

Resource utilization and secondary schools effectiveness: a comparative analysis of rural and urban schools in central Uganda

¹Edward Kanya, ²Emmanuel Kiweewa, ³Nakate Sylvia, ⁴Adam Charles Matiko

⁵Samanya John, ⁶Mutebe Janet, ⁷Meinrad Haule Lembuka

Kampala International University, Kampala, Uganda.

Abstract

*The study investigated the difference between rural and urban secondary schools in terms of utilization of physical, human and financial resources. It also delved into a comparison between the level of availability and utilization of resources in secondary schools in Urban and Rural A causal comparative survey was adopted to establish the difference between Rural and Urban secondary schools in terms of resources availability, utilization and the effectiveness of secondary schools. A sample of 22 schools was employed; simple random was used to obtain the minimum sample. Data obtained was analyzed by use of means and standard deviations for the levels of resource availability, utilization and school effectiveness, student's independent test (*t*-test) for the difference between Rural and Urban. The sig. value was used to conclude on the hypotheses. The findings revealed a significant difference in the utilization of resources in the rural and urban secondary schools. We concluded that urban secondary schools are more effective than rural secondary schools in resource utilization.*

Key words: Resource utilization, school effectiveness

1. Introduction

The issue and factors for school ineffectiveness in Uganda can be traced as early as colonial days, for example in the early colonial days, education in Uganda developed because of the initiative of voluntary organizations especially those of the Christian missionaries. Good educational facilities during those days were only available to a small elite group and the masses remained largely illiterate or poorly educated. From 1925, the colonial government started exercising control over education by establishing a Directorate of Education. After independence, education was developed on the basis of recommendations of the Castle Commission which laid emphasis on creating opportunities for quality education for all people, raising standards of agriculture and technical education, expansion of girl education and provision of adult education. During the eighties, emphasis was placed on the general recovery and rehabilitation of

structures and restoration of provision of facilities and services all which had been damaged by war and civil strife. However [iv] commented that although considerable

expansion took place in a number of primary and secondary schools in the early eighties, most of the new schools were ill-planned and ill-equipped.

2 Literature review

Besides evidence of lack of appropriate and adequate resources in terms of human, physical and financial to handle the overwhelming numbers of learners especially in primary schools, in 2007, Uganda became the first country in sub-Saharan Africa to introduce universal secondary education [ii]. Over 10 years after the introduction of universal secondary education, the number of enrollment has been increasing. Universal Secondary Education (USE) has expanded access for many Ugandan families to secondary education, including some of the vulnerable poor who would not have even considered secondary school without this policy. However, the overwhelming numbers of students taking part in USE exert pressure on the teachers, facilities, and funds. The quality of secondary education has begun to suffer, whereas Uganda's goal is to improve the quality of its education system.

The Ministry of [iv] reported that Uganda has relatively high levels of grade repetition and drop-out, which indicate low levels of system efficiency, quality of learning and effectiveness.

According to [i] financial resources are the central point of all activities and the success of a school. He emphasized that education as a social service requires adequate funds to keep the school going, the provision of adequate and qualitative resources will depend on the income available at school and how it is used.

[iii] and [v] revealed that there was lack of equal distribution of resources, in terms of physical, material, human and financial, the misappropriation of resources and failure to effectively utilize them which lead to several undesirable outcomes such as failure in academic performance, low promotion rates, lack of effectiveness among teachers and failure to compete with other schools in and outside the country, which as a whole lead to school ineffectiveness.

Uganda has undergone only quantitative improvement in terms of number of institutions and students' enrolment while there has been little effort in respect to the capacity to manage and utilize them through provisions of adequate financial, human and physical resources. He further emphasized that many institutions do not have the physical facilities and those with resources do not have current and relevant ones. Practical lessons are taught as theoretical while equipment and materials are

inadequate and sometimes borrowed for external examinations. [iv] Survey report indicated that, schools effectiveness is still low in secondary schools. It identified factors such as, work related factors, lack of learning materials such as exercise books, pens and pencils as the major causes. It further asserted that 10 percent of teachers are not in school to carry out their work. It added that many teachers live far away from their schools and many miss due to transportation or bad weather during rainy seasons.

A survey design was employed and data was collected from 22 secondary schools. The schools and respondents were randomly selected using simple random sampling technique. Descriptive statistics and t-statistics were used to analyze the data and the sig-values were used draw conclusions and decisions on the hypotheses. A comparative analysis was done so as to ascertain the difference in resource utilization and school effectiveness in selected secondary schools.

3 Methodology

4 Findings

Table 1: T-test for the Difference between Rural and Urban Secondary Schools in Terms of Resource Utilization and School Effectiveness

Category	School Residence	Mean	t	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision on Ho
Utilization-Physical	Rural	2.42	5.023***	0.000	Significant difference	Rejected
	Urban	2.66				
Utilization-Human	Rural	2.80	-2.040**	0.042	Significant difference	Rejected
	Urban	2.93				
Utilization-Financial	Rural	2.49	-3.676***	0.000	Significant difference	Rejected
	Urban	2.69				
Utilization Index	Rural	2.57	-3.824***	0.000	Significant difference	Rejected
	Urban	2.76				

** Significant at 95% *** significant at 99%

Results in table 1 indicate physical resource utilization in rural schools has a mean of 2.42, whereas urban has 2.66 with a t-value of 5.023 and a sig value of 0.000 implying a significant difference. On the other hand the utilization of human resource in rural schools has a mean of 2.795 and Urban 2.93 with a t-value of -2.68, sig 0.042. Financial resources displayed a mean 2.49 in rural and 2.69 among the urban secondary schools. The t-value is -3.676 with a sig. of 0.000. On average the utilization of resources physical, human and financial is significantly different, rural schools presented an average mean of 2.567 and

urban has 2.76 with a sig value of 0.000 implying a difference. The results suggest that resources were significantly well utilized in urban secondary schools compared to rural area. The findings suggest that resource utilization in urban schools is better than rural schools. This could be because of the appropriateness of the urban environment. Because the urban area always has a better environment with the quality of life being relatively higher than the rural area, could prove why there is a difference between in resource utilization between urban and rural schools in central Uganda.

Table 2: T-test for the difference between the rural and urban secondary schools in terms of school effectiveness

	School Residence	Mean	t	Sig.	Interpretation	Decision on Ho
Effectiveness-Physical	Rural	2.56	-5.686***	0.000	Significant difference	Rejected
	Urban	2.80				
Effectiveness-Human	Rural	2.74	-5.038***	0.000	Significant difference	Rejected
	Urban	2.99				

Effectiveness-	Rural	2.86	-0.627	0.531	No significant	Accepted
Financial	Urban	2.90			difference	
Effectiveness	Rural	2.72	-4.085***	0.000	Significant	Rejected
Index	Urban	2.91			difference	

*** Significant at 99%

Table 2 indicates that there was a significant difference between rural and urban secondary schools in terms of their effectiveness. Urban schools were more effective in physical aspects compared to rural (mean=2.55 Rural, 2.80 Urban $t=-5.68$; Sig 0.000). This implied that on average Urban schools had better school facilities and climate, clean physical plant which was well maintained, more facilities for extracurricular activities among others facilities. Human effectiveness in rural and urban schools, it was found out that still there was a significant difference, where urban schools scored better than rural (means=2.73 Rural; 2.98 Urban). The implication here was that on average urban secondary schools are better in administration, teachers, students' attendance is higher. Using the sig-value results indicate significant difference. With respect to financial effectiveness, there was no significant difference between rural and

5 Conclusion

With regard to the findings, there is a significant difference in utilization of resources, and effectiveness urban and rural schools. The urban schools on average

urban secondary schools considering the financial aspects. Table 2 show a mean difference of 2.86 Rural and 2.90 Urban, the $t=-.627$ with a sig. 0.531 respectively. Since the sig. 0.531 is greater than 0.05, we declare that financial effectiveness is not significantly different in rural and urban secondary schools. In this case we accept the null hypothesis and conclude that there is no significant difference between rural and urban secondary schools in terms of financial effectiveness.

However, overall effectiveness index, showed a significant difference (mean 2.72 Rural, 2.90 Urban; $t=-4.08$; Sig 0.000). This implies that generally there is a significant difference in the effectiveness of secondary schools in Rural and Urban settings. The difference suggests that urban schools are more effective than rural schools. Using the sig. value, we infer that the null hypothesis is rejected.

utilized their resources better than rural the rural schools. To improve on school effectiveness in the rural area, the government should support the rural schools through structural development and supporting staff development. Staff



development enhances the quality of teachers while structural development

provides a good learning environment which motivates both teachers and learners.

6 References

[i] Adeogun A,A .The principal and the financial management of public secondary schools in Osun State. *Journal of Education System and Development*. 5(1) pp.1-10. 2001.

[ii] Ezenne, A. *Human resources management inn eeducation*. Kindle Edition Information Age Publishing. December 1, 2012.

[iii] Harber, C. Democratic management and school effectiveness in Africa: *Learning from Tanzania*. Compare, 23, 289-300 1993

[iv] Ministry of education and sports education for all National review, 2015.

[v] Ssekamwa & Lugumba. *A History of Education in East Africa*. Fountain Publishers, Kampala 2001

[vi] UNESCO *World education report. The right to education: towards education for all throughout life*. UNESCO Publishing 2000