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ABSTRACT: This study investigated massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of administration in public secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State. An ex-post facto correlational design was used. Three research questions were formulated to guide the study and three Null hypotheses were tested. The population of the study consisted of all the 221 public secondary school principals in the state. The sample size of 57 principals (25 percent) with 171 teachers that is, 3 teachers rating one school principal was drawn for the study using cluster and the simple random sampling techniques on Local Education Committee bases. Data collection was done with the use of a researcher designed instrument tagged “Effectiveness of Secondary School Administration Questionnaire (EOSSAQ)” for teachers only. Cronbach Alpha statistics used to determine the reliability of the instrument gave a reliability coefficient of 0.76. The statistical technique used for both the research questions and Null hypotheses was simple linear regression at 0.05 alpha levels with 1 and 54 degree of freedom. Findings from the study, revealed no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of school supervision, supply of school facilities and managing of school budgets. All the null hypotheses were retained. The study thus concluded that massification of students’ intake has no direct relationship on the effectiveness of secondary school administration. Based on this, it was recommended that administrators and all heads of schools should not panic whenever there is influx of students in their school enrolment. State Secondary Education Board should have some sort of incentives to use and encourage principals who manage their schools without much demand on the government for their ingenuity.
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INTRODUCTION

Education has always remained a social process in capacity building and maintenance of society for a very long time. It is through education that members of the society acquire skills, relevant knowledge and habits for surviving in the challenging world. The educational system in Nigeria has experienced a lot of changes both in its policies and programmes. The Universal Basic Education (UBE) is one of these changes. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights Act which culminated in a World conference of Education for All (EFA), held in Jomtien, Thailand in 1990, gave rise to the universal, free and compulsory education in Nigeria (Dike, 2000). This program was launched by the then President of the Federal Republic of
Nigeria, Chief Olusegun Matthew Obasanjo on September, 30th 1999. This was subsequently signed into law in May, 2004 (UBE Digest, 2004 Nov.). The intention of this Universal Basic Education was to make education universal, free and also compulsory from primary up to the junior secondary schools for all Nigerians irrespective of age, sex, race, religion, occupation or location. The 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, section 18, sub-section 1-3 states that government shall direct its policy towards ensuring that there are equal and adequate educational opportunities at all levels. It thus implies that the background of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) has been constitutionally enunciated as a means of providing access to education for all. The Universal Basic Education (UBE) would thus, lay the foundation for basic literacy, numeracy and communication in the society (Uyanga, 2012).

Thus, although the Federal Government of Nigeria laid the foundation of Universal Basic Education in the country in September, 1999, the Akwa Ibom State Government in 2009, extended this program to senior secondary education in the state by making it to be free and compulsory. With this policy, the state educational sector became rebranded, repositioned and completely repackaged (AKSG, 2010). Also, with the child’s right act by the state government just a few months later, education in Akwa Ibom state became a fundamental right for all children residing in the state (AKSG, 2010). To show its commitment to the compulsory education, the government reeled out new monitoring policy on 26th April, 2010 to ensure the full implementation and to consolidate on the gains so far recorded. The government monitoring policy stressed that any child of school age found on the street during school hours whether in uniform or not will be arrested alongside with parents or guardian and prosecuted accordingly (Akwa Ibom State Government, 2010).

The universal, free and compulsory education policy together with the Akwa Ibom State policy of free and compulsory secondary education have brought with it an upsurge in school population. This means that the number of school enrolment in the state public secondary schools increased tremendously. With the growth or increase in students’ population and subsequent increase in teaching staff, the effectiveness of the school administration may be faced with several challenges. Facing these challenges becomes important and necessary for the school principals or administrators in other to achieve the school goals and objectives. Massification therefore, is the current phenomenon where schools run well over capacity. Some factors contribute to this fact especially in our secondary schools where there has been an explosion of population growth in the last few decades. Again, the expansion and improvement of standards at both primary and secondary schools have led to the inevitable increase in enrolment of students even at tertiary institutions (Zeelen, 2012) predicts that the output of the school and sends a negative or positive signal to the entire secondary school system. This calls for high moral effectiveness and efficiency supported by desirable characteristics in their administrative responsibilities. The task of maintaining an effective machinery of a functional school system like secondary education is one that demands a great deal of administrative qualities of principals. They are expected to coordinate human and material resources for effective administration of the school.

The effectiveness of school administration is concerned with doing the right things at the right time. It relates to output of the job and what the administrators or principals actually achieve. Thus, Oleforo (2014) describes administrative functions of the principals to include; preparing teaching schedules, ensuring teaching effectiveness of staff, performing personnel decision-making and managing the school budget. The success or failure of the school is therefore, the
principal’s responsibility. The mandate of secondary school education can only be achieved through the effective performance by the principals’ or administrators of their functions (Ogbodo, 2002). Principals are therefore, expected to coordinate human and material resources for effective administration of schools.

The relationship between school population and administrative effectiveness has been a perplexing one for educators. Studies have found that the physical environment, class overcrowding and teaching methods are all variables that affect teaching and learning (Zockoff, 2012). Massification of students’ intake, or increased school population was thus established to have a direct impact on the quality of teaching and instruction delivery. Overcrowded classrooms are suspected to increase the possibilities for mass failure and make students to lose interest in school. This is because over populated classes do not allow an individual student to get attention from teachers, which invariably, leads to low reading scores, frustration and poor academic performance (Zockoff, 2012).

Consequently, apart from the problems associated with the student population, staff and student’s related problems, funding and environmental factors, school supervision, supply of school facilities and managing the school budget appear to be vital factors that require close attention for effective administration of schools. Supervision is not peculiar to the field of education. In every function in the society, the superordinates oversee the work of the subordinates to ensure that the later are doing the right thing. Supervisor is then someone in a position of leadership who possesses the skill and ability to provide a “super” “vision” to the school in terms of perceiving desirable objectives, maintaining a balance in the curriculum, and rendering help to the teachers regarding methods and other instructional problems that they encounter (Mbipom, 2000). The principal of a school is therefore, the first supervisor both of teachers, students and school facilities. Educational research has repeatedly identified teacher effectiveness as the most important factor in student learning. The work that teachers accomplish in classrooms matters and administrators’ top priority should be developing teachers. It is appropriate to have a discussion about how to effectively supervise teachers so that the process is relevant to teachers and also improve their instructional practice to cope with the students population increase. As with any initiative in education, effective school supervision starts with school leadership.

The administrator should adopt comprehensive and fair teacher supervision, policies and practices that will guide teachers in dealing with the students’ teeming population. The principal should ensure that teachers are providing high quality instruction to the students by constantly checking on them. Effective principals, routinely visit teachers’ classrooms and provide formative and corrective feedback to teachers. This routinely visiting of classrooms is critical because it is ludicrous to assume one can create a clear picture of teachers’ effectiveness by merely visiting their classrooms fewer than five times per year (Bret, 2013). Principals should endeavor to be in all teachers’ classrooms weekly, for extended periods of time and the school boards should also hold principals accountable for performing this task. The bottom line is if teacher development is a priority in the students’ learning and performance amid their increased population, both the State Education Board and administrators will find a way to routinely visit teachers’ classrooms.

Supply of school facilities is another variable that may positively or negatively affect school administration. For effective education to occur school facilities must be adequately provided,
maintained and utilized objectively by administrator, teachers and students. Again, for effective actualization of secondary education goals and objectives, all the necessary resources must be effectively harnessed, managed and directed towards achievement of pre-determined goals of secondary schools. School facilities comprise buildings, tools, equipment and materials that constitute the school plants. These are used by school administrators to enhance teaching and learning. The expenditure for school facilities is one of the largest investments in education. The total financial value of school facilities in Nigeria runs into billions of naira as school facilities incur substantial cost of school system (Ibia, 2006).

There is no meaningful educational programme without adequate and functional school facilities. This underlines the relevance of huge investment in education for both public and private school. With massification of students’ intake in schools more facilities may be needed for effective school administration. With the increase, the roles of school principles become enormous. These include sourcing for fund, supervising and maintenance operations, employment of custodial staff, storage and distribution of supplies, equipment and facilities. How the principal goes about all these shows how effective the school administration is. The present condition of public secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State speaks very badly of school leadership and staff. As an observer in the school system, and a teacher for a very long period, it is pertinent to note that some of these schools may have been adequately supplied with facilities by the government at the onset. However, with different school administrators over the years, these facilities keep deteriorating and becoming less useful to be of pedagogical advantage. The general tendency for school principal today is to divert the funds meant for school facilities and upkeep to personal use.

Managing the school budget is another factor that may affect administrative effectiveness on massification of students’ intake in schools either positively or negatively. Budgeting, according to Olufidipe (2003), is a process of preparing and using budgets to achieve management objectives. Budget on the other hand, is a comprehensive and coordinated plan expressed in financial terms for the future. Etuk (2006) sees budget as a special kind of plan that is concerned with money, it usually indicates income sources and details of how the funds will be spent. Managing of school budget by school administrators is an enormous task and with increased school population, because of compulsory free education, the task becomes more serious. Budgeting has been a very important and useful part of administrative strategy of organizations such as educational institutions right from ages. It has the fundamental importance of controlling the financial behaviour of administrators in the school system. Administrators must therefore tread with caution when managing school budget.

In the Nigerian school system, many principals have been accused of poor budgeting practices by the teachers and parents. For instance, it has been observed by some authorities that principals do not follow budget procedures in planning and management of budgets, nor do they keep and use the necessary financial account records in Nigeria schools (Nzekwe, 2007). No work has been found on massification and effectiveness of school supervision, school facilities supply and budgeting. Little or no work is done on repairs of school building, provision of reagent and specimens for science practicals, inter-house sports and games. Hence, this research was designed to investigate into massification and effectiveness of secondary school administration and supervision, supply of school facilities and managing of school budget.
Statement of the Problem

There has been an upsurge in the number of secondary school students as a consequence of the free and compulsory secondary school education policy by the State government. On the contrary, there seems to be an increasing rate of administrative laxity in the areas where administrators are not to be found to be lax. The issue is that education has been made free and compulsory in the state and there is a subsequent upsurge of students’ intake in schools. This has expectedly brought about challenges and pressures on all facets of public secondary school administration, including among other things, dearth of statistics on students’ enrolment, paucity of qualified teachers, inadequate supply of school facilities, poor school supervision, poor managing of school budgets or funds and so on.

In line with the problems, there arises the need to empirically assess the relationship between the massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of school administration in Akwa Ibom state. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. To determine the relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of school supervision in public secondary schools.
2. To examine the relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness in the supply of school facilities in public secondary schools.
3. To determine the relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of managing the school budget in public secondary schools.

Research Questions

To guide the study the following research questions were raised:

1. What is the relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of school supervision in public secondary schools?
2. In what way does massification of students’ intake relate to effectiveness in the supply of school facilities in public secondary schools?
3. What is the relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of managing the school budget in public secondary schools?

METHODOLOGY

An ex-post facto correlational design was used for the study because the phenomena for investigation had already occurred and the researcher needed to establish the relationship without manipulating the variables. A study population of 221 public secondary school principals in Akwa Ibom State in 2013/2014 school year was used. A sample of 57 principals and 171 teachers. The cluster and simple random sampling techniques were used in selecting the school principals on Local Education Committees (LEC) basis. The state was divided into twenty-five (25) Local Education Committees and 25% of the school principals were randomly selected from each Local Education Committee of the secondary schools in the state. Three teachers from each of the public secondary schools in the state were used to assess each principal from their school.

A 15 item questionnaire captioned Effectiveness of Secondary School Administration Questionnaire (EOSSAQ) was developed by the researchers. This was divided into two major sections. Section A contained personal data of the respondents, while Section B contained 15 items used to assess the effectiveness of principal’s supervision, 5 items assessed effectiveness of supply of school facilities and 5 items also assessed the effectiveness of principals.
management of school budget. The respondents were required to tick either Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D) or Strongly Disagree (SD). However, the moving average model of time series population analysis was used to determine upward static and downward trend in school enrolment. Average movement within four academic years was found for each school selected for the study and scores obtained were regressed with the scores obtained on administrative effectiveness. The test items in the instruments were validated and the internal consistency and reliability of the instrument was determined using the Cronbach Alpha Statistics. A value of 0.76 was obtained. Responses to the items were collected and analyzed using simple linear regression statistical analysis to both the research questions and the hypotheses.

Results
The results of the analyses based on each research question and hypotheses are shown as follows:

Research Question 1
What is the relationship between massification of students’ intake and administrative effectiveness of school supervision in public secondary schools?

Table 3: Result of simple Regression Analysis of students’ massification and principals’ supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Squared</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ Supervision</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor (Constant), MASSIFICATION

The R-value of 0.220 shows a weak positive relationship between students’ massification and principals’ supervision and R² of .05 is the coefficient of determination. This result means that only 5% of the total variance of principals’ supervision is determined by students’ massification.

Research Question 2
What is the relationship between massification of students’ intake and administrative effectiveness in the supply of school facilities in public secondary schools?

Table 4: Result of Simple Regression Analysis of Students’ Massification and Principals’ Supply of School Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted R Squared</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ Supply of school facilities</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor (Constant), MASSIFICATION

The R-value of .169 shows a very weak relationship between students’ massification and principals’ supply of school facilities and R² of .029 is the coefficient of determination. This
result means that only 3% of the total variance of principals’ supply of school facilities is caused by students’ massification.

**Research Question 3**
What is the relationship between massification of students’ intake and administrative effectiveness in the supply of school budget in public secondary schools?

Table 5  Result of simple Regression Analysis of Students’ Massification and principals’ supply of school budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Squared</th>
<th>Adjusted Squared</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Std. Error of Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ managing of school Budget</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Predictor (Constant), MASSIFICATION

The R-value of .033 shows a very weak relationship between students’ massification and principals’ managing of school budget and $R^2$ of .001 is the coefficient of determination. This result means that only 0.1% of the total variance of principals’ managing of school budget is determined by students’ massification.

**Hypotheses**
There is no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness of school supervision in public secondary schools.

Table 6  Result of Simple Regression Analysis of Students’ Massification and Principals’ Supervision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massification</td>
<td>Regression 32.930</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32.93</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual 645.070</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total 678.000</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: PRINCIPALS SUPERVISION

Table 6 reveals that the calculated F-value of 2.76 is less than the critical F-value of 4.03 at 0.05 level with 1 and 54 degree of freedom. This result is not significant; therefore the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between students’ massification and principals’ supervision is retained. This implies that every unit of change in students’ massification does not cause a change in principals’ supervision scores.

**Hypotheses 2**
There is no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and Principals Supply of School Facilities in public secondary schools.
Table 7: Result of Simple Regression Analysis of Students’ Massification and effectiveness in Supplying of School Facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>18.741</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.741</td>
<td>1.596</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>634.098</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.743</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>652.839</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: PRINCIPALS SUPPLY OF SCHOOL FACILITIES

Table 7 reveals that the calculated F-value of 1.596 is less than the critical F-value of 4.03 at .05 levels with 1 and 54 degree of freedom. This result is not significant; therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between students’ massification and principals’ supply of school facilities is retained. This implies that every unit of change in students’ massification does not cause a change in principals’ supply of school facilities.

Hypotheses 3

There is no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness in managing of school budget in public secondary schools.

Table 8: Result of Simple Regression Analysis of Students’ Massification and Effectiveness in Managing of School Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>658.271</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>658.982</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent variable: PRINCIPALS MANAGING OF SCHOOL BUDGET

Table 8 reveals that the calculated F-value of .058 is less than the critical F-value of 4.03 at .05 levels with 1 and 54 degree of freedom. This result is not significant; therefore, the null hypothesis that there is no significant relationship between students’ massification and principals’ managing of school budgets is retained. This implies that every unit of change in students’ massification does not cause a change in principals’ managing of school budget scores.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The discussion is done based on the variables under study:

Massification of Students’ Intake and Effectiveness of School Supervision

The result revealed that there is no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness in supervision in public secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State. This is so because any administrator/principal is unique in his/her ways of administration. An intelligent and experienced principal will definitely be able to effectively supervise his/her school despite the increase in school enrollment. If massification of students’ intake however, becomes large, that intelligent principal will find a way or strategize a method to handle supervision accordingly. This study is in consonance with the assertion of Akubue, (1981) that principals’ poor supervision was because principals’ were incompetent and preoccupied with other demanding routine. This finding is also in agreement with the findings of (Boardman
1993) who stated that in schools enrolling many students, the principals tended to spend major part of their time in the duties of their offices. Boardman (1993) went further to state that in large schools, principals rarely thought of supervision but rather spend most of their time in administration. This implies that massification of students’ intake in public secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State could not be responsible for administrative ineffectiveness in school supervision.

**Massification of Students’ Intake and Effectiveness in Supply of School Facilities**

It was also found in this study that there is no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and effectiveness in the supply of school facilities. The finding in this study indicated that some principals are very good in providing facilities to their schools than others. These very good ones could go extra miles to improvise facilities when faced with any increase in school population. It then follows that this study is not in agreement with the work of Akumah and Ganah (2005) which had it that, expanding of public school enrolment increased the critical problem of inadequate school facilities. Etuk (2006) had the view that, it is the responsibility of the school administrators to provide and maintain school facilities to make sure they are functional, increase of students’ enrolment notwithstanding. It does imply therefore, that massification of students’ intake does not result in administrative ineffectiveness in supply of school facilities. A highly effective administrator will find ways of meeting the demands of facilities in his/her school by improvising methods and good management of available ones.

**Massification of Students’ Intake and Effectiveness in Managing School Budgets**

The result of this finding shows that there is no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and administrative effectiveness in managing school budgets. In this finding also, managing of school budget/fund is a prerogative of principals. As such every administrator must device a way of dealing with this aspect of school management. It is also a very delicate issue in any educational institution. Hence any principal who can manage the budget of a small sized school honestly and efficiently, will always do the same in a school with large students’ population. Such a person will not think of embezzling the school fund but will always figure out ways of making use of whatever amount that is available to him. This finding is therefore, contrary to the findings of Onyike (2009) who opined that poor budgeting had accounted for the seeming neglect and dilapidation of school infrastructure in greater percentage of schools over a decade particularly in secondary schools. This again implies that massification of students’ intake does not cause administrative ineffectiveness in managing school budgets. Principals should all the same follow the budget guideline specifications.

**CONCLUSION**

This study was carried out to examine the relationship between massification of students’ intake and administrative effectiveness in public secondary schools in Akwa Ibom State. Result has shown that there is no significant relationship between massification of students’ intake and administrative effectiveness in public secondary schools in the state. Based on this, the school administrator/principal is expected to carry on with his/her administrative functions without much regard to the massification or increase in school enrolment. This will go a long way to show that an effective principal will always remain one in whatever circumstance he/she finds himself.
Recommendations
It was recommended based on the findings that
1. Administrators and all heads of schools should not panic whenever there is influx of students in their school enrolment. Rather, when faced with such a challenge, should look for the best way to tackle that administrative responsibility by looking inward.
2. The State Secondary Education Board should have some incentives to use and encourage principals who manage their schools without much demand on the government.
3. Principals who manage their budgets well, whether they have small or large schools should receive cash award from the government publicly to be a way of sensitizing others to managerial effectiveness.
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