



IMPACT OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES WASTAGES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN EBONYI STATE

¹Nwani, Okereke Boniface Jerry²Prof. S. N. Aja

¹⁻²Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki

¹nwanibonjerryo70@gmail.com+234 803 745 8930²saja4net@gmail.com+234 803 740 7461

**BEING A PAPER PRESENTED AT THE 44TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF NIGERIAN
ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND PLANNING,**

**WITH THE THEME:
ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND DIGITAL CONNECTIVITY FOR
TRANSFORMATIVE EDUCATIONAL MANAGEMENT IN NIGERIA (AI4TEM) HELD AT
NIGER DELTA UNIVERSITY, WILBERFORCE ISLAND, BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA.**

FROM MONDAY 6TH – FRIDAY 10TH OCTOBER, 2025.

IMPACT OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES WASTAGES ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN EBONYI STATE

Abstract

The study examined the impact of Educational resources wastages on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State. Three research questions and three null hypotheses guided the study. Descriptive research design was adopted for the study. The population of the study consist of 4,816 senior secondary school principals and teachers in 224 public secondary schools in Ebonyi State. The sample size for the study was 405 respondents which was drawn through simple random sampling. Instrument for the data collection was a structured questionnaire titled “Educational Resource Wastages Questionnaire (ERWQ)”. The reliability of the instrument was determined using Cronbach Alpha technique. The result yielded a co-efficient index of 0.53. The findings of the study include the following among others: Educational finance resource wastages negatively impact administration of public secondary

schools by lack of accountability and improper financial record keeping. Educational time resource wastages negatively impact administration of public secondary schools as some staff engage in their personal businesses during working hours and poor planning of school time table. Based on the findings of the study, the researchers recommended among others that: Government should make adequate budgetary allocation for education with supervision in the management of school finance. This will encourage accountability, transparency and accomplishment of school project as at when due and School administrators' personal affairs like engaging in other businesses that are not allowed by the school authority should be suspended till after school activities. This will reduce interference with official responsibilities and enhance school administration.

Key words: Resources. Educational Resources, Wastages, Administration.

INTRODUCTION

Education worldwide has been identified as vital instrument that promotes socio-economic development of any nation and her citizens. Udo and Eni (2019) stated that Education is the instrument that empowers an individual to contribute his/her quota to national development. It is in this line of thought that it is believed that no nation can rise above the level of its education. Access to education is variously seen to be affected by inefficiency, especially in secondary schools, despite the huge resources being allocated to education for national development, these elements of inefficiency results to resources wastages which exist in form of physical, human, time, financial and material resources wastages or their wrong use. The categories of resources include humans, physical facilities, materials, time.

The categories of resources include humans, physical facilities, materials, time. Moreover, Adeleye (2015) observed that resources are available source of aid, support or wealth; a new or reserve supply that can be drawn upon when needed. A resource is anything that has identity e.g. electronic document. Resources to a state or government are those things that are available and can be used to her advantage e.g. human resources, material resources, fund, natural resources, physical resources, time resources (Niyi, Ahaotu & Jegede, 2021). Resources in relation to education, are considered to be all those human, materials and non-material factors combined together in a workable manner to facilitate education production. All these resources are useful in all form of educational institutions especially the secondary education. Secondary education is that education given to students or learners who are studying in a school in a secondary school. They consist of junior secondary one to three (JSS I – JSS III) and senior secondary one to three (SS I – SS III) students. These group of students are under the control of their principals (administrators).

However, some Secondary schools' administrators in Nigeria seem to waste these resources, laying credence to this perception is the poor service delivery of some teachers, poor quality of

products supplied as educational inputs and consequently poor output, (Bassey, Owan and Eze, 2019). Wastages is an unprofitable and uneconomical use of time and other resources (Adamu, 2010; Oyetakin, 2011:27). Wastage in respect to education refers to human and material resources spent or 'wasted' on students who have to repeat a grade or who drop out of school before completing a cycle (Ngome & Kikechi, 2015). Wastage secondary schools are denoted by the inability or inefficiency of a school administrator to make use of available opportunities and resources in the development of students' cognitive, affective, and psychomotor attributes, that are needed for a productive living and life-long learning, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO, 2005). It is also wastage when students cannot pass examinations and other qualifying tests they have registered for, after attaining a certain level of education (Akindele, 2015; Charles, 2013; Muhammad & Muhammad, 2011).

Resources in this study can be classified into the following: physical resources, financial resources, and time resources. The physical resources refer to the tangible resources that can easily be seen and observed in any institution such as, the structure, the machines, raw materials, vehicles and other tools. Natural resources may also come under physical resources. Natural resources include land, water, mineral deposits and natural habitats. These resources vary in organizations. For instance, in the educational system, the physical resources would include the classrooms, staff offices, vehicles, health centres, library, laboratory, toilet to mention but few. Niyi, Ahaotu and Jegede (2021) maintained that it is not the availability of these resources alone that guarantees effective performance of school, but their adequacy and effective utilization. Material resources however, include instructional materials, books, stationery and equipment.

Another resource is financial resources. This is indeed a more critical element with which other factors of administrations are created, maintained and sustained. In school administration, the principal require buildings, materials, equipment, personnel and other vital items to enable him perform his/her functions. This call for allocation of enough funds so that the administration of school can be handled effectively and sustained (Odoemelam, 2013). Observation by the researcher shows that there is many alleged cases of under-funding and mismanagement of available funds by some secondary school administrators, especially in the study area which seem to create room for financial resource wastages. Another factor supporting mismanagement of available resources is time resource.

Time resource is considered as one of the scarce resources to school administrators. The value of time over all other resources is, hinged on non-recoverable nature of time. Once used, it cannot be recovered. The use of the time refers to the appropriate allocation of time to the various stages and tasks of administrative activities. This implies that time utilization could be explained in the framework of doing the right thing at the right time in the work place (Adedeji, 2008). Fafunwa cited in Niyi, Ahaotu and Jegede(2021) noted that time is the major index to measure the successful completion of an academic programme. Insufficient time for delivery of lesson to students may result to poor performance and also serve as resource wastage. It is advisable for school personnel who constitute the human resource to make judicious use of time.

Poor conditions of schools, such as poor teaching, poor motivation of teachers, lack of facilities and equipment have culminated into inefficiency in the system with students dropping out and repeating classes constituting educational wastages (Adigwe, 1997). Ebonyi state has almost consistently ranked lowest in external certification examinations for secondary school among other states in the South East geopolitical zone of Nigeria (National Bureau of Statistics) (NBS) 2019).

For instance, in 2023, an independent organization “Hope for Nigeria” (HFN 2023), using above parameter, ranked Ebonyi state the study area on the 10th position, out of 36 states and FCT. This was consistent with previous ranking of Ebonyi as the 10th poorest state in Nigeria, with poverty rate of 73.6%, National Bureau of statistics (NBS) (2015), and poverty is one of the causes of educational wastages (UNICEF, 2015).

The 10th position of Ebonyi state, the study area placed the state behind other states in the South East geopolitical zone, where Abia state was ranked 1st position; Anambra state 2nd position; Imo state 5th position; Enugu state 9th position and Ebonyi state 10th position (National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) 2019). The same report indicated that for three consecutive years (2016, 2017 and 2018), Ebonyi state has the least enrollment in public secondary schools. Ebonyi state public secondary schools recorded 24,146 candidates in 2016; 23,389 candidates in 2017 and 24,970 candidates in 2018. While other states in the zone had public secondary schools’ enrollment in the range of between 41,328 candidates (least) and 51,727 candidates (highest) within the same period. The same report revealed that in addition to low enrollment in public secondary schools’ Ebonyi state, trails behind other states in the zone in the percentage of

candidates who passed WAEC examinations with five credits or more including English language and Mathematics.

Presently, it is alleged that most students who had intentions of entering into higher institution of learning after their secondary school fail to gain admission probably because of low performance in Joint Admission and Matriculation Board Examination (JAMB) and Senior Secondary School Examinations. Consequently, some secondary school students seem to drop out of the system, while others transfer to private schools. This is because it appears there is a gap between the expectancy and actual output due to alleged inefficiency in the administration of public schools which seem to constitute a sort of waste to the educational system.

The above scenario, informed the researchers to ponder on how educational resource wastages have impacted on the administration of public secondary school in Ebonyi State of Nigeria. The problem of this study was therefore, posed as a question thus: What are the impacts of educational resource wastages on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State?

1.3 Purpose of the study

The main purpose of the study was to investigate impact of educational resource wastages on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State. Specifically, the study shall determine the impact of:

1. Physical resource wastage on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.
2. Financial resource wastage on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.
3. Time resource wastage on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.

Research questions

The following research questions were raised to guide the study.

1. In what ways does physical resource wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State?
2. In what ways does financial resource wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State?

3. In what ways does time resource wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State?

Research hypotheses

The following null hypotheses guided the study.

1. **H0₁**. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Male and Female Principals and Teachers on the impact of physical resource wastages on administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.
2. **H0₂**. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Male and Female Principals and Teachers on the impact of financial resource wastages on administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.
3. **H0₃**. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Male and Female Principals and Teachers on the impact of time resource wastages on administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.

Literature Review

age is an unprofitable and uneconomical use of time and resources (Adamu, 2000; Samuel, 2004; Oyetakin, 2011). “Wastage in respect to education refers to human and material resources spent or 'wasted' on students who have to repeat a grade or who drop out of school before completing a cycle” (Ngome & Kikechi, 2015). Wastage denotes the school’s inability or inefficiency to make use of available opportunities and resources in the development of students’ cognitive, affective, and psychomotor attributes that are needed for a productive living and life-long learning (UNESCO, 1998). It is also wastage when students cannot pass examinations and other qualifying tests they have registered for after attaining a certain level of education (Muhammad and Muhammad, 2011; Charles, 2013; Akindele, 2015). The dropout and repetition rates in schools are usually considered as two components of educational wastage (Ngome & Kikechi, 2015).

Resources are considered to be all those human, materials and non-material factors combined together in a workable manner to facilitate production. National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN, 2012) noted that, a resource is also described as anything used or consumed while performing a function. Adeleye (2015) observed that resources are available source of aid, support or wealth; a new or reserve supply that can be drawn upon when needed. A resource is

anything that has identity for example, electronic document. Resources to a state or government are those things that are available and can be used to advantage for example, human resources and natural resources.

Wastage can take different forms in educational system. According to Durosaro (2012), some noticeable signs of wastage in Nigeria include premature withdrawals/ drop out, repeaters, misguided types of education, unemployment of school leavers and brain drain. In a study carried out by Rajesh and Roy (2014), they describe premature withdrawal of student when he/she fails to complete the full course of study prescribed by leaving school before the completion of a given stage of education or leaving at some intermediate or non-terminal point in a cycle of schooling except death and transferring to another school.

Resource wastage is the misused of human and materials resources. Resource wastage is the application of human and materials resources wrongly. Resource wastage is the use of resources in a way and manner that it will not achieve the objective to which the resources was allocated. Resource wastage occurs when resources are not effectively and efficiently used. Resources wastage is common in educational institutions. It is referred to as educational wastage (Niyi, Ahaotu & Jegede, 2021).

It is widely believed that school building to a larger extent has a significant influence on the effectiveness of a school system (McGowan, 2007). By school building we mean physical structures, classrooms, laboratories, libraries, toilets, staff rooms, walls, roofs, drains, doors, windows, floors and also fix furniture. One of the most important facilities necessary to aid rapid school progress and ensure instructional flow is the school buildings (Douglas and Ransom, 2006). Generally, the maintenance culture of Nigerians is very low as many individuals believe that school buildings and other facilities are government properties. Thus, it does not affect them whether they are maintained or vandalized.

Empirically, Munyi and Orodho (2015) investigated the causes of wastage of school building in public secondary schools from a Kenyan perspective. Findings of the study indicated that many schools lacked enough resources to maintain school buildings, and as a result, there is also increased dropout, repetition as well as low completion and transition rates. This finding implies that there is ineffectiveness of many schools.

The high rate of corruption in Nigerian tertiary institutions constitutes a major source of resource wastages. Financial resources meant for infrastructural facilities and human capital development end up as wastage by some administrators or managers in the system. For example, the Budget and Monitoring Committee of the Academic Staff Union of Universities, Obafemi Awolowo University branch accused the management of the institution for expending ₦3.5 billion meant for hostel renovation and construction of new lecture theaters in breach of due process and transparency. The funds were part of the 100 billion Naira unrestricted funds of the federal government in 2013 for all Universities in Nigeria. The fund was in response to the long struggle and agitation by ASUU against the government (Obi & Okoye, 2021).

Time wastages in school management are those activities that make the school administrator, teacher or student to use plenty of time doing things that are not necessary or unrelated to school curriculum or that are not professional duties and has no link to the attainment of set educational goals of school. Time wastages are whatever that stops a person from attaining his objectives effectively (Khalil, in Ahmed 2015). Drucker explained elements that result in losing time in average; They are sometimes known as administrative obstacles (Sheikha in Ahmed 2015). Ajayi (2007) described a time waste as whatever happens at any time that isn't important to the time or a hobby that takes greater than needed time. Akomolafe (2015) itemized time wasters in educational administration to include: (a) Telephone calls (b) unofficial visitors (c) dialogue with co-employees (d) needless meetings and so forth.

Other time wasters that may negatively impact the administration of secondary schools according to Palmer, (2023) include:

1. Telephone interruptions – the use of cellular phones has become part of our daily life. Where there is no regulation or non-enforcement of regulations prohibiting /restricting call during official time periods results in some administrators and teachers abusing the use of phone, thereby disrupting teaching and learning and other school activities.
2. Visitors with/without appointments – visitors to schools should always be scheduled during break periods. Receiving visitors outside break periods certainly will interfere with school curricula activity and instructional delivery, more so when unscheduled visitors come to school's principal or teachers often to discuss matters not related with their children or wards in the school. Some principals or teachers after such unnecessary discussions still escort the visitor thereby misusing school time.

3. Meetings – both scheduled and unscheduled – holding meetings too frequently usurps time meant for instructional delivery.
4. Lack of priorities and deadlines – school administrators who fail to set priorities and deadlines often fail to meet set educational objectives.
5. Reluctance or failure to delegated duties – delegation is a known effective administrative strategy, however, some principals /administrators are reluctant to delegate responsibility especially when money is involved. Failure to delegate results to delay and time wastage and this affects productivity.
6. Indecision and procrastination – these creates gaps in communication and actions and therefore is a time waster.
7. Lack of or unclear communication and instruction
8. Laisses-faire attitude
9. Lack of standards and progress reports that enable managers to keep track of developments
- 10. Fatigue**

Methodology

This study adopted descriptive survey research design to determine the impact of educational resources wastages on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State. Three research questions and three hypothesis guided the study. The population of the study consisted of all the 4,816 senior secondary school principals and teachers (principals: 224 and teachers, 4,592) in all the 224 public secondary schools in Ebonyi State. Yaro Yamane formula was used in sampling 405 as the sample for the study. A 15-item questionnaire was developed by the researchers. The questionnaire was subjected to face and content validation by three experts; two of the experts are from Educational Foundations Department, precisely, Administration and Planning, and one expert is from the Department of Science Education, Measurement and Evaluation option. Cronbach Alpha reliability technique was used to determine the internal consistency of the instrument and it yielded a reliability co-efficient of 0.53. The researchers administered 405 copies of the questionnaire to the 405 respondents with the help of two research assistants. The research assistants were briefed by the researchers on the objectives and explanation to the respondents. The copies of the questionnaire were collected on completion, however 400 questionnaire valid on retrieval and used for data analysis. The data collected were analyzed using mean and standard deviation while the t-test was adopted in testing the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Research question 1: In what ways does physical resources wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State?

Table 1: Mean and standard deviation on how does physical resources wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.

| S/N | ITEM QUESTIONS | N | X | SD | Decision |
|--|---|-----|-------------|------|----------|
| 1 | Unkempt toilet facilities in many public secondary schools make students seek transfer to other schools | 400 | 3.41 | 0.68 | Accepted |
| 2 | Non maintenance of libraries in most public secondary schools negatively affect teaching and learning | 400 | 2.93 | 1.08 | Accepted |
| 3 | Inefficient space utilization like classroom in some public secondary schools limit the number of students admitted. | 400 | 3.07 | 0.98 | Accepted |
| 4 | Careless inventory records keeping leads to losses of equipment and supplies thereby resulting to wastages in some public secondary schools in Ebonyi state | 400 | 2.93 | 0.84 | Accepted |
| 5 | Inadequate laboratory equipment in some public secondary schools affect teaching and learning negatively | 400 | 3.10 | 0.76 | Accepted |
| Grand mean (\bar{x}) | | | 3.08 | | |

Table 1 presented results of analysis for, item 1 – 5 which showed how physical facilities resource wastages impacted on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State. Each item 1 – 5 obtained mean value that is up to 2.50 and a grand mean of 3.08. This implied that respondents agreed that inadequate maintenance of physical facilities, low maintenance of libraries, inefficient space utilization, careless inventory records keeping and inadequate laboratory equipment in some public secondary schools negatively impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State.

Research question 2: In what ways does financial resource wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State?

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation on how financial resource wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State

| S/N | ITEM QUESTIONS | N | X | SD | Decision |
|-----|--|-----|------|------|----------|
| 6 | Lack of accountability in financial resources of school limit commitment of the members of staff | 400 | 3.05 | 0.74 | Accepted |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|-----|-------------|------|----------|
| 7 | Poor management of budget allocation to school may affect effective administration in the school | 400 | 2.84 | 0.84 | Accepted |
| 8 | Improper financial records keeping of the school income results in financial losses and delay the administrator's decision making. | 400 | 2.88 | 0.86 | Accepted |
| 9 | Poor revenue available to the public secondary schools affect in-service training of the staff negatively | 400 | 3.03 | 0.88 | Accepted |
| 10 | Shortage of finances make it hard for the principal to procure educational materials for effective teaching and learning | 400 | 3.11 | 0.86 | Accepted |
| Grand mean (\bar{x}) | | | 2.98 | | |

The result of the data analysis presented in table 2 revealed how financial resource wastages impact the administration of secondary schools. Items 6 – 10, obtained mean values that is up to 2.50 and above. The grand mean yielded 2.98. Based on this, the researcher concludes that financial resource wastages impact negatively on the administration of secondary schools.

Research question 3: In what ways does time resource wastages impact on administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State?

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation on how time resource wastages impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State

| S/N | ITEM QUESTIONS | N | X | SD | Decision |
|--|---|-----|-------------|------|----------|
| 11 | Some school administrators use precious time to answer phone calls that are irrelevant to school effectiveness thereby negatively affect concentration, instructional delivery and overall output | 400 | 2.83 | 1.00 | Accepted |
| 12 | Giving adequate time to unofficial visitors while on duty causes distraction to teaching and learning | 400 | 3.09 | 0.78 | Accepted |
| 13 | Engaging in too many informal meetings in school hinder teachers commitment to classroom activities | 400 | 2.94 | 0.95 | Accepted |
| 14 | Some administrators use precious school time to gossip | 400 | 3.05 | 0.87 | Accepted |
| 15 | Poor planning of school activity time-table leads to waste of school administrators' time. | 400 | 3.04 | 0.82 | Accepted |
| Grand mean (\bar{x}) | | | 2.99 | | |

The result of the data presented in table 3 revealed the impact of time resource wastages on administration of secondary schools. Thus, items 11 – 15 generated mean values of 2.50 and above. The grand mean yield 2.99. It was based on this, that the researcher concludes that time resources wastages impact negatively on the administration of secondary schools.

Test of Hypotheses

H₀₁: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals and teachers on physical educational resource wastage impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State

Table 4: t-test of difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how physical educational resources wastages impact on administration of public secondary schools

| Items | Group | N | X | SD | DF | T | P-value | Decision |
|-------|------------|-----|------|------|-----|-------|---------|--------------------|
| 1. | Principals | 84 | 3.21 | 0.41 | | | | |
| | Teachers | 316 | 3.46 | 0.73 | 398 | -3.01 | 0.00 | Do Not Reject Null |
| 2. | Principals | 84 | 3.35 | 0.67 | | | | |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.82 | 1.15 | 398 | 4.04 | 0.00 | Do Not Reject Null |
| 3. | Principals | 84 | 3.41 | 0.60 | | | | |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.98 | 1.04 | 398 | 3.66 | 0.00 | Do Not Reject Null |
| 4. | Principals | 84 | 2.97 | 0.74 | | | | |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.91 | 0.87 | 398 | 0.56 | 0.02 | Do Not Reject Null |
| 5. | Principals | 84 | 3.26 | 0.73 | | | | |
| | Teachers | 316 | 3.06 | 0.77 | 398 | 2.15 | 0.32 | Reject Null |

Note: SD = Significant Difference

NSD = No Significance Difference

Result in table 4 showed that the showed results of data analysis for cluster A, items 1 – 5 of the instrument. The t-test for Item 1 was -3.01, while the p value was 0.00. Since the p - value is less than 0.05% significance level, we do not reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals and teachers on how *‘Unkempt toilet facilities in many public secondary schools make students seek transfer to other schools’*. For Item 2, the t-test score was 4.04, p - value was 0.00 at 0.05 level of significance. We do not reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *‘Non maintenance of libraries in most public secondary schools negatively affect teaching and learning’*. Item 3 recorded t – test score of 3.66, p – value of 0.00, the null hypothesis was not rejected and we concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *‘Inefficient space utilization like classrooms in some public secondary schools limit the number of students admitted’*. Item 4 recorded t – test score of 0.56, p – value of 0.02 at 0.05% significance level.

We do not reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *'Careless inventory records keeping leads to losses of equipment and supplies thereby resulting to wastages in some public secondary schools in Ebonyi state'*. And Item 5 had t – test score of 2.15, p - value of 0.32 at 0.05% level of significance. The p – value was greater than the 0.05% level of significance. We therefore reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *'Inadequate laboratory equipment in some public secondary schools affect teaching and learning'*.

H₀₂: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals and teachers on the impact of educational finance resource wastage impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State

Table 5: t-test of difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on the impact of educational finance resources wastages on the administration of public secondary schools

| Items | Group | N | X | SD | DF | T | P- value | Decision |
|-------|------------|-----|------|------|-----|------|----------|--------------------|
| 6. | Principals | 84 | 3.16 | 0.73 | 398 | 1.62 | 0.17 | Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 3.01 | 0.68 | | | | |
| 7. | Principals | 84 | 3.15 | 0.86 | 398 | 3.82 | 0.00 | Do Not Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.76 | 0.80 | | | | |
| 8. | Principals | 84 | 2.97 | 0.88 | 398 | 1.05 | 0.21 | Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.86 | 0.72 | | | | |
| 9. | Principals | 84 | 3.13 | 0.92 | 398 | 1.08 | 0.05 | Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 3.01 | 0.76 | | | | |
| 10. | Principals | 84 | 3.21 | 0.89 | 398 | 1.15 | 0.95 | Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 3.09 | 0.65 | | | | |

Note: Reject Null = Significant Difference Do Not Reject = No Significant Difference

Result in table 5 indicated that Item 6 yielded t-test of 1.62, p - value was 0.17. Following decision rule, the p - value is greater than t-critical at 0.05% significance level, the null hypothesis was rejected and we concluded that there is significant difference in the mean ratings of principals and teachers on how *'Lack of accountability in financial resources of school limit commitment of the members of staff'*. For Item 7, the t-test was, 3.82, p - value was 0.00 and at 0.05% significance level, we do not reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is no

significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *'Poor management of budget allocation to school may affect effective administration in the school'*. Item 8 recorded t – test score of 1.05, p – value of 0.21, following the decision rule, we reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *'Improper financial records keeping of the school income results in financial losses and delay the administrator's decision making'*. Item 9 recorded t – test score of 1.08, p – value of 0.05 we rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *'Poor revenue available to the public secondary schools affect in-service training of the staff negatively'*. And Item 10 had t – test score of 1.15, p - value of 0.09 at 0.05 level of significance. The p – value was greater than the 0.05 significance level. We therefore reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is significant deference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *'Shortage of finances make it hard for the principals to procure educational materials for effective teaching and learning'*.

H₀₃: There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals and teachers on the impact of educational time resource wastage impact on the administration of public secondary schools in Ebonyi State

Table 6: t-test of difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on the impact of educational time resources wastages on the administration of public secondary schools

| Items | Group | N | X | SD | DF | T | P- value | Decision |
|-------|------------|-----|------|------|-----|------|----------|--------------------|
| 11. | Principals | 84 | 3.35 | 0.65 | 398 | 5.60 | 0.00 | Do Not Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.69 | 1.03 | | | | |
| 12. | Principals | 84 | 3.42 | 0.60 | 398 | 4.45 | 0.96 | Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 3.00 | 0.80 | | | | |
| 13. | Principals | 84 | 3.41 | 0.62 | 398 | 5.21 | 0.00 | Do Not Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.82 | 0.99 | | | | |
| 14. | Principals | 84 | 3.42 | 0.68 | 398 | 4.47 | 0.20 | Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.95 | 0.89 | | | | |
| 15. | Principals | 84 | 3.30 | 0.72 | 398 | 3.31 | 0.81 | Reject Null |
| | Teachers | 316 | 2.97 | 0.83 | | | | |

Note: Reject Null = Significant Difference Do Not Reject = No Significant Difference

Result in table 6 shows that Item 11 recorded t – value = 5.60, p - value = 0.00 at 0.05% level of significance. The researchers does not reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of principals and teachers on how *‘Some school administrators use precious time to answer phone calls that are irrelevant to school effectiveness thereby negatively affect concentration, instructional delivery and overall output’*. For Item 12, the t -test = 4.45, p - value = 0.96 and at 0.05% level of significance. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *‘Giving official time to unofficial visitors while on duty causes distraction to teaching and learning.’* Item 13 recorded t – test score of 5.21, p – value of 0.00 at 0.05 significance level. The researcher therefore does not reject the null hypothesis and concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *‘Engaging in too many informal meetings in school hinder teachers’ commitment to classroom activities’*. Item 14 recorded t – test score of 4.47, p – value of 0.20 and at 0.05% significance level, the researcher rejected the null hypothesis and concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *‘Some administrators use precious school time to gossip’*. And for Item 15, the t – test score was 3.31, p - value = 0.09 at 0.05 significance level. The p – value is greater than the 0.05% significance level. The researcher rejected the null hypothesis and thus concluded that there is significant difference in the mean rating of principals and teachers on how *‘Poor planning of school activity time-table leads to waste of school administrators’ time’*.

Discussion of Results

The result of the data as shown in table 1 indicated that physical educational resource wastages impact negatively in the administration of secondary schools. As such, the responses of the respondents showed that there is inadequate maintenance of physical facilities like classrooms, toilets, staff rooms, walls, roofs, low maintenance of libraries, improper inventory record keeping and inadequate laboratory equipment for practical exposure. However, the null hypothesis indicated that there was significant difference in the mean ratings of the 400 sampled male and female respondents on item 5. These findings are in agreement with that of Douglas and Ransom (2006) that the maintenance culture of Nigerians is very low as many individuals believe that school buildings and other facilities are government properties. Thus, it does not affect them whether they are maintained or vandalized.

The result of the data analysis presented in table 2 showed that financial resource wastages contributed to poor administration of secondary schools. This implied that lack of accountability in financial resources of schools discourage members of staff in the discharge of their responsibilities. In addition, poor budgetary allocation, poor management of budget allocated, improper financial record keeping, poor revenue affect teaching and learning negatively. Also, tables 4.5 presented results of analysis of t- test statistic for cluster B. There was no significant difference in the mean ratings of male and female respondents on the impact of finance resource wastages on the administration of public secondary school in Ebonyi state. These findings are in line with that of Obi and Okoye (2021) who stated that the high rate of corruption in educational institutions constitutes a major source of resource wastages. Financial resources meant for infrastructural facilities and human capital development end up as wastage by some administrators or managers in the education system.

The result of the data analysis as presented in table 3 highlight the negative impact of educational time resource wastages in school administration. The respondents accepted that some school administrations engage in their personal business during school hours, provision for unofficial visit at the duty post, attending informal meetings and poor planning of school time table. These findings are in agreement with that of Ahmed (2015) who noted that time wastages in faculty management are those activities that make the faculty directors to use plenty time doing things which can be pointless or that are not professional duties which has no linking to the attainment of set educational dreams of school. Time wastages are whatever that stops a person from attaining his objectives effectively (Khalil as mentioned in Ahmed 2015).

Conclusion

The conclusion of the study includes:

Educational resources like school building, library facilities, desk are wasted in so many ways by school staff and students through poor management, theft, insect, pest, diseases and other natural processes. It is also concluded that educational resources wastages has a significant, direct and inverse effect on school system effectiveness. In addition, improper time management in the school system, poor allocation of financial resources.

Recommendations

The recommendations of the study include:

1. Government should make adequate budgetary allocation for education with supervision in the management of school finance. This will encourage accountability, transparency and accomplishment of school project as at when due.
2. School administrators' personal affairs like engaging in other businesses that are not allowed by the school authority should be suspended till after school activities. This will reduce interference with official responsibilities and enhance school administration.

References

- Adamu D. O. (2010). *Cost of education: where the shoe pinches*. University of Ilorin Press
- Adamu, B. (2000). Financial implication of educational wastage in secondary schools in Ondo State. *Journal of Professional Educators*, 1(1a), 9-15.
- Adediji S. O. (2008). An evaluation of the implementation of universal basic education (UBE) programme in Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*, 4(1), 1 -12
- Adediji, S. O. (2008). *Impact of resource management on educational outcomes in secondary schools*. *International Journal of Education Management*, 12(4), 56-78.
- Adeleye O. B. (2015). Wastages in schools: what are the emerging internal efficiency concerns in public primary schools in Kenyan division Embu county Kenya? *Developing countries studies* 5 (6), 135 - 146.
- Adigwe, D. D. (1997). Waste of Secondary Education in Ekiti South Senatorial District of Ekiti State. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*. 4 912): 1155 – 1162.
- Ahmed, C. (2015). Mapping the incidence of dropouts: A case study of communities' in Northern Ghana. *Comparative Education*, 45 (2) 219 – 233.
- Ajayi, I. A. (2007). *Issues in school management*. Lagos: Bolabay Publications.
- Akindele J. B. (2015). Wastages factors in Universal Basic Education Programme Implementation in Nigeria: The way out. *The Online Journal of Counselling and Education* 4 (1), 1 – 12.
- Akomolafe, F. (2015). Effectiveness and efficiency of educational measures evaluation practices, indicators and rhetoric's, *Sociology mind*. 2 (3) 255.
- Bassey, B. A., Owan, U. I. & Eze, E. A. (2019). Nexus between students; teachers and school system effectiveness: Construction and Factorial Validity of a Measuring Instrument. *British Journal of Education*, 7 (1) 62 –72
- Charles G. (2013). The effects of teenage pregnancy on the educational attainment of girls at Chokoric suburb of Accra. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 3 (5) 53
- 49
- Journal of Contemporary Research in Educational Administration & Management Volume 2, Issue 3, 2025, 33-51

– 60.

Douglas, J., & Ransom, B. (2006). *Understanding building failures (understanding construction)* (4th ed.). Abingdon, United Kingdom: Routledge.

Durosaro, D. O. (2012). *Where the shoe pinches: Cost of education* (103rd Inaugural lecture) University of Ilorin.

Hope for Nigeria” (HFN 2023). Available at <https://hopeforigeria.org.ng/http://journal.uob.edu.pk/journal/index.php/jehr/article/view/197>

McGowen, R. S. (2007). *The impact of school facilities on student achievement, attendance, behavior, completion rate and teacher turnover rate in selected Texas high schools*. PhD Dissertation Submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies of Texas A & M University. Meshalaya. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Studies*. 3 (5) 340 –

Mohammad F. J. & Mohammad A. K. (2011). *Determining the factors influencing the Dropouts in Government Primary Schools in Karachi*, Pakistan, Federal Urdu University.

Munyi, J. K. & Orodho, L. W. (2015). *Planning and Economics of Education*. Nairobi. Pangolin Publication Limited.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2015). *Models for change strategies in Nigeria Educational Management*. Federal Ministry of Education, Lagos.

National Bureau of Statistics (NBS) (2019). *Models for change strategies in Nigeria Educational Management*. Federal Ministry of Education, Lagos.

National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN) (2019). *Principles of Instructional Administration*. NERDC Press.

National Open University of Nigeria (NOUN) (2012). *Principles of Instructional Administration*. NERDC Press.

Ngome, C. K. and Kikechi R. W. (2015). Educational Wastage in Kenya: A threat of internal efficiency in Bugoma County secondary education. *Journal of Educational policy and entrepreneurial research*, 2 (10) 151 – 157.

Niyi, J. O., Ahaota, G. & Jegede, I. (2021). Resource wastages in public tertiary institutions in Nigeria: Effects and way forward. *European multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science* 5(1), 16-25.

Obi, Z. & Okoye, P. N. (2021). Impact of school environment on education and innovations for sustainable development in public secondary schools in Awka education zone of Anambra State. *Journal of Educational Research* 6(1) 216-224.

- Odoemelam A. C. (2013) Effective classroom management: A key to academic excellence. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 5(1), 1 - 8
of Education and Humanities Research (JEHR), University of Balochistan, Quetta,
of Physics in Bwari Area Council of Nigeria Federal Capital, Abuja Implication for
- Oyetakin, A. I. (2011). Cost of education: Determinant of free education and human
infrastructure in Nigeria. *Educational Thought*, 8(1), 171-185.
- Palmer M. (2023). Top 15 Time Wasters. Retrieved from:
<https://extension.colostate.edu/top-15-time-wasters/>
- Rajesh, E. & Roy, P. (2014). Education Wastage: A problem of primary education. *American
Research Innovation and Implications in Education*, 6(2), 17 – 24
- Samuel, T. (2004). Repositioning education in Lagos State for improved service delivery: A
synopsis of contending issue and policy imperatives. *Tescom News*, 9(2), 18 – 23.
- Udo, C. I. & Eni, A. A. (2019) The Role of the School Manager in Curriculum
Implementation in Nigeria Secondary Schools. *The Journal of Educational
Administration* 14 (2) 37 – 51.
- Ukpong, N. (2020). Secondary school administration in the era of globalization. Retrieved
from: <http://www.researchgate.net>.
- UNESCO (2005). *Education and Development: A review*. Paris, France
- UNESCO. (1998). *Lifelong learning and institutions of higher education in the 21st century*.
Paper presented at the Report on the Preparatory Meeting for the World Conference on
Higher Education.
- UNICEF (2015). Education for Sustainable Development Goals. Learning Objectives.
Retrieved from: <https://education.unicef.org>.