers on equal opportunity to learning and management of students’ development.

Table 7: Equal Opportunity to Learning and Management of Students’ Development

| Variable | N | Mean | SD | T Critical | Decision |
|----------|---|------|----|------------|----------|
| Teachers | 364 | 2.87 | 0.99 | 7 | 537 | 0.196 | Accepted |
Table 7 shows the t-test analysis of principals’ and teachers’ mean scores on equal opportunity to learning and management of students’ development. The t-calculated value of 0.80 is less than t-critical value of 1.96. This means that there is no significant difference between the replies of principals and teachers on equal opportunity to learning and management of students’ development. Thus, the hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between equal opportunity and management of students’ development is accepted.

**Ho2:** There is no significant difference between the mean scores of principals and teachers on provision of basic needs and management of students’ development.

### Table 8: Provision of Basic Needs and Management of Students’ Development

| Variable          | N   | \(\bar{x}\) | SD  | Df | T-cal | t-crit. | Decision |
|-------------------|-----|-------------|-----|----|-------|---------|----------|
| Teachers          | 364 | 2.89        | 0.97|    | 537   | 0.97    | Accepted |
| Principals        | 175 | 2.83        | 0.99|    | 83    | 0.99    |          |

Table 8 shows the t-test analysis principals’ and teachers’ mean scores replies on provision of basic needs and management of students’ development. The t-calculated value of 0.83 is less than t-critical value of 1.96. This means that there is no significant difference between the responses of principals and teachers on provision of the basic needs and management of students’ development. Hence, the hypothesis which states that there is no positive difference between provision of basic needs and management of students’ development is accepted.

**Ho3:** There is no significant difference between the mean scores of principals and teachers on teacher preparation and management of students’ development.

### Table 9: Teacher Preparation and Management of Students’ Development

| Variable          | N   | \(\bar{x}\) | SD  | Df | T-cal | t-crit. | Decision |
|-------------------|-----|-------------|-----|----|-------|---------|----------|
| Teachers          | 364 | 2.93        | 0.78|    | 537   | 0.78    | Accepted |

Table 9 shows the t-test mean scores of teachers and principals on teacher preparation and management of students’ development. The t-calculated value of 0.78 is lower than t-critical value 1.96. This means that there is no significant difference between the replies of teachers and principals on teacher preparation and management of students’ development. Therefore, the null hypothesis which stated that there is no significant difference between teacher preparation and management of students’ development is accepted.

**DISCUSSION**

The results in table 4 expresses that equal opportunity to learning improve efficient management of students’ development in Kwara State, Nigeria. This in turn encourage students to empathize with others and develop the skill of critical thinking, allows students to achieve the level of success and self-respect to which they are entitled, helps students to attain social skills required to interact efficiently with others, helps learners with opportunities to participate in extra-curricular activities that foster positive development as well as helps students to have more control over their life positively. Results from hypothesis one shown that there is no positive difference between equal opportunity to learning and management of students’ development. These findings conform with Genc and Eryaman (2008) who posits provision of learning opportunity improve individual talents and intelligence at maximum level as well bring out development in students. These findings disagreed with Sultan (1991) that fairness in bringing education to everyone does not essentially guarantee that results or benefits gained are steady.
The findings in Table 5 indicates that the provision of basic needs enhance students’ development in Kwara State. Such that it makes students think effectively and develop the skills for relevant judgement, makes students understand and appreciate their role as citizens, makes students understand the basic facts about sanitation needed for promoting good health condition, helps students take right decision on how to make use of available resources at the appropriate time to improve their knowledge as well as helps students in satisfying their needs in accordance with the institutional goals. Result from hypothesis two indicated that there is no positive difference between provision of basic needs and management of students’ development. These findings agreed with Takwate (2018) that the provision of education basic needs in terms of learning facilities and guidance and counselling services have been found as a significant determinant of students’ development. These findings also concur with Odumbe, et al (2015) that the availability of teaching and learning facilities, competent teachers and good physical environment have an impact on students’ development. In addition, these findings agreed with Onasanya (2016) that provision of education basic needs facilitate proper functioning of school and enhance quality learners. Furthermore, these findings in line with Farooq et al (2011) that adequate provision of needed facilities in school enhance the quality of students’ academic performance.

The findings in Table 6 show that the teacher preparation of lesson increase effective management of students’ development. Such that it helps in the growth and development of the students cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains, helps in making adequate provision for student activities, helps to generate enthusiasm for learning among students, helps to ensure continuous intellectual and social development of the learners as well as helps to encourage development of learners’ personality. Result of hypothesis three presented that there is no positive difference between teacher preparation and management of students’ development. These findings are in conformity with Olorundare (2015) that preparing for lessons assist teachers to understand the methods of teaching to be utilized in classroom so as to make teaching more interesting, interactive and exciting to all the categories of learners with the aim of achieving educational goals and objectives. These findings are in line with Oduwaiye (2016) that lesson preparation helps in maintaining attention, concentration, consequently order and discipline.

F. CONCLUSION

This finding will provide countless advantage to school managers. The outcome of the study will assist the management to recognize the necessity of social justice in providing equal opportunity to learning, education basic needs and ensure proper teacher preparation for lesson in order to enhance effective management of students’ development. This study would also help teachers and principals to continue to make appropriate preparation of lesson to be taught so as to arouse the interest of learners in teaching. Furthermore, this study would be useful to researchers in the field of education in terms of reference citation.

Social justice is an imperative element in enhancing active management of students’ development. Regarding the outcome of this study, it was resolved that there is no positive difference between equal opportunity to learning, provision of basic needs, teacher preparation of lesson and management of students’ development as they were found to connect one another.
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