



ADEQUACY OF RURAL SECONDARY EDUCATION TEACHERS' CAPACITY BUILDING ON SAFE SCHOOL MEASURES IN KATSINA STATE, NIGERIA

Okeke O. C.^a, Ikwuakam O. T.^b, and Ibrahim M.^c

^aDepartment of Igbo, Federal College of Education, Katsina State.

Email: okecee66@gmail.com

^bDepartment of Agricultural Education, Federal College of Education, Katsina State.

Email: ikwuosca@yahoo.com

^cDepartment of Home Economics Education, Federal College of Education, Katsina State.

Email: maimunaib37@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author's Email: ikwuosca@yahoo.com

Cite this article:

Okeke, O. C., Ikwuakam, O. T., Ibrahim, M. (2024), Adequacy of Rural Secondary Education Teachers' Capacity Building on Safe School Measures in Katsina State, Nigeria. *British Journal of Contemporary Education* 4(1), 112-128. DOI: 10.52589/BJCE-ZAGHT9Q5

Manuscript History

Received: 31 May 2024

Accepted: 4 Aug 2024

Published: 12 Aug 2024

Copyright © 2024 The Author(s).

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits anyone to share, use, reproduce and redistribute in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

ABSTRACT: *This study examined adequacy of secondary education teachers' capacity building on safe school initiative in Katsina State. A sample size of 240 teachers was selected using multistage sampling techniques from all public secondary schools in the state. Descriptive survey design and structured questionnaire were adopted in collecting data on teachers' participation, practice and adequacy of capacity building across state's three senatorial districts (SDs); Katsina North (KN), Katsina Central (KC), and Katsina South (KS). Frequency counts, percentages, means, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and multiple regression analysis were employed in data analysis. Findings revealed a relatively experienced teaching workforce with varied educational qualifications. Significant disparities in participation level were observed across districts, with KN and KC showing better engagement compared to KS. Practice levels varied, with strengths in students' counseling and security collaboration, with weaknesses in intercultural competence and psychological first aid. ANOVA results indicated significant differences in practice and capacity building effectiveness across districts, with KS outperforming other SDs. Regression analysis identified participation in capacity building and practical application of learned skills as significant determinants of adequacy capacity building on safe school initiatives, while age and formal education were less influential. Though overall, adequacy of capacity building was low, significant disparities existed at SDs level with KS showing more positive perception than KN and KS. This highlights the need for equitable distribution of capacity building opportunities, targeted interventions in under performing districts.*

KEYWORDS: Safe school measure, capacity building, participation, practice, adequacy.



INTRODUCTION

The concept of safe schools has gained significant attention in recent years, particularly in regions facing security challenges. In Nigeria, and specifically in Katsina State, the need for safe learning environments has become increasingly critical due to various threats to educational institutions (Ibrahim, Sani, Bello, 2023). The adequacy of teachers' capacity to implement safe school initiatives is paramount in ensuring the security and well-being of students and staff.

Safe schools are characterized by environments that protect students from violence, bullying, harassment, and other forms of abuse while promoting a positive learning atmosphere (Oluwole, Adebayo, & Nwosu, 2021). In the context of Katsina State, where security concerns have impacted educational activities, the role of teachers in maintaining safe schools cannot be overstated. However, the effectiveness of teachers in this regard largely depends on their capacity and preparedness to handle various safety-related concerns.

Capacity building for teachers on safe school initiatives encompasses a range of activities designed to equip educators with the knowledge, skills, and resources necessary to create and maintain secure learning environments. These may include training on risk assessment, crisis management, psychological support, and collaboration with security agencies (Abdullahi & Tukur, 2020). The adequacy of such capacity building efforts is crucial in determining the overall success of safe school programmes.

Recent studies have highlighted the importance of teacher preparedness in implementing safe school measures. Umar, & Bello, (2021) found a positive correlation between teachers' training and the effectiveness of safety measures in schools. Adebayo & Ige (2023) also noted uneven progress in implementing comprehensive safe school strategies across Nigerian states, emphasizing the need for targeted capacity building initiatives.

In Katsina State, the implementation of safe school measures may have faced various challenges, including resource constraints, varying levels of teacher engagement, and disparities across different regions of the state. Understanding the adequacy of current capacity building efforts is crucial for identifying gaps and improving the overall effectiveness of safe school initiatives in the state. This study aims to assess the adequacy of secondary education teachers' capacity building on safe school initiatives in Katsina State. This with a view to providing valuable insights for policymakers, educational administrators, and stakeholders involved in enhancing school safety in the state. It is also believed that the findings will add to the growing body of knowledge on safe school implementation in Nigeria and Katsina State in particular.

Statement of the problem

The increasing security challenges in Nigeria, particularly in northern regions, has significantly impacted the education sector. Katsina State, like many others in the area, has faced numerous threats to its educational institutions, ranging from kidnappings to terrorist attacks (Ibrahim et al., 2023). These security concerns have not only disrupted learning but have also instilled fear among students, teachers, and parents, potentially leading to decreased school enrollment and increased dropout rates (Oluwole et al., 2021).



In response to these challenges, the concept of "Safe Schools" has gained prominence as a crucial initiative to ensure the continuity and quality of education in affected areas. However, the success of such initiatives heavily relies on the capacity of teachers as fundamental stakeholders to implement and maintain safe school measures effectively. In order to ensure that each teacher is prepared to reasonably achieve such ascribed responsibilities, the Katsina State Government in collaboration with World Bank, and Katsina State Branch of Nigerian Red Cross Society came up with capacity building initiative for teachers as stakeholders on safe school environment. The effort was aimed at building teachers' capacity on resilience, safe school approach, evacuation techniques and first aid skills (The adolescent Girls' Initiative for Learning and Empowerment (AGILE) 2022).

It was expected that this effort would averagely produce a safe school environment that is learner-friendly, free of violence and conducive for teaching and learning. Contrarily, schools in Katsina State have sustainably recorded threats and violence in various degrees and dimensions. This include among others incessant killings, disappearance and, abduction of people, forced exile, torture, and maiming, military use of schools, destruction of educational buildings and materials, sexual violence, recruitment and use of child soldiers (Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack, 2020). The Guardian Newspaper (2020) has in corroboration noted the escalation of school attacks in State with over 300 students of GSSS Kankara Local Government Area (LGA) and 21 children (including 17 girls and 4 boys) aged between 15-18 years Faskari LGA of the State being abducted by bandits (This Day newspaper 2022).

The ugly trend raises questions on the adequacy of the capacity building efforts for secondary school teachers in Katsina State. These issues highlight the critical need for a comprehensive study to assess the adequacy of secondary education teachers' capacity building on safe school initiatives in Katsina State. It is believed that without addressing this gap in knowledge, efforts to implement effective safe school measures through the teachers may be hampered and potentially leave students, school and entire school community vulnerable to security threats.

Objectives of the study

The general objective of the study was to find out adequacy of capacity building provided to secondary education teachers on safe school measures in Katsina State. The specific objectives include:

1. Find out teachers' level of participation in capacity building on safe school measures
2. Identify teachers' level of safe school measures practice in Katsina State
3. Ascertain adequacy of the capacity building programmes on safe school in Katsina State



LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept of safe schools and the role of teachers' capacity building in implementing safe school initiatives have been subjects of increasing research interest, particularly in regions facing security challenges. Safe schools are environments that ensure the physical, emotional, and psychological safety of students and staff. Oluwole et al. (2021) define safe schools as institutions that protect students from violence, bullying, harassment, and other forms of abuse while fostering a positive learning atmosphere. Adebayo and Ige (2023) expand this definition to include protection from external security threats, given the country's unique challenges.

However, if by any chance, school safety is not met, learners and staff could be at risk and such scenario is capable of breeding truancy and drop out among learners (Mubita, 2021, Applebury, 2021). Unfortunately, Nigeria has overtime being in the news for avoidable spate of attacks on schools with North East, North West and North Central witnessed increasing number of violent attacks by armed bandits. Killings, kidnapping and abduction, rape, recruitment of child soldiers, intimidation and other forms of vices have perpetrated and recorded. For instance, on 11 November 2020, Government Science Secondary School, Kankara in Katsina State came under attack by armed bandits and more than 300 students were abducted. Similar incidents were reported at various times in Kagara (Niger State), Jangebe (Zamfara State), Rama and Afaka (Kaduna State) (NILDS and DRPC 2021). The increasing potency of threats has caused parents and guardians to become afraid and skeptical of sending their children to school (GCPEA. 2020).

In an effort to curb the menace, the Federal Government of Nigeria approved the National Policy on Safety and Security in Schools (FME 2021). The policy, among other things, provided clear directions on stakeholders' roles, early warning, disaster risk reduction and disaster risk management. Stakeholders in this context refer to individuals, groups and officials with vested interest in the progress, continuity, and success of the education system (FME, 2021). Teachers by their position are part of these stakeholders and are saddled with role among others to support the integration of safe, security and violent-free school initiative and improvement plan (FME, 2021).

The importance of teachers' capacity building for effective role delivery cannot be wished away and such well documented. Abdullahi & Tukur (2020) have stressed the critical role of professional development programs in enhancing teachers' readiness for safe school initiatives. Their findings suggest that teachers who participate in regular training programs are better equipped to handle safety-related issues in schools. Ibrahim et al. (2023) further emphasized that teachers' theoretical knowledge alone was insufficient in ensuring safe school rather teachers need hands-on experience to effectively implement safe school strategies. This is the gap capacity building strategy can fill.

However, several studies have identified series of challenges in implementing safe school initiatives particularly in Nigeria. Abubakar, Sani, & Mohammed (2022) observed variations in educational policy implementations across different Nigeria states. They noted that resource constraints, varying levels of teacher engagement, and regional disparities as significant factors affecting the success of safe school programs. Garba & Abubakar (2024) in corroboration stressed the need for effective policy implementation in improving educational outcomes, including school safety. They further argued that inadequate follow-up and lack of continuous support often hampered the long-term effectiveness of capacity building initiatives.



The effectiveness of capacity building programmes has also been observed as issue of concern. Ibrahim et al. (2023) found out that programmes emphasizing practical and hands-on training were more effective in improving teachers' ability to implement safe school measures. This depicts a shift from pure theoretical approaches to more applied, context-specific training methods such as routine capacity building programmes. As crucial as this is, Adebayo & Ige (2023) has observed uneven progress in implementing comprehensive safe school strategies across Nigerian states.

METHODOLOGY

The study was carried out in Katsina State located in North-Western zone of Nigeria. The state covers an area of 23,938 sq. km and is located between latitudes $11^{\circ}08'N$ and $13^{\circ}22'N$ and longitudes $6^{\circ}52'E$ and $9^{\circ}20'E$ (Adewale, Olowu & Ladele, 2005). It has 34 LGAs from three senatorial districts, shares common boundary with Niger Republic in the north, Jigawa and Kano States in the east, Kaduna State in the South and Zarnfara State in the West.

All rural public secondary school teachers formed the population of the study. Multistage sampling procedure was used to select sample size of 240 teachers. First, 16 rural LGAs were selected from three SDs using purposive sampling technique. Second, of the 16 LGAs, four LGAs (25%) (Batsari, DanMusa, Kafur and Baure) were selected using simple random sampling technique. Third stage involved purposive sampling of five rural secondary schools from each LGA to give 20 schools. Fourth stage involved systematic selection of twelve teachers from each sampled 20 schools to get the sample size. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data on teachers' personal profiles, level of participation, level of safe school measures practiced and adequacy of capacity building programmes.

A descriptive survey design was adopted for the study. In measuring the variables, level of participation was measured on a 3 – point response scale of very high = 3, high = 2, low = 1. Mean score for each capacity were obtained and used to categorize teachers' participation into high (\geq mean score) and low ($<$ mean) levels. Level of safe school measures practiced was measured on 4-point response scale of Always = 4, occasionally = 3, Rarely = 2, never = 1. The mean scores so obtained was used to categorize the level of practice into high, and low levels using the Mean \pm SD criterion. Adequacy of capacity building programme was measured on a three-point scale using scores of Not adequate = 0, Adequate = 1 Very adequate = 2. The mean score and standard deviation were generated and used to categorize capacity building programmes into adequate ($<$ mean \pm SD), highly adequate (\geq mean \pm SD). Data analysis was carried out using frequency counts, mean, standard deviation, percentages, ANOVA and Multiple regression.



RESULTS

Personal profile of teachers

Table 1 presents results on personal profiles of respondents. The results show that overall (40.83%) were within 31-40 years old. Across SDs, KS (45%) had the highest teachers with this age range compared to KN (41.7%) and KC (35.8%). The 41-50 age group recorded overall (35.83%) with KC (39.2%) leading KS (38.3%) and KN (30%). Younger teachers (≤ 30) are more in KN (21.7%) than in South (16.7%) and KC (6.7%). Teachers over 50 are most common in KC (18.3%) and absent in KN (6.7%) and KS (0). The mean age for overall is 40.35 years with KS (41.89) years slightly higher than KC (41.38) and KN (39.32).

The results on educational qualifications show that overall; 48.60%, 42.23% and 7.77% have a Master of Education (M.Ed.), Certificate in Education (NCE) and Bachelor of Education (B.Ed.) respectively. At SDs, NCE holders dominated in KN (55%) and KS (56.7%), but less prevalent in KC (15%). M.Ed holders were common in KC (72.5%), with lower percentages in KN (40%) and KS (33.3%). Overall (7.77%) B.Ed holders have a limited presence across all SDs.

Table of personal profile

Item		Total	KC	KN	KS
Age	≤ 30	15.03	6.7	21.7	16.7
	31-40	40.83	35.8	41.7	45
	41-50	35.83	39.2	30	38.3
	> 50	8.33	18.3	6.7	0
Mean		40.35 \pm 8.07	41.38 \pm 4.07	39.32 \pm 5.07	41.89 \pm 7.01
Educational status	Any other	1.40	2.5	1.7	0
	NCE	42.23	15	55	56.7
	M Ed	48.60	72.5	40	33.3
	B Ed	7.77	10	3.3	10
	PHD	0.00	0	0	0

Participation in capacity building programme

Table 2a presents result on teachers participation in capacity building for safe schools. The results reveal that 62.1%, 37.9%, 49.2%, 42.5%, 51.2% occasionally engaged in collaboration with stakeholders, intercultural competence activities, peer mediation, identification and reporting of abuse/neglect and safety procedures respectively. Occasionally also 50.4%, 40.8%, 40.4%, 37.1%, 49.6%, 45.8% and 36.2% engaged in security risk assessments students' counseling and guidance, emergency contingency plans, crisis response, collaboration with security agencies, mobilization of resources to support safe school and identification of early warning signs respectively. Respondents rarely engaged in trauma identification in students (59.5%), providing psychological first aid (50.9%), emergency contingency plans (46.7%), crisis response (47.5%) and security risk assessments (48.7%). The results further show using mean scores that overall respondents engaged in stakeholder collaboration (2.85), intercultural competence (2.36), peer mediation (2.68), identification and reporting of abuse/neglect (2.64), safety procedures (2.98), supporting students with special needs (2.56), trauma identification



in students (2.22) and providing psychological first aid (2.31). other areas included students' counseling and guidance (3.16), emergency contingency plans (2.52), crisis response (2.52), security risk assessments (2.53), collaboration with security agencies (3.01), mobilization of resources to support safe school (2.62) and identification of early warning signs 2.51).

Results across SDs using mean scores further show that participation in capacity building on collaboration with stakeholders in KN (3.07) was more than in KN (2.90) and KC (2.58). Katsina North (2.85) again participated better than KS (2.27) and KC (1.97) in intercultural competence. Engagement in peer mediation was better in KN (2.90) compared to KC (2.40) that lagged behind. Identification and reporting of abuse/neglect was more in KN (2.95) followed by KS 2.55 with KC (2.42) trailing behind. Participation in safety procedures was better in KS (3.32) than in KN (3.0) and KC (2.63). Supporting students with special needs in KN (2.70) showed better engagement than KS (2.52) and KC (2.45). Katsina North (2.43) performed better compared to KC(2.30) and KS (1.92) in trauma identification. Providing psychological first aid was more in KC (2.42) followed by KN (2.27) and KS (2.23) that trailed behind. Students' counseling and guidance was good in both KS (3.38) and KC (3.10). Katsina North (2.70) had better participation than KS (2.43) and KC (2.42) in emergency contingency plans while crisis response was better in KS (2.78) than in KN (2.63) and KC (2.15). Security risk assessments in KS (2.75) was better in KN (2.65) than KC (2.18). Collaboration with security agencies was good in KS (3.15) than KN (2.98) and KC (2.90) while mobilization of resources to support safe school was better in KN (2.83) than KS (2.60) and KC (2.43). Identification of early warning signs was good in KN (2.57) than KS (2.52) and KC (2.44). Table 2b provides results on level of participation in capacity building across SDs. The result show that overall (51.1%), KN (80%), KC (80%) and KS (53.3%) had high levels of participation.

Table 2: distribution of respondents based on participation on capacity building programme

Items	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Always	KC	KN	KS	Overall
Collaboration with stakeholders	12.9	10.4	62.1	14.6	2.58	3.07	2.90	2.85
Intercultural competence	24.2	31.7	37.9	6.2	1.97	2.85	2.27	2.36
Peer mediation	15	22.5	49.2	13.3	2.40	2.90	2.73	2.68
Identification and reporting of abuse/neglect	16.7	24.6	42.5	16.2	2.42	2.95	2.55	2.64
Safety procedures	10.8	13.3	51.2	24.6	2.63	3.00	3.32	2.98
Supporting students with special needs	27.1	17.5	30.8	24.6	2.45	2.70	2.52	2.56
Trauma identification in students	26.2	33.3	30.8	9.6	2.30	2.43	1.92	2.22
Providing psychological first aid	29.2	21.7	35.8	13.3	2.42	2.27	2.23	2.31
Students' counseling and guidance	6.2	8.3	50.4	35	3.10	2.98	3.38	3.16
Emergency contingency plans	16.7	30	40.8	12.5	2.42	2.70	2.43	2.52



Crisis response	21.7	25.8	40.4	12.1	2.15	2.63	2.78	2.52
Security risk assessments	21.2	27.5	37.1	14.2	2.18	2.65	2.75	2.53
Collaboration with security agencies	8.8	12.9	49.6	28.7	2.90	2.98	3.15	3.01
Mobilization of resources to support safe school	14.6	26.7	45.8	12.9	2.43	2.83	2.60	2.62
Identification of earlier warning signs	17.1	31.7	36.2	15	2.44	2.57	2.52	2.51

Table 2b: distribution of respondents based on participation level on capacity building programme

Senatorial District	category	F	%
Katsina Central	High	3	20
	Low	12	80
Katsina North	High	12	80
	Low	3	20
Katsina South	High	8	53.3
	Low	7	46.7
Total	High	23	51.1
	Low	22	48.9

Practice of safe school measures

Table 3 provides results on implementation of safe school measures. The results show that 50% respondents occasionally collaborated with stakeholders. Intercultural competence (43.8%), peer mediation (49.6%), identification and reporting of abuse/neglect (49.2%), safety procedures (85.4%) and supporting students with special needs (63.3%) were occasionally practiced. Others measures occasionally practiced were trauma identification in students (62.5%), providing psychological first aid (57.5%), students' counseling and guidance (90%), emergency contingency plans (64.6%), crisis response (66.2%), security risk assessments (68.8%), collaboration with security agencies (81.6%), mobilization of resources to support safe school (65.4%) and identification of early warning signs (64.1%).

The result also show that using mean scores, overall; students' counseling and guidance (3.40), safety procedures (3.20) and collaboration with security agencies (3.12) show better scale of engagement than intercultural competence (2.48), providing psychological first aid (2.49) and emergency contingency plans, peer mediation (2.84), identification and reporting of abuse/neglect (2.81) and crisis response (2.80). The results across the three SDs, show that students' counseling and guidance was practiced in KC (3.40) and KS (3.77) than in KN (3.03) while KN (2.85), KS (3.67) did better than KC (3.08) in safety procedures. Collaboration with security agencies was better implemented in KS (3.37) and KC (3.24) than in KN (2.75). Providing psychological first aid witnessed better implementation in KC (2.72), KS (2.65) than KN (2.10). KN (2.78) implemented intercultural competence better than KS (2.43) and KC (2.22) while emergency contingency plans was better KN (2.63) compared to KS (2.78) and K



(2.58). Table 3b further provides summary of level of practice across the three SDs. The result show that overall practice was high (37.78%) while low among 62.22%. At the SDs level, 86.7% had low scale of practice while only 13.3% had high level. Katsina central (53.3%) recorded low rate while 46.7% had high scale of practice.

Table 3a: distribution of respondents based on practice of safe school measures

Items	Never	Rarely	Occasionally	Always	KC	KN	KS	Overall
Collaboration with stakeholders	8.3	17.9	50	23.8	2.8	2.7	3.10	2.89
Intercultural competence	19.2	28.7	43.8	8.3	2.2	2.7	2.43	2.48
Peer mediation	9.6	20	49.6	20.8	2.7	2.7	3.05	2.84
Identification and reporting of abuse/neglect	8.8	22.5	49.2	19.6	2.7	2.7	2.88	2.81
Safety procedures	4.6	10	49.2	36.2	3.0	2.8	3.67	3.20
Supporting students with special needs	22.1	14.6	28.3	35	2.9	2.4	2.77	2.71
Trauma identification in students	22.9	14.6	28.3	34.2	2.8	2.4	2.78	2.70
Providing psychological first aid	20	22.5	40.4	17.1	2.7	2.1	2.65	2.49
Students' counseling and guidance	2.1	7.9	37.9	52.1	3.4	3.0	3.77	3.40
Emergency contingency plans	12.9	22.5	51.7	12.9	2.5	2.6	2.78	2.67
Crisis response	11.7	22.1	42.9	23.3	2.7	2.6	3.08	2.80
Security risk assessments	11.7	19.6	49.2	19.6	2.8	2.6	2.80	2.75
Collaboration with security agencies	7.1	11.2	41.2	40.4	3.2	2.7	3.37	3.12
Mobilization of resources to support safe school	12.9	21.7	52.9	12.5	2.5	2.7	2.68	2.68
Identification of earlier warning signs	8.8	27.1	46.2	17.9	2.7	2.6	2.72	2.72

**Table 3b: distribution of respondents based on level of practice of safe school measures**

Senatorial district	Level	F	%
Katsina Central	High	7	46.7
	Low	8	53.3
Katsina North	High	2	13.3
	Low	13	86.7
Katsina South	High	8	53.3
	Low	7	46.7
Total	High	17	37.78
	Low	28	62.22

Adequacy of capacity building on safe schools measures

Table 4a presents results on adequacy of capacity building on safe schools. The results show that capacity building in collaboration with stakeholders (43.8%), peer mediation (40.8%), identification and reporting of abuse/neglect (37.9%), safety procedures (47.9%) supporting students with special needs (32.1%), and providing psychological first aid (25%) were adequate. Similarly, students' counseling and guidance (42.9%), crisis response plan(40%), security risk assessments (33.8%), and collaboration with security agencies(42.5%) were adequate. On other hand, intercultural competence (40.4%), trauma identification in students (32.1%), emergency contingency plans (41.7%), mobilization of resources to support safe school (40.8%), providing psychological first aid (31.7%) were fairly adequate.

Also, overall using mean scores, students' counseling and guidance (2.78), collaboration with stakeholders (2.54), security risk assessments (2.29), peer mediation (2.36), collaboration with security agencies (2.55), identification and reporting of abuse/neglect (2.33), crisis response (2.39), safety procedures (2.59) had relatively high adequacy mean scores. These were followed by those with low mean scores such as providing psychological first aid (2.02). trauma identification in students (1.96), intercultural competence (2.08), emergency contingency plans (2.21), supporting students with special needs (2.22), mobilization of resources to support safe school (2.23), identification of earlier warning signs (2.21).

At the SDs level, using mean scores, KS shows highest adequacy (2.87) followed by KC (2.46) and KN (2.30) for collaboration with stakeholders. KN (2.23) was slightly higher than KS (2.08) and KC (1.93)in intercultural competence programme. For peer mediation; KS (2.63) took the lead followed by KC (2.30) and KN (2.15). Identification and reporting of abuse/neglect was adequate in KC (2.40) than KN (2.30) and KS (2.30) while safety procedures was significantly adequate in KS (3.05) than KC (2.54) and KN (2.18). Supporting students with special needs was relatively low across the districts (KC 2.30; KN:2.02; KS 2.35). Adequacy of trauma identification in students was highest in KC (2.20) followed by KN (1.93) and lowest in KS (1.73). Mean scores for providing psychological first aid was also low in all districts with KC (2.31) having highest mean score compared to KS (1.93) and KN 1.82). KS (3.17) shows highest adequacy mean score followed by KC (2.93) and KN (2.23) while emergency contingency plans was relatively consistent in KC (2.23), KN (2.20), KS (2.20).



Crisis response showed more variations with KS (2.68) having better score than KN (2.25) and KC (2.23). Security risk assessments and collaboration with security agencies show higher adequacy in KS (2.80), compared to KC (2.65) and KS (2.20). Mobilization of resources to support safe school scores were relatively consistent across KC (2.27), KN (2.27) and KS (2.15) districts. Identification of earlier warning signs scores were relatively consistent across the districts with KC (2.26), KS (2.20) and KN (2.17).

Table 4b provides results on levels of adequacy across the three SDs and overall. The results show that KC (53.3%) rated capacity building highly, while 46.7% rated it low. In KS (86.7%) rated it as low while KN (86.7%) rated is low. Katsina South (60%) rated the adequacy as high. Overall (42.2%) rated adequacy of capacity building programmes as high, while 57.8% rated it as low. Table 4b provides results on levels of adequacy of capacity building programmes across the three SDs. The results show that KC (53.3%) rated the adequacy of capacity building programmes high, while 46.7% rated it low. In KS, 60% rated it highly adequate while KN (86.7%) rated low. Overall (42.2%) rated capacity building highly adequate while 57.8% rated it as low.

Table 4a: distribution of respondents based on adequacy of capacity building programme

Items	Very Adequate	Adequate	Fairly Adequate	Not Adequate	KC	KN	KS	Overall
Collaboration with stakeholders	11.7	43.8	29.6	15	2.46	2.30	2.87	2.54
Intercultural competence	3.3	27.1	40.4	29.2	1.93	2.23	2.08	2.08
Peer mediation	6.2	40.8	34.2	18.8	2.30	2.15	2.63	2.36
Identification and reporting of abuse/neglect	7.9	37.9	35.4	18.8	2.40	2.30	2.30	2.33
Safety procedures	13.3	47.9	22.1	16.7	2.54	2.18	3.05	2.59
Supporting students with special needs	13.8	32.1	18.8	35.4	2.30	2.02	2.35	2.22
Trauma identification in students	6.2	25.4	32.1	36.2	2.20	1.93	1.73	1.96
Providing psychological first aid	9.2	25	31.7	34.2	2.31	1.82	1.93	2.02
Students' counseling and guidance	24.6	42.9	22.1	10.4	2.93	2.23	3.17	2.78
Emergency contingency plans	4.6	32.9	41.7	20.8	2.23	2.20	2.20	2.21
Crisis response	8.3	40	29.6	22.1	2.23	2.25	2.68	2.39
Security risk assessments	8.8	33.8	33.3	24.2	2.23	2.25	2.38	2.29
Collaboration with security agencies	17.1	42.5	21.2	19.2	2.65	2.20	2.80	2.55
Mobilization of resources to support safe school	7.1	30.8	40.8	21.2	2.27	2.27	2.15	2.23
Identification of earlier warning signs	8.3	28.7	39.6	23.3	2.26	2.17	2.20	2.21



Table 4b: distribution of respondents based on level of adequacy of capacity building programme

Senatorial District	Adequacy Level	F	%
Katsina Central	High	8	53.3
	Low	7	46.7
Katsina North	High	2	13.3
	Low	13	86.7
Katsina South	High	9	60
	Low	6	40
Total	High	19	42.20
	Low	26	57.80

Test of variance adequacy of capacity building

The ANOVA analysis (Table 5a) comparing the SDs by capacity building scores indicates a statistically significant difference among the districts. The F value is 4.986291 with a p-value of 0.007565, which is less than the 0.05 significance level. The post hoc analysis (Table 5b) further examined the differences between the SDs. The scores are as follows: KC (36.7833), KN (41.5167), and KS (40.05). Katsina central and KN are grouped together with the letter "A," indicating no significant difference between their capacity building scores. However, KS is grouped with the letter "B," indicating a significant difference from KC. While KS 's capacity building score is significantly different from KC 's, it is not significantly different from KN 's score.

Table 5a: ANOVA on adequacy of capacity building programmes

Model	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Senatorial district	2	1024.533	512.2667	4.986291	0.007565
Capacity scores	237	24348.2	102.735		

Table 5b: post hoc result on adequacy of capacity building programme

Comparison	Capacity building scores	std	se	groups
Katsina central	36.7833	12.1165	0.9253	A
Katsina North	41.5167	9.1735	1.3085	A
Katsina south	40.05	5.6940	1.3085	B

Test of variance on school safety practice

The ANOVA analysis (Table 6a) reveals a statistically significant difference in the practice scores of safety measures across the three SDs. The F value of 3.5151 and a p-value of 0.0313 (less than 0.05) indicate that the variation in safety measure practices between these districts is unlikely to have occurred by chance. The post hoc analysis provides a more detailed understanding of the differences between the SDs. KS has highest practice score (44.5333) and is significantly different from KC, which has a lower practice score (42.2917). However, KN,



with a practice score of 39.9167, does not show a significant difference from neither KC nor KS. The grouping letters (A, B, AB) confirm these distinctions, indicating that while KC and KS differ significantly, KN 's practice scores are not significantly different from the other two districts.

Table 6a: ANOVA on safety measures

Model	Df	Sum Sq	Mean Sq	F value	Pr(>F)
Senatorial district	2	639.6750	319.8375	3.5151	0.0313
Residuals	237	21564.31	90.9886		

Table 6b: Post hoc on safe measures

Comparison	Practice scores	std	se	groups
Katsina central	42.2917	11.1584	0.8708	A
Katsina North	39.9167	9.3615	1.2315	AB
Katsina south	44.5333	5.1699	1.2315	B

Determinants of adequacy of capacity building

The regression analysis (Table 7) aims at identifying the determinants of adequacy of teachers' capacity building by examining the effects of various predictors: age, capacity building scores, program scores, and education. The intercept value is 8.0728, with a standard error of 3.6894, resulting in a t-value of 2.1881 and a p-value of 0.0296. This indicates that the intercept is statistically significant at the 5% significance level, suggesting that when all predictor variables are zero, the baseline level of adequacy in teachers' capacity building for safe schools is significantly different from zero. While age (0.0515, $p = 0.4434$) and education (-0.8015, $p = 0.3159$) were not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$), capacity building participation (0.4099, $p = 0.0000$) and safe school practice (0.3863, $p = 0.0000$) were significant.

Table 7: Multiple regression Analysis on determinants of adequacy of capacity building

Regression	Estimate	Std. Error	t value	Pr(> t)
Intercept	8.0728	3.6894	2.1881	0.0296
Age	0.0515	0.0671	0.7678	0.4434
Capacity building participation	0.4099	0.0757	5.4115	0.0000
Capacity building practice	0.3863	0.0737	5.2428	0.0000
Education	-0.8015	0.7974	-1.0051	0.3159



DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

This age distribution suggests a relatively experienced workforce, who can cope with the rigors of capacity building activities. This is consistent with Adamu, Ibrahim & Yusuf, (2021) who found relatively young experienced teachers dominating teaching profession in northern Nigeria. The result on educational qualification is an indication that teachers who possess advanced qualifications are within the teaching job. This implies a qualitative teaching delivery. Also, the high percentage of NCE holders is consistent with the minimum qualification required for teaching in Nigerian, as stipulated in the National Policy on Education (Federal Republic of Nigeria, 2013).

The relatively better teacher participation in capacity building in KN and KC compared to KS could be attributed to possible better access to training resources and interventions in KN and KC. The results further imply that significant gaps in participation existed in the state. The result on practice of safe school measures is indicative of varying levels of engagement in different aspects of safe school practices. While some areas like students' counseling and collaboration with security agencies show reasonable levels of engagement, same cannot be said of intercultural competence and psychological first aid. This variability is consistent with findings from Adebayo & Ige (2023), who noted uneven progress in implementing comprehensive safe school strategies across Nigerian. The results at SDs level was also indicative that while KS made progress, KN seemed to be facing substantial challenges with KC falling in between. The overall low implementation rate suggests significant challenges that require remediation still exist across state. This result is in conformity with the finding of Abubakar, Sani & Usman, (2022) who observed similar variations in educational policy implementations in Nigeria.

The results on adequacy of capacity building depicted significant disparities among the state's senatorial districts. While KS showed more positive perception, KN appear to have lagged behind significantly. The overall low capacity building also suggests a pressing need for comprehensive and equitable capacity building initiatives in the state. The result is also instructive that while there were areas of strength, such as collaboration with stakeholders, student counseling, many aspects of capacity building showed room for remediation. Garba & Abubakar (2024) in corroboration have stressed the importance of effective policy implementation in improving educational outcomes in Nigeria

The ANOVA analysis result implies a statistically significant difference in the practice of safety measures across the SDs. The result also indicates that the variation was unlikely to have occurred by chance. The post hoc analysis result further depicted that KS had highest practice score and is significantly different from KC, which has a lower practice score. However, KN did not show a significant difference from either KC or KS. The grouping letters (A, B, AB) confirmed these distinctions, indicating that while KC and KS differ significantly, KN 's practice score is not significantly different from the other two districts. This suggests that while some districts are implementing safety measures more effectively, others still have room for improvement.

The ANOVA analysis comparing the SDs by capacity building scores indicates a statistically significant difference among the districts. The post hoc result further indicated that while KS 's capacity building score is significantly different from KC 's, it was not significantly different from KN 's score. This suggests that KS has a more effective capacity building programme



compared to KC while the effectiveness of KN 's programme is intermediate and does not significantly differ from either of the other two districts. These results highlight specific areas where capacity building efforts could be targeted for improvement, particularly in KC.

The regression results were indicative that participation in capacity building programmes and practical application of learned skills are the most significant factors in determining the adequacy of capacity building for safe school in the state. Age and formal education levels appeared less important factors. The results are in tandem with the findings of scholars like Abdullahi & Tukur (2020) on capacity building participation and Ibrahim et al. (2023) on capacity building practice,

CONCLUSION/RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings, it is concluded that teaching workforce in Katsina State is relatively experienced, with a significant proportion of young, experienced teachers with a good mix of educational qualifications. Also, there are significant disparities in teacher participation in capacity building activities across the SDs with KN and KC showing better participation compared to KS. Similarly, implementation of safe school measures varies across different aspects. With student counseling and collaboration with security agencies showing reasonable engagement compared to areas like intercultural competence and psychological first aid that lagged behind. Though overall, the scale of adequacy is low, significant disparities also existed across the SDs, with Katsina South (KS) showing more positive perceptions than KN and KC. ANOVA results showed statistically significant differences in the practice of safety measures across districts. Participation in capacity building programmes and practical application of learned skills are the most significant factors that determined adequacy of capacity building programmes in the state. It is therefore recommended that:

1. A more equitable distribution of capacity building opportunities across all senatorial districts is germane.
2. Efforts should be geared towards improving areas of weakness in safe school practices, particularly in intercultural competence and psychological first aid.
3. Targeted interventions by government and NGOs should be directed to districts that showed lower performance, especially KC and parts of KN.
4. Emphasis on practical, hands-on training and consistent participation in capacity building programs by teachers is important
5. A comprehensive approach to safe school implementation that addresses the disparities between districts and focuses on areas of identified weakness is also important.



REFERENCES

- Abdullahi, M., & Tukur, A. (2020). The impact of professional development programs on teachers' readiness for safe school initiatives in Katsina State. *Journal of Nigerian Education Studies*, 15(3), 45-62..
- Abubakar, M., Ibrahim, A., & Usman, S. (2022). Implementation of safety protocols in Northern Nigerian schools. *Journal of School Safety*, 16(3), 45-60.
- Abubakar, M., Ibrahim, A., & Usman, S. (2022). Regional disparities in safe school measure implementation: A case study of Katsina State. *Journal of Education and Security Studies*, 16(3), 45-60.
- Adamu, Y., Bello, S., & Okoye, C. U. (2021). School-security force collaborations in volatile regions of Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Security*, 5(2), 114-131.
- Adebayo, F. A., & Ige, A. M. (2023). Safe Schools in Nigeria: Progress and Challenges. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 37(3), 278-292.
- Adeleke, A. A., Olowu T.O & Ladele, A.A (2005): Bridging the Communication Gap between Scientists and Farmers in Katsina State of Nigeria: A review of the activities of the Information and Communication Support for Agricultural Growth in Nigeria (ICS-Nigeria) Project in Katsina State of Nigeria. Ibadan: International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA) Ibadan, Nigeria
- Applebury, G. (2021). *Why Is School Safety Important?* <https://safety.lovetoknow.com>. (Accessed on July 15, 2021)
- Federal Ministry of Education(2021) National Policy On Safety, Security And Violence-Free Schools With Its Implementing Guidelines. Abuja: Federal Ministry of Education
- Federal Republic of Nigeria. (2013). National Policy on Education. NERDC Press.
- Garba, A., & Isah, M. (2024). Psychological support in Northern Nigerian schools: Challenges and prospects. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 29(1), 50-62.
- Global Coalition to Protect Education from Attack (GCPEA). (2020). Safe Schools Declaration: A framework for action.
- Mubita, K. (2021). *An assessment of the Provision, Quality and Adequacy of Welfare Facilities in Selected Schools of Lusaka. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS) |Volume V, Issue VI, June 2021|ISSN 2454-6186*
- NILDS and DRPC (2021) Report on Safe School Initiative. A joint research by the National Institute for Democratic and Legislative Studies (NILDS) and the development Research and Projects Center (dRPC)
- Oluwole, O., Adebayo, F., & Nwosu, C. (2021). Factors influencing teachers' preparedness for safe school implementation in North-Western Nigeria. *African Journal of Education and School Safety*, 6(1), 78-95.
- The Guardian newspaper (2020) Police confirm attack on school in Katsina <https://guardian.ng/news/nigeria/police-confirm-attack-on-school-in-katsina-state/accessed-07/02/2023>
- The Adolescent Girls' Initiative for Learning and Empowerment (AGILE) (2022) Safe School Approach in Preventing Violence in School Training Manual. Agile Katsina.
- This Day (Nigeria) (2020) "Nigeria: New clashes after security forces break up meeting of Biafran separatists," France 24, August 26
- Umar, A., & Bello, M. (2021). Inclusive education challenges in Northern Nigerian secondary schools. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 25(11), 1289-1304.



Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support from TETFUND Nigeria. The authors also extend enormous gratitude to the anonymous reviewers, for their helpful review and critical comments.