AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT AND STAKEHOLDERS' PARTICIPATION IN THE FUNDING OF STUDENTS WELFARE AND INSTRUCTIONAL FACILITIES OF STATE-OWNED UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA

Jim-Dorgu Godson
Department of Educational Foundations,
Faculty of Education, Niger Delta University,
Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State
gjimdorgu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study seeks to access university management and stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare and instructional facilities of state-owned universities in South-South. Two specific objectives, two research questions and two null hypotheses were formulated for the study. This paper utilizes analytical descriptive survey design with a target population of 506 management staff from six selected state-owned public Universities in South-South, A sample size of 430 management staff (representing 85%) of the total population was selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique. This study used descriptive and inferential statistics to examine its data. Study participants' demographic information was analyzed using the descriptive statistics techniques of standard deviation, simple percentage, and mean. The inferential statistical tool of ANOVA analysis was used to analyze the hypothesis. The findings of the study indicates that there is no substantial difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria and there is no substantial difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria. Based on the findings of the study, it was recommended among others that university management staff should not consider their management status as an influencing factor in their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities.

Keywords: Students, Welfare, Instructional, Facilities.

Introduction

The achievement of peace, progress, and excellent academic results in universities relies heavily on the provision of social services and efficient service delivery within the institutions. The well-being of students is crucial in the daily functioning of educational institutions. Neglecting this aspect can result in protests, disruptions to programmes, or even violence, in addition to academic dysfunction. Oladipo and Adewale (2018) assert that the effective execution of academic and non-academic activities in tertiary institutions, particularly in

universities, relies on the provision of enough and high-quality auxiliary support. This is crucial for the production of highly skilled personnel. The Surt Foundation (2010) defines welfare as the implementation of measures or protocols that ensure the fundamental welfare of both individuals and society as a whole. These services can be offered as a fundamental entitlement of citizenship or arranged through market transactions, and overseen by either governmental bodies and institutions or private entities. These are services provided by school management to help students support, develop and focus on their academic performance and personal needs. These services assist students to improve and enhance their academic and social life. These services are either provided confidentially through effective advice that would help them resolve some conflict or through practical exercises that will help assists in improving their capability, ability, aptitude and values. These services are the basic facilities or amenities which will give students the necessary love, care, guidance and counseling and also assist students resolve their problems. These services include Guidance and Counseling, clubs and societies, games, health care services, library services, student assessment, orientation and academic advice.

To promote smooth effective and efficient learning and harmonious relationship school management should provide these services. These require timely allocation of funds for these services. Students' welfare are expensive ventures. Therefore, stakeholders should participate in adequate provision of funds for these services, failure of which may stifle the progress and effective organizational climate of the school.

Facilities as describe by South African Facilities Management Association (SAFMA) (cited in Chikafalimani, Kibwami and Moyo 2021) are all physical entities where products or services are created, stored and distributed. Facilities are the materials that enable trained and professional personnel to achieve a particular individual or organizational task easily, efficiently and effectively. Nura (2014) refer to facilities in education to the materials that a trained and professional teacher utilizes to successfully translate, implement and achieve school instruction objectives. As stated by Chikafalimani, Kibwami, and Moyo (2021), school facilities encompass a wide range of structures and resources that support both academic and non-academic endeavours. These include various buildings, equipment, spaces for sports and games, landscaping features, farms and gardens (including trees), as well as roads and walks. Additional amenities encompass furnishings, lavatory provisions, illumination acoustics, storage provisions, parking facilities, security measures, transportation services, information and communication technology, cleaning supplies, food provisions, and specialised accommodations for those with physical disabilities.

The state of infrastructure in the universities is very poor with floors full of holes and ceilings broken and maintenance work are scarcely carried out. The overall assessment shows that the fabrics are in a poor state of repairs. Windows have shattered at best but these doors are not often locked, so the schools lack security. In order to be secure, efficient, and productive, many schools lack the necessary infrastructure, including classrooms, offices, labs, workshops, dormitories, furnishings, and machines. The lack of perimeter fencing at most institutions makes them vulnerable to theft and damage. Theft of furniture, littering of lecture rooms, and even their usage as toilets has all been reported. The scenario calls for proper funding. Funds are needed to build and purchase and maintain these educational infrastructures. Funds are also needed to service and maintain them.

Research Questions

The study answered the following research questions

1. What is the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria?
2. What is the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria?

Purpose of the Study

The major purpose of the study is to access university management and stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare and instructional facilities of state-owned universities in South-South Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought:

1. To determine the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.
2. To examine the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Hypotheses

The subsequent null hypotheses were created and were evaluated at a significance level of 0.05:

1. There is no substantial difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.
2. There is no substantial difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Literature Review

Stakeholders' Participation in the Funding of Students Welfare in State Owned Universities

The achievement of peace, progress, and excellent academic results in universities relies heavily on the provision of social services and efficient service delivery within the institutions. The well-being of students is crucial in the daily functioning of educational institutions. Neglecting this aspect can result in protests, disruptions to programmes, or even violence, in addition to academic dysfunction. Oladipo and Adewale (2018) assert that the effective execution of academic and non-academic activities in tertiary institutions, particularly in universities, relies on the provision of enough and high-quality auxiliary support. This is crucial for the production of highly skilled personnel. The Surt Foundation (2010) defines welfare as the implementation of measures or protocols that ensure the fundamental welfare of both individuals and society as a whole. These services can be offered as a fundamental entitlement of citizenship or arranged through market transactions and overseen by either governmental bodies and institutions or private entities. These are services provided by school management to help students support, develop and focus on their academic performance and personal needs. These services assist students to improve and enhance their academic and social life. These services are either provided confidentially through effective advice that would help them resolve some conflict or through practical exercises that will help assists in improving their capability, ability, aptitude and values. These services are the basic facilities or amenities which will give students the necessary love, care, guidance and counseling and also assist students resolve their problems. These services include Guidance and Counseling, clubs and societies, games, health care services, library services, student assessment, orientation and academic advice.

a. Library Services

The University Library Service offers a diverse array of materials, services, and study areas, together with expert guidance, to support the academic endeavours and research of students and scholars, thereby facilitating their success. A library is a comprehensive collection of books and various other resource materials within a school. The collection comprises diverse learning and teaching materials that are stored in a centralised location and meticulously organised by personnel for the benefit of scholars. It encompasses both written and visual materials, such as books, diaries, films, slides, and recordings. Materials resources include things like books, journals, CD-ROMs, microfilm, microfiche, and abstracts of dissertations; human resources include things like librarians and support workers. Because of this, the school library is the nerve center of each school's resource system (Library and Index Project, 2006). Aside from being a place to get gas, this business also serves as a hub for personal growth. In schools, it is the hub for students to work independently.

All members of the school community are empowered to develop critical thinking skills and successfully use knowledge in various formats and media through the educational services, materials, and resources provided by the school library. In keeping with the objectives stated in the UNESCO Public Library Manifesto, school libraries connect to the larger network of libraries and information resources. While engaged in activities such as reading, borrowing books, or searching for information, students at the library encounter an ambiance characterised by tranquilly, serenity, and amicability. Typically, one should not anticipate dancing, exuberant wailing, or aggressive outbursts.

b. Laboratory Services

Laboratory refers to the hands-on application of theoretical knowledge in a specifically designated setting, where students actively participate in structured educational activities. The citation is from the National Research Council in 2006.School laboratories provide an excellent environment for students to increase their learning by gaining a practical understanding of the scientific subjects taught in classrooms. Effectively designed laboratories not only enhance the enjoyment of science experiments but also contribute to students' attainment of favourable scholastic outcomes. Regular practice in listening to models, beginning these models, and practicing the spoken language is facilitated by the mechanical and electronic room, which is equipped with devices that allow students to hear and repeat recorded materials in a foreign language. The National Curriculum Framework (NCF) of India, as stated by the National Council of Educational Research and Training (NCERT) in 2005, emphasised the necessity of providing schools with laboratories or scientific equipment for conducting science-related activities. The lack of such amenities significantly limits the range of subjects available to pupils, depriving them of equal learning opportunities and prospects for their future.

A laboratory activity provides students with the opportunity to learn through hands-on experience and actively participate in the process of acquiring scientific knowledge. During a laboratory activity, students engage in independent or collaborative work to address a question, problem, or hypothesis. This interactive procedure utilises scientific resources to develop an individual's personal interpretation of scientific occurrences.

c. Health Services

Health services refer to the range of services offered to safeguard and enhance the well-being of both faculty and students within an educational institution. The majority of contagious diseases occur among school kids due to their frequent exposure to various health dangers in the educational setting. Therefore, the maintenance of health facilities plays a crucial role in preventing diseases in schools. Park (2000) states that the majority of our learning environments suffer from diseases and parasites as a result of a lack of proper health habits and inadequate sanitation systems. These factors

are often responsible for illness and death in many underdeveloped nations. According to Lucas and Gillies (2003), many school pupils are at risk of contracting environmentally linked diseases such as malaria, typhoid, diarrhoea, and dysentery, which pose a persistent threat to their lives. The prevalence of diseases resulting from unhygienic waste disposal by students and staff, as well as the absence of adequate health facilities, is a direct consequence of the inadequate supply of portable drinking water and poor environmental sanitation in the school premises. One of the most significant consequences of a bad environment is the high prevalence of diarrhoea and intestinal worm infections, which collectively contribute to more than 100% of the overall illness burden in many educational settings (WHO, 2005). Insufficient availability of portable water significantly heightens the likelihood of contracting schistosomiasis, guinea worm, and skin illnesses (Park, 2000). Effective management of health services and enhanced environmental sanitation are crucial in controlling and preventing environmentally-related diseases within the community.

According to Ugbonnaya (2000), a well-organized and carefully executed programme for maintaining school health services is designed to enhance students' capacity to cope with stress in the educational setting by ensuring adequate nutrition and proper availability and upkeep of facilities in schools. Tonnes (2010) argued that an enhanced health standard for school students should not solely rely on curative services. Instead, it should also focus on imparting scientific knowledge. Therefore, any health programme should include education on social and fundamental aspects of hygiene. This would enable students to maintain a harmonious relationship with their surroundings. This can be achieved by the implementation of health services maintenance protocols, which involve maintaining a clean and orderly atmosphere and adhering to preventive medicine guidelines.

i. Washing services

Washing services should be provided and offered in a manner that is equivalent to the provision of toilets, ensuring their availability and accessibility. They are crucial for individuals involved in bathroom maintenance and related duties, as well as those who may come into contact with locations such as laboratories, student dining halls, and watering areas. Immediate washing facilities are necessary in close proximity to restrooms. Supplementary cleaning services may be required in areas where food is being prepared. Soap and water should be readily accessible in the lavatory and laboratories during practical activities. Provision of cleaning agents and potable water is necessary. The school administration must contemplate the implementation of distinct amenities for males and females. However, the provision of adequate washing facilities would contribute to creating a comfortable and conducive climate for teaching and learning.

d. Recreational services

Recreational programmes are crucial for the academic well-being of pupils. They assist pupils in achieving success in their post-school endeavours in society (Millard, 2010). These services influence the social and physical perspectives of the kids (Marsh and Kleitman, 2011 and Kelstrom, 2010). The extra-curricular project activities of the university serve as a representation of university education in society (Odeh, 2014). Woosnam, Dixon, and Brookver (2006) argue that the primary factor influencing a student's choice of institution is no longer the academic nature of the institution. Students have come to recognise that university campuses must offer co-curricular activities and programmes to cater to their extracurricular requirements. Mollet and Pascarella (2016) have documented a significant body of research dedicated to investigating student engagement in higher education, indicating that meaningful engagement is associated with enhanced student learning and development.

Recreational services are currently being offered to students to encourage their involvement in physical activity-based recreation programmes. These programmes aim to promote the students' physical and emotional development and foster a sense of optimism. Owing to the intricate nature of a swiftly evolving society and intense rivalry in school, students have experienced physical and emotional debilitation, leading to significant societal issues stemming from an imbalance in physical fitness and strength. In light of the current situation, the significance of physical education in fostering well-rounded individuals through physical activities is becoming prominent, in order to accomplish the educational objective of nurturing future leaders of the Korean society (Choi & Kim, 2007).

The impact of recreation is far-reaching. It improves one's ability to express oneself, achieve personal fulfilment, develop interpersonal skills, utilise leisure time effectively, build physical strength, express creativity, and appreciate aesthetics. The features inherent in recreation can have a beneficial impact on individuals who face limitations in their daily lives. Thus, amusement is permitted to be utilised as a therapeutic strategy (Lee, 2000). Hence, it is beneficial to utilise free time engaging in enjoyable and calming leisure pursuits to achieve an optimal period of personal growth and education.

To promote smooth effective and efficient learning and harmonious relationship school management should provide these services. These require timely allocation of funds for these services. Students' welfare are expensive ventures. Therefore, stakeholders should participate in adequate provision of funds for these services, failure of which may stifle the progress and effective organizational climate of the school.

Methodology

The research design utilized in this study was that of analytical descriptive survey design. In this study, the demographic detail of interest was that of management staff

status which was applied to compare their opinion on the subject matter under investigation. Another important attribute that supported the utilization of this design was that, it does not permit a researcher to manipulate the independent variable in the study as obtainable in the case of true experimental design. The target population of this study was made up of 506 management staff from six selected state-owned public Universities in South-South, Nigeria during the 2022/2023 academic session (Office of the Establishment Officer of Universities, 2023). This was distributed as 60, 81, 69, 112, 77 and 107 for Akwa Ibom State University of Technology (AKUTECH); Ambrose Ali University (AAU), Ekpoma; Cross River State University of Science and Technology (CRUTECH), Calabar; Niger Delta University (NDU); Rivers State University (RSU), Port-Harcourt and Delta State University (DELSU), Abraka respectively. Similarly, the population was further distributed as 36 and 470 principal officers and non-principal officers respectively.

A sample size of 430 management staff (representing 85%) of the total population was selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique from the two strata of principal officer and non-principal officer management staff of state-owned public Universities in South-South, Nigeria, during the 2022/2023 academic session. This was distributed as 51, 69, 59, 95, 65 and 91 for Akwa Ibom State University of Technology (AKUTECH); Ambrose Ali University (AAU), Ekpoma; Cross River State University of Science and Technology (CRUTECH), Calabar; Niger Delta University (NDU); Rivers State University (RSU), Port-Harcourt and Delta State University (DELSU), Abraka respectively. Similarly, the sample was further distributed as 30 and 400 principal officers and non-principal officers' management staff respectively.

A structured questionnaire titled "University Management Perception of Stakeholders' Participation in the Funding of State-Owned Universities Questionnaire (UMPSPFSOUQ) was developed by the investigator of this study. The questionnaire is divided into section A and B. containing seven (7) items each. The measurement of all items was conducted using a 4-point rating scale of `Strongly Agree (SA) 4-points; Agree (A) 3-points, Disagree (D) 2-points and Strongly Disagree (SD) 1-point. Two experts and the investigator's supervisor checked the validity of the instrument. Located at Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Niger Delta University's Department of Educational Foundations was home to two experts: one in educational administration and planning and the other in measurement and assessment. Simply by gauging its perceived worth, the supervisor validated the procedure for ascertaining the instrument's validity. The expert from educational management and planning carried out the validity process of the instrument on the content aspect and also ensured the appropriateness of each item statement in respect of the variables in the study. In the contrary, the expert from measurement and evaluation carefully

implemented the validity of the instrument on the construct value. All the comments, suggestions and observations were sincerely utilized in arriving at the final draft of the instrument.

The instrument was administered to 40 management staff of University of Africa, Toru-Orua in Bayelsa State that were not part of the main population of the study. The internal consistency of the test was determined using scores collected from a single administration of the item. Through the use of Cronbach's Alpha analysis, we were able to ascertain the reliability coefficient values for each variable inside the instrument. For every component of the complex tool, the dependability coefficient was determined. The values obtained were stakeholders' participation in funding students' welfare (0.74), stakeholders' participation in funding instructional facilities (0.75), and the overall instrument (0.82). The dependability coefficients for different sectors were derived from the overall condition of the instrument. The investigator and two trained research assistants administered the instrument to ensure that copies of the questionnaire were distributed and retrieved efficiently. The primary goal of employing research assistants with the necessary skills was to guarantee a high rate of return for all of the disseminated questionnaires. A total of 450 copies of the instrument were distributed, however, 430 (96%) copies of the instrument were completely administered by the respondents and alternatively, 20 (4%) copies were not properly administered as a result these copies were not utilized for the purpose of analysis in the study. The duration of period for distribution and retrieval of copies of the instrument for data collection lasted for seven (7) weeks.

This study used descriptive and inferential statistics to examine its data. Study participants' demographic information was analyzed and research issues were addressed using the descriptive statistics techniques of standard deviation, simple percentage, and mean. The inferential statistical tool of interest applicable in the study for data analysis was ANOVA analysis. All hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. In addition, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was the central point of utilization for all the analyses in the study.

Results and Discussion

Demographic Data

Table 1: Simple Percentage Analysis of Respondents by Gender

S/N	Gender	Frequency	Percentage
1	Male	297	69
2	Female	133	31
3	**Total**	**430**	**100**

Source: Fieldwork, 2023

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

The data presented in Table 1 shows that 297 (69%) of the total respondents were male and 133 (31%) were female management staff. This implies that male management staff respondents were more in number than their female colleagues in the study.

Table 2: Simple Percentage Analysis of Respondents by Management Staff Status

S/N	Management Staff Status	Frequency	Percentage
1	Principal Officer	30	7
2	Non-Principal Officer	400	93
3	***Total***	***430***	***100***

Source: Fieldwork, 2023

Among the total responses, 30 (or 7% of the total) were principal officer management personnel, whereas 400 (or 93% of the total) were not. This fact only indicates that there were more non-principal officer management staff members compared to their other study peers.

Table 3: Simple Percentage Analysis of Respondents by Name of University

S/N	Name of University	Frequency	Percentage
1	AKUTECH, Uyo	51	12
2	AAU, Ekpoma	69	16
3	CRUTECH, Calabar	59	14
4	NDU, Wilberforce Island, Amassoma	95	22
5	RSU, Port-Harcourt	65	15
6	DELSU, Abraka	91	21
7	***Total***	***430***	***100***

Source: Fieldwork, 2023

The data presented in Table 3 reveals that 51 (12%) of the total respondents were from AKUTECH, Uyo; 69 (16%) were from AAU, Ekpoma; 59 (14%) were from CRUTECH, Calabar; 95 (22%) were of NDU, Wilberforce Island, Amassoma; 65 (15%) were form RSU, Port-Harcourt and 91 (21%) were of DELSU, Abraka. This merely indicates that there were more replies from NDU than from any of the other participating universities.

Research Question 1

Table 4: Summary of mean and standard deviation scores of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities

S/N	Stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare	Principal Officer		Non-Principal Officer		Total		Decision
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	Stakeholders support in the provision of health services to students	2.87	0.90	2.76	1.02	2.77	1.02	Accepted

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

2	Stakeholders support in the provision of library services to students	2.87	0.97	2.66	0.99	2.67	0.99	Accepted
3	Stakeholders support in the provision of entertainment services to students	1.97	0.96	2.48	1.05	2.44	1.05	Rejected
4	Stakeholders support in the provision of counseling services to students	3.33	0.61	3.06	0.84	3.08	0.82	Accepted
5	Stakeholders support in the provision of recreational services to students	3.17	0.70	2.96	0.82	2.97	0.81	Accepted
6	Stakeholders support in the provision of bursary and other scholarships to students	3.30	0.65	3.10	0.77	3.11	0.77	Accepted
7	Stakeholders support in the provision of transport services to students	3.07	0.87	2.59	0.98	2.63	0.98	Accepted
	Grand Mean/SD	**2.94**	**0.33**	**2.80**	**0.44**	**2.81**	**0.43**	**Accepted**

Cut-off mean = **2.50**; Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **30**; Non-Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **400** and Total = **430**

The data represented in Table 4 shows that, the mean rating scores of principal officer management staff in all items were greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except item 31 with mean scores of 2.87, 2.87, 1.97, 3.33, 3,17, 3.30 and 3.07 respectively. This implies all items were accepted except item 31 by the principal officer management staff. Similarly, the non-principal officer management staff mean rating scores for all items were also greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except item 3 with mean scores of 2.76, 2.66, 2.48, 3.06, 2.96, 3.10 and 2.59 respectively. This implies that all items were accepted except item 3 by the non-principal officer management staff. This reveals that on the whole the total mean rating scores for all items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except item 3 with mean scores of 2.77, 2.67, 2.44, 3.08, 2.97, 3.11 and 2.63 respectively. This implies that all items were accepted except item 3. The grand mean rating score of non-principal officer management staff (2.80) was less than that of the principal officer management staff (2.94) with a total grand rating mean score of (2.81) being greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This simply means that, principal officer management staff mean rating score was better than that of the non-principal officer management staff on their rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students welfare in State owned Universities. Consequent upon the observed difference the mean rating scores were further subjected to ANOVA analysis in order to authenticate if the difference observed is substantial or not.

Research Question 2

What is the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

facilities in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria?

Table 5: Summary of mean and standard deviation scores of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities

S/N	Stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities	Principal Officers		Non-Principal Officers		Total		Decision
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
8	Stakeholders participate in the provision of audio-visual materials	3.27	0.91	2.89	1.05	2.92	1.04	Accepted
9	Stakeholders participate in the provision of online learning	2.67	0.80	2.61	0.98	2.61	0.97	Accepted
10	Stakeholders participate in the provision printing materials	2.80	0.89	2.79	0.94	2.79	0.94	Accepted
11	Stakeholders participate in the provision of classrooms/lecture halls.	3.33	0.71	3.09	0.90	3.10	0.89	Accepted
12	Stakeholders participate in the provision of library and laboratories facilities (utilities in the school)	3.30	0.79	3.15	0.92	3.16	0.91	Accepted
13	Stakeholders participate in the provision of office equipment	2.77	0.97	2.68	1.01	2.69	1.00	Accepted
14	Stakeholders participate in the provision of machineries	2.07	0.91	2.02	0.90	2.02	0.90	Rejected
	Grand Mean/SD	**2.89**	**0.28**	**2.75**	**0.90**	**2.76**	**0.42**	**Accepted**

Cut-off mean = **2.50**; Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **30**; Non-Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **400** and Total = **430**

The data represented in Table 5 reveals that, the mean rating scores of principal officer management staff in all items were greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except item 14 with mean scores of 3.27, 2.67, 2.80, 3.33, 3.30, 2.77 and 2.07 respectively. This implies all items were accepted except item 14 by the principal officer management staff. Similarly, the non-principal officer management staff mean rating scores for all items were also greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except item 14 with mean scores of 2.89, 2.61, 2.79, 3.09, 3.15, 2.68 and 2.02 respectively. This implies that all items were accepted except item 14 by the non-principal officer management staff. It further indicates that, on the whole the total mean rating scores for all items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except item 14 with mean scores of 2.92, 2.61, 2.79, 3.10, 3.16, 2.69 and 2.02 respectively. This implies that all items were accepted except item 14. The grand mean

rating score of non-principal officer management staff (2.75) was less than that of the principal officer management staff (2.89) with a total grand rating mean score of (2.76) being greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This simply means that, principal officer management staff mean rating score was better than that of the non-principal officer management staff on their rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities. Consequent upon the observed difference the mean rating scores were further subjected to ANOVA analysis in order to ascertain if the difference observed is substantial or not.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Table 6: ANOVA analyses of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Principal officer management staff	Between Groups	5.720	3	1.907	2.190	.089
Non-principal officer management staff	Within Groups	370.941	426	.871		
	Total	376.660	429			

The ANOVA analysis does not yield statistically significant results at the 0.05 alpha level, as shown in Table 4.14. Specifically, at the 0.05 level of significance and with 428 degrees of freedom, the probability (Sig.) associated with the ANOVA result which is 0.090 is greater than the alpha value of 0.05. Thus, it is possible to affirm the null hypothesis. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted, which states that principle and non-principal officers' management staff in state-owned universities in South-South Nigeria do not significantly differ in their mean ratings of stakeholders' involvement in supporting students' welfare.

Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.12 (2), May-August, 2024 https://ajemates.org

Table 7: ANOVA analyses of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Principal officer management staff	Between Groups	122.846	202	.608	.878	.090
Non-principal officer management staff	Within Groups	265.433	227	1.169		
	Total	388.279	429			

Source: Author's computation

The data in Table 4.15 indicates that the ANOVA analysis is not statistically significant at the 0.05 alpha level. This is because the probability (Sig.) associated with the ANOVA result which is 0.090 is greater than the alpha value of 0.05 considering 429 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which asserts that there is no significant difference between the average rating of stakeholder participation in the funding of instructional facilities among principal and non-principal officers' management staff in State-owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria, is accepted.

Discussion of Findings

The result presented in Table 4 reveals that, the mean score of principal officer management staff (2.94) was greater than that of non-principal officer management staff (2.80) on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities. Statistical analysis in Table 6 indicates that, there is no significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities.

The result implies that, management staff status does not support management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities. The result also indicates that principal officer management staff rated higher on the stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities than that of their non-principal officer management staff in the study. The rating of the principal officer management staff is expected and not surprising, as a result of their general welfare towards students 'in the university system. Similarly to what Mollet and Pascarella (2016) found, this study found no significant difference in the mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of

students' welfare in state-owned universities between principal and non-principal officers' management staff. However, the results of this study contradict those of Oladipo and Adewale (2018), who found that management staff members who are not principals or vice principals had significantly different opinions on the level of involvement of stakeholders in the funding of student welfare at state-owned universities.

The result presented in Table 5 shows that, the mean score of principal officer management staff (2.89) was greater than that of non-principal officer management staff (2.75) on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities. Statistical analysis in Table 7 indicates that, there is no significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities.

The result implies that, management staff status does not contribute to management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities. The result also indicates that principal officer management staff rated stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities higher than that of their non-principal officer management staff in the study. The rating of the principal officer management staff is expected and not surprising, as a result of their exposure to financial matters more for utilization in the provision of instructional facilities through stakeholders than the non-principal officer management staff in the university system. Consistent with Dare's (2009) findings, this study found no significant difference in the mean evaluation of stakeholders' engagement in the funding of instructional facilities in state-owned universities by management staff members who were principle or non-principal officers. On the other hand, this study's results contradict those of Osaro and Wokekoro (2018), who found that management staff members who are not principals or vice principals rated stakeholders' involvement in the funding of state-owned universities' instructional facilities significantly differently.

Conclusion and Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusion was provided. Management staff status does not significantly influence management staff on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities. Similarly, management staff status does not significantly influence management staff on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities. The following recommendations were formulated in the study.

1. University management staff should not consider their management status as an influencing factor in their mean rating of

stakeholders' participation in the funding of students' welfare in State owned Universities.

2. University management staff should not depend on their management status as an attribute of influence on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of instructional facilities in State owned Universities.

REFERENCES

Chikafalimani, S.H.P., Kibwami, N. & Moyo, S. (2021). Management of facilities at public universities in Africa: current challenges and the way forward. Real estate management and valuation, 29(1), 21-29.

Choi, A & Kim, S. (2007). Stakeholder perceptions of secondary education quality in Sokoto State, Nigeria. *Quality Assurance in Education*; 25 (2): 248-267.

Dare, M.O. (2009). Theories and concepts of educational administration, planning and supervision for tertiary institutions in Nigeria. Kano: Afomat Print.

Kelstron, B.G. (2010). *Financing Higher Education in Sub-Saharan Africa.* Jerry Commercial Productions, Calabar.

Lucas, B. & Gillies, B. (2003). Students' achievement through staff development. Alexandria Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Marsh, S. T. & Kleitman, T. L. (2011). Infrastructure, welfare services and students' perceived motivation to learning in universities in South-West Nigeria. *Quality Assurance in Education*; 25 (2): 248-267.

Mollet, J.M., & PAscarella, R. L. (2016). *Human Resource Development*. Australia: Thomson South Western.

Nura, K. D. (2014). Community participation in the provision and maintenance of infrastructural facilities in public senior secondary schools in Tudun Wada Zonal Education Office, Kano State Nigeria.

Nuru, K. D. (2011). Community participation in the provision and maintenance of infrastructural facilities in public senior secondary schools in Tudun Wada Zonal Education Office, Kano State Nigeria.

Oladipo, O. P. & Adewale, O. T. (2018). Actors in decision making and policy process. *Global Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences; G.J.I.S.S, 5 (1):47-51.*

Osaro, N. G., & Wokekoro, E. (2018). Stakeholders Roles in Improving the Current State of Public Secondary Schools Infrastructure in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention, 5*(3), 4503–4508.

Oseni, M. (2012). Adequacy of Budgetary Allocation to Educational Institutions in Nigeria.*Pakistan Journal of Business and Economic Review, 3 (1).*

Park, E.F. (2000). The role of different stakeholders in Ethiopia in the improvement of educational quality. *International Journal of Research Studies in Education, 2 (1), 11-24.*

Tolutope, I. O, &Dang, P. L. (2019). Funding tertiary education for national development in Nigeria: a historical perspective. KIU Journal of Social Sciences, Kampala International University; 5(2): 59-67.

Woosnam, E., Dixon, I., & Brooker, E. (2009). Funding of university education in Nigeria: the way forward. *International Journal of Higher Education Research, 1(1), 158-166.*