



Influence Of School Resources Management On Academic Performance Of Junior Secondary School Students In Rivers State, Nigeria

Adasigwung, Victor Naaman

**Department of Educational Management and Planning,
Rivers State University, Nkpolu-Oroworokwo, Port Harcourt, Nigeria
(+2348033429713); adasivictor2@yahoo.com**

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the influence of school resource management on academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State, Nigeria. Specifically, it is aimed at finding out the influence of school resource management exercised by carrying out the management functions (planning, and controlling) on Junior Secondary School students' academic performance. The study is anchored on Education Production Function Theory since education could be likened to other economic production process with input-process-output functions; and students' performance remain the product by which society judges the justification of her investment in education. A sample of 927 principals, vice principals and teachers were selected from a population of 8, 712 by multi-stage sampling technique. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. A validated structured questionnaire with a reliability index of 0.87 was the main instrument used. Mean and standard deviation of data collected were the descriptive statistics adopted to answer the research questions while one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the null hypotheses. It was found that the two management functions investigated influence students' performance to a high extent. The closest cluster of standard deviation around the mean indicating stronger consensus by respondents was found for controlling function in resources management. It was therefore recommended that managers and proprietors of schools should place as much emphasis on management of resources as they do on funding and procurement. School supervisors should insist on the availability and strict use of school level plans: lesson notes specifying teaching/learning resources, attendant registers etc. Similarly, employment of school managers should be based on professional competence in resources management while the incumbents should be trained to acquire needed competencies in resources management if students' academic performance would be influenced to expected extent and in the right direction.

Keywords: resource management, academic performance, students

INTRODUCTION

Men, money and materials are generally regarded as resources needed in organizations to achieve set goals. Organisations are primarily set up to achieve set goals. Society also expects the school as an enterprise to produce quality humans as its product to justify investments therein. In education, such resources are employed directly or indirectly to enhance the transmission and acquisition of knowledge, skills or desired changes in behaviour. Ekundayo (2009) stated that resources in education refer to the totality of everything which the education system needs for its smooth running. It is noteworthy, however, that at the junior secondary school level, almost all major resources (human, infrastructure and materials), particularly in public schools, should be there for the principal to manage.

Resources management in the opinion of Dlazeoye (2004) is the prudent utilization and maintenance of the human, material, financial and other available scarce resources for the optimum achievement of a set

of educational goals. Management of educational resources is said to be effective if the intended result is achieved from effective utilization of the resources. According to Adetoro (2009), resource management involves planning, leading, directing and a number of other activities in order to achieve efficient utilization of resources available to education. In the same vein, Gabson (1976) in Adetoro (2009), views management as a set of activities which can be classified as concerned with planning, organizing and controlling. From the assertions of these experts, it is reasonable to regard efficient planning, directing organizing controlling etc, which are actually management functions as necessary variables which actually define effective management.

Whereas planning refers to decisions in advance of actions; school level plans will include scheme of work and lesson notes. Planning involves setting objectives and making decisions on the needed what, how, when and who. Planning reduces emergencies, makes evaluation easy. In managing resources, planning is inevitable. Even the teacher need to plan and obtain his teaching materials in advance of teaching, if he/she must succeed to influence students' performance. The scheme of work stating what is to be taught week by week and the school calendar stating when tests, examination, and breaks will be observed are forms of plans. The teacher, for instance, need to plan, the resources needed for a science lesson, how to use them to achieve set lesson objectives. Planning pervades all levels of the education system Availability and utilization of these should indicate school level planning. Whether good planning has a relationship with academic achievement is an issue requiring investigation.

In the same vein, directing/controlling which involves giving instructions, supervising and relating actions to set standards, rules and regulations could influence students' performance.. This should also lead to efficiency and effectiveness in the use of resources involved in the teachers jobs and possibly influence the performances of the beneficiary of their actions (students). In other words, a school principal that ensures that teachers teach according to stated plans, keeps all attendance and makes workers comply with rules and regulations could be said to be employing the rules that make for effectiveness. Controlling aims at ensuring that performance does not deviate from set standards. This also ensures that workers'/teachers' interests are subordinate to those of the school to an extent, ensuring that things are done according to set down rules while sanctions should be just.

A neat, comfortable and suitable school plant is necessary for good learning. As Oluchukwu (2002) stated, the physical environment of the school contributes largely to the learning environment and the school head has to ensure that it is well managed. Proper management of these facilities and equipment should be a priority if academic achievement, which is the hallmark of our investment in education, will improve. From these opinions, it also has implication on students' academic achievement.

Academic performance of students is regarded as the extent to which a student has achieved set academic goal (Wikipedia, 2012). Schools measure academic performance by tests (teacher-made and standardized), home/class work, quizzes etc. Every input in the school system is largely aimed at good student academic performance. Resources: human, material and funds, put into the system should therefore be effectively managed to enhance students' academic performance. Research evidences support this view. Savasci and Tomul (2013) carried out a study on the relationship between education resources of school and academic achievement of 7th grade students Results showed a relationship between educational resources and academic achievement. It was also found that educational resources have the strength to possibly diminish the effect of socioeconomic features. Similarly, Melisa (2017) carried out a study on relationship between resource planning and school organizational performance in selected secondary schools in Mainland Local Government Area of Lagos State The study revealed that there is relationship between planned resources and utilization, between planned resources and teachers work performance and students' performance by implication. From these findings, it was recommended that educational resource planning should be the watchwords of Nigerian educational managers. The views of Waslander, . Pater and M. van der Weide (2010), who carried out "An analytical review of empirical research on market mechanisms in education", summarises it all "When resources are limited, as they always are, these resources need to be well used to support educational improvement objectives to the greatest possible extent

Statement of the Problem

The Universal Basic Education Programme which is a policy reform agendum in the education system in Nigeria has some obvious legal and financial provisions aimed at preventing it from going the way of its antecedent [the Universal Primary Education (UPE) Programme]. The statutory provision of 2% Consolidated Federal Revenue (CFR) avails States that make counterpart contribution, funds for provision of infrastructure and equipment. Rivers state, for instance, recruited a large number of teachers during the 2011/2012 session, who are on their payroll. Since improvement in the quality and quantity of resources is known to influence production, could the lacklustre performance of our students be due to poor management of resources. Does management of resources as defined by its functions influence academic performance, and to what extent?

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to investigate the influence of management of resources on academic performance of junior secondary schools in Rivers State. Specifically the study sought to:

1. Find out the extent to which planning in resource management, influence academic performance of students of Junior Secondary Schools in Rivers State.
2. Determine the extent to which controlling in resource management influence academic performance of student of Junior Secondary Schools in Rivers State.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent does planning in resource management influence academic performance of students of Junior Secondary Schools in Rivers State?
2. To what extent does controlling in resource management influence academic performance of students of Junior Secondary Schools in Rivers State?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses formulated for this study were tested at 0.05 alpha level.

1. There is no significant difference in the mean rating of Principals, Vice Principals and Teachers on the extent to which planning influences academic performance of students of Junior Secondary Schools in Rivers State.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean rating of Principals, Vice Principals and Teachers on the extent to which controlling influences academic performance of students of Junior Secondary Schools in Rivers State.

METHODOLOGY

The design for this study is the descriptive survey. The population for this study comprised of 8,712 Principals, Vice principals and Teachers and a sample of 927 taken by multi-stage sampling technique, from public junior secondary schools in Rivers State, which has won South-South and National awards in the performance of the UBE programmes. The main instrument was the questionnaire with a reliability index of 0.85 titled "Management of Resources and Students' Performance Questionnaire (Mores-PQ). Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while the one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the null hypotheses at the 0.05 level of significance.

RESULTS

Research Question 1: *To what extent does planning as a school resource management function influence the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State?*

Table 1: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which planning as school resource management function influences students’ academic performance

| S/N o | Statement | Principals [n ₁ = 304] | | V/Principals [n ₂ = 306] | | Teachers [n ₃ = 309] | | Decision |
|----------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| | | \bar{x} | SD | \bar{x} | SD | \bar{x} | SD | |
| 1 | Taking decisions in advance on staff needed by the school | 2.70 | 0.65 | 3.01 | 0.93 | 2.91 | 0.81 | High Extent |
| 2 | Having set schedules for the use of school buildings (library and laboratories) | 2.99 | 0.74 | 2.89 | 0.68 | 2.76 | 0.77 | High Extent |
| 3 | Carrying out need assessment before any procurement is made | 3.28 | 0.82 | 3.12 | 0.74 | 3.25 | 0.72 | High Extent |
| 4 | Stating needed teaching/learning aids in lesson notes and sourcing for them. | 3.14 | 0.91 | 3.20 | 0.84 | 3.12 | 0.69 | High Extent |
| 5 | Budgeting | 3.19 | 0.85 | 3.17 | 0.81 | 3.24 | 0.83 | High Extent |
| 6 | Having school level calendar and time table for all activities | 3.26 | 0.67 | 3.28 | 0.78 | 3.17 | 0.94 | High Extent |
| | Total | 3.09 | 0.20 | 3.11 | 0.13 | 3.08 | 0.18 | High Extent |

The total sample of Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers used for the study is 919, while n₁, n₂, and n₃ are the sub-samples of Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers respectively.

Decision: Students’ academic performance is influenced by planning (as a school resource management function) to a high extent ($2.50 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.49$).

The information in table 1 presents that Principals have a total mean of 3.09 and standard deviation of 0.20, Vice Principals have a total mean of 3.11 and standard deviation of 0.13, and Teachers have a total mean of 3.08 and standard deviation of 0.18 on their rating of the extent of influence of planning (as a school resource management function) on academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State. The Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers have very low standard deviations indicating close cluster of the scores about the mean, and total means that lie between 2.50–3.49, implying high extent influence of planning (as a school resource management function) on academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State. Therefore, planning (as a school resource management function) influences, to a high extent, the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State.

Research Question 2. *To what extent does controlling as a school resource management function influence the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State?*

Table 2: Summary of descriptive statistics on the extent to which controlling as school resource management function influences students’ academic performance

| S/No | Statement | Principals [n ₁ = 304] | | V/Principals [n ₂ = 306] | | Teachers [n ₃ = 309] | | Decision |
|------|--|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|-------------|------------------------------------|-------------|--------------------|
| | | \bar{x} | SD | \bar{x} | SD | \bar{x} | SD | |
| 7 | Having set rules and for school activities | 3.22 | 0.23 | 2.93 | 0.93 | 3.12 | 0.85 | High Extent |
| 8 | Keeping attendance and movement registers for staff and students strictly | 2.88 | 0.81 | 3.24 | 0.44 | 3.32 | 0.24 | High Extent |
| 9 | Regulating the issuance and use of teaching materials | 3.20 | 0.66 | 3.17 | 0.47 | 3.16 | 0.32 | High Extent |
| 10 | Heads of departments and units ensure that teaching materials/equipment are used to enhance learning | 2.95 | 0.62 | 3.12 | 0.36 | 2.89 | 0.71 | High Extent |
| 11 | Firmness of the head teacher on set rules of operations | 3.15 | 0.42 | 3.26 | 0.53 | 3.06 | 0.43 | High Extent |
| 12 | Ensuring that teachers prepare and mark lesson notes | 3.17 | 0.48 | 2.95 | 0.60 | 2.95 | 0.27 | High Extent |
| | Total | 3.09 | 0.13 | 3.11 | 0.13 | 3.08 | 0.14 | High Extent |

The total sample of Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers used for the study is 919, while n₁, n₂, and n₃ are the sub-samples of Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers respectively.

Decision: Students’ academic performance is influenced by planning (as a school resource management function) to a high extent ($2.50 \leq \bar{x} \leq 3.49$).

The information in table 2 presents that Principals have a total mean of 3.09 and standard deviation of 0.13, Vice Principals have a total mean of 3.11 and standard deviation of 0.13, and Teachers have a total mean of 3.08 and standard deviation of 0.14 on their rating of the extent of influence of controlling (as a school resource management function) on academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State. The Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers have even lower standard deviations (SD = 0.13, 0.13 and 0.14) indicating a closer cluster of the scores about the mean, and total means that lie between 2.50 – 3.49, implying high extent influence of controlling (as a school resource management function) on academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State. Therefore,

organising (as a school resource management function) influences, to a high extent, the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State.

Hypotheses Testing

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in the mean rating of Principals, Vice Principals and Teachers that planning as a resource management function influences the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State.

Table 3: Summary of One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the influence of planning on academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State

| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | .196 | 2 | .098 | 3.297 | .073 |
| Within Groups | 27.233 | 916 | .030 | | |
| Total | 27.429 | 918 | | | |

$F(2, 0.098) = 3.297; p = 0.073 > 0.05: H_0$ is not rejected

Table 3 presents the sum of squares of 0.196, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.098 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 27.233, degrees of freedom of 916, and a mean square of 0.030, while the total has 27.429 sum of squares and 918 degrees of freedom. The computed F is 3.297 which is statistically not significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the mean rating of Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers that planning as a resource management function influences the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State” is not rejected: $F(2, 0.098) = 3.297, p > .05$. In other words, Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers of junior secondary schools in Rivers State are in a consensus that planning as a resource management function influences students’ academic performance to a high extent.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference in the mean rating of Principals, Vice Principals and Teachers on extent to which controlling as a resource management function influences the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State.

Table 4: Summary of One-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on the influence of controlling on academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State.

| | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|----------------|----------------|-----|-------------|-------|------|
| Between Groups | .135 | 2 | .067 | 3.736 | .124 |
| Within Groups | 16.497 | 916 | .018 | | |
| Total | 16.632 | 918 | | | |

$F(2, 0.067) = 3.736; p = 0.124 > 0.05: H_0$ is not rejected

Table 4 presents the sum of squares of 0.135, with 2 degrees of freedom, and a mean square of 0.067 for between groups. Within groups has the sum of squares of 16.497, degrees of freedom of 916, and a mean square of 0.018, while the total has 16.632 sum of squares and 918 degrees of freedom. The computed F is 3.736 which is statistically not significant at .05. Thus the null hypothesis that “there is no significant difference in the mean rating of Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers that controlling as a resource management function influences the academic performance of students of junior secondary schools in Rivers State” is not rejected: $F(2, 0.067) = 3.736, p > .05$. In other words, Principals, Vice Principals, and Teachers of junior secondary schools in Rivers State are in a consensus that controlling as a resource management function influences students’ academic performance to a high extent.

DISCUSSION

The study found that planning as a school resource management function influences academic performance of students of public junior secondary schools to a high extent. This finding is in consonance with those of many empirical studies. Penelope, Ronald and Christopher (2019) found a relationship between planning, teacher behaviour and students outcome. It also agrees with Gwamukama (2014) who found out from his study that planning enables employees to think more clearly about their work and perform better, invariably influencing the efforts of beneficiaries (student) to do better. It behoves school managers therefore to have and insist on functional schedule (plan) for the use of resources and all teaching/learning activities. Thus the use of classrooms, laboratories, libraries and other resources should follow set schedules. In the light of this finding, the assertion by Melisa (2017) that educational resources planning should be the watchword of educational managers need to be heeded. Besides, the finding agree no less with opinions of Ayeni (2014) and Okoroma (2016) that planning ensures a managers success in other management functions (coordinating, controlling, etc) and influences group and individual actions toward goal achievement.

The Study also revealed that controlling function in school resource management influences academic performance of students of public junior secondary schools to a high extent in Rivers State. This finding on the influence of controlling function is in agreement with those of Ekal (2016) that principals' management function, including controlling in human, material and financial resources influence students' performance. Ayeni et al. (2014) agreed that controlling and co-ordinating functions in resource management are the hob of students learning outcome but this study highlights controlling as having an edge over others. Based on this revelation, they recommended that regular monitoring and class visitation (i.e. controlling) should be continued to further improve students' academic performance.

These findings and recommendations are in tandem with the implications of the finding of this study: that it is necessary for managers of schools to regulate movement and regularity of teachers and students, by keeping attendance and movement registers strictly, and effecting set rules and regulations to guide general and academic activities in the school. The findings of this study also include heads of departments and units ensuring that teaching materials and equipment are used according to set standards to enhance learning and students' performance to a high extent. Firmness on adherence to rules and ensuring that teachers use materials stated in lesson notes are also implied by this finding, as ways of enhancing academic performance of students. In the same vein, Ogbunanya, et al. (2017) found from their study, that these functions, including controlling are necessary in the management of learning materials, which influence teaching and students achievement in electrical electronics technology. His conclusion that controlling is a necessary strategy for managing material resources to improve teaching and learning, and students achievement goes further to support the benefit derivable from the finding of this study.

CONCLUSION

School resources remain the inputs which directly or indirectly enhance the transmission and acquisition of knowledge, skills and attitude for which schools are established. This work has revealed that management, defined by its elements (planning, controlling,), influences students' academic performance to a high extent. The extent could even be superlative (very high), depending on the management function and the extent of effectiveness of the manager involved.

RECOMMENDATIONS

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

1. School Management Boards should make it a policy to base promotion into school management positions on performance appraisal in the application of resource management functions like planning and controlling,
2. Ministry of Education, schools management boards and school heads should monitor and ensure proper resource management practices even to the classroom level.
3. As much emphases should be placed on effective management of resources as is done on the contract to provide them.

REFERENCES

- Adeogun, A. A. (2003). Economics of education. In Adetoro J. A. (2009) resource management in education, Lagos. Macmillan Nigerian publishers limited.
- Ayeni, A. J. (2010). Teachers Instructional Task Performance and Principals Supervisory Role as Correlates of Quality Assurance in Secondary Schools in Ondo State. Doctorial Dissertation, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
- Dlazeoye, B. (2004) administration of the educational system and school governance. Pretoria: centre for education law and education policy. University of Pretoria Press.
- Ekal, L. R. (2016). Influence of Principals' Management of Resources on Students' Performance. <http://pdfs.semanticsscholars.org>.
- Ekundayo, H. T. (2009). Resource management in education, in Babalola, J. B. (ed, 2009). Educational management theories and tasks, Yaba, Lagos: Macmillan Nigerian Publishers Limited.
- Gabson, A. M. (1976). Business organisation and administration, A. (2009) resource management in education, Lagos. Macmillan Nigerian Publishers Limited.
- Gwamukama, P. U. (2014). *The Effect of Strategic Planning on Academic Performance of Students in Mbarara University of Science and Technology*. <http://hdi.handle.net/10570/4439>.
- Melisa, S. (2017). *Relationship between Resource Planning and School Organisational Performance*. www.projecttopics.org.
- OKoroma, N. S. (2016). Perspectives of Educational Management, Planning & Policy Analysis. Port Harcourt, Minson Publishers
- Penelope, L. P., Ronald, W. M. & Christopher, M. C. (2019). *On Teacher Planning, Teacher Behaviour and Students' Achievement*. <http://journals.sagepub.com>
- Svasci, H. & Tomul, E., (2013). The Relationship between Educational Resources of Schools and Academic Achievement. The Canadian Centre of Science and Education. International Education Studies Journal, 6(\$), 112- 123
- Waslander, S., Pater, C. & Van der Weide, M (2010). Markets in Education: An Analytical Review of Empirical Research on Market Mechanisms in Education" OECD Education Working Papers, No. 52. Paris: OECD Publishing www.oecd.org/edu/workingpapers.
- Wikipedia (2012) . Monitoring and Evaluation. En. M. wikipedia.org.