

*Original Research Article*

# Administrators Adoption of Funding Strategies for Resource Improvement in South-South Universities

Prof. Nkechi Ikediugwu and Alphonsus Patrick Udoh\*

## Abstract

Department of Educational  
Management and Policy, Nnamdi  
Azikiwe University, Awka

\*Corresponding Author's E-mail:  
[udoh.alphonsus@yahoo.com](mailto:udoh.alphonsus@yahoo.com)

This study centered on administrators' adoption of funding strategies for resource improvement in South-South Universities. Evaluative survey was adopted for the study. The study comprised of 730 universities administrators in the study areas. However, due to instrument mortality in the administration process, a total of 670 instruments (Federal Universities 366; state universities 304) were successfully returned. These formed the final sample size. Two research questions were answered while two hypotheses were tested in the study at 0.05 alpha level of significance. The instrument for data collection was a questionnaire titled: Administrators Adoption of Funding Strategies for Resource Improvement Questionnaire (AFSRIQ). Mean was used to answer the research questions, the aggregate mean for each cluster were computed separately for federal and state universities respondents on each research question. Research questions were answered using mean scores while hypothesis were tested using IBM statistical package for social sciences (SPSS Statistics) to compare the variability of scores among respondents. The decision rule was to reject a null hypothesis where the significant value was greater than or equal to the alpha value and where the alpha value was less than the significant value, the null hypothesis was not rejected. It was found out that both administrators in federal and state universities agreed that they adopt the public private partnership funding and tertiary education trust fund funding strategies for resource improvement in south-south universities. Among the recommendations made were; Universities administrators should seek for intervention of public private partnership in the development of university. The universities administrators should approach the board of trustee of TETFund agency to reviewed programmes to accommodate non-teaching staff in academic programmes and the 30% allocation to non-teaching staff be reviewed upward. Conclusion was drawn based on the findings.

**Keyword:** Resources, Improvement, Strategies

## INTRODUCTION

A university (Latin: *universitas*, "a whole") is an institution of higher (or tertiary) education and research which grants academic degrees in various subjects and typically provides undergraduate education and postgraduate

education. The word "university" is derived from the Latin *universitas magistrorum et scholarium*, which means "community of teachers and scholars. The governance is undertaken by governing councils partially appointed by

the State Government if the university is funded by state and Federal Government if it is funded by federal as well as the respective university communities; internal university management; University Senates, while standards are regulated by regulatory agency known as the National Universities Commission (NUC). The history of university education in Nigeria is traced to the Elliot Commission of 1943, which culminated in the establishment of University College Ibadan (UCI) in 1948.

In anticipation of indigenous manpower needs of a soon-to-be independent Nigeria, a Commission was set up in April 1959 under the chairmanship of Sir Eric Ashby of Cambridge University, U.K. to conduct an investigation into Nigeria's needs in the field of post-school certificate education over the next twenty years. Among the Commission's recommendations were that: a university should be established in Lagos, the capital city, with emphasis on evening and correspondence programmes; a university should be established in each of the three regions (North, East and West); each university should be autonomous and independent in the conduct of its affairs. The Ashby Commission's recommendation led to the establishment in 1962 of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria (North); the University of Lagos (Capital); and the University of Ife (West). The East was already had its own University of Nigeria Nsukka, established in 1960. These, together with U.C.I. which attained fully fledged status in 1963 as the University of Ibadan (U.I.) and the University of Benin established in 1970 for the newly created Mid-west region, are known today as the first generation universities. In the Third National Development Plan (1975-1980), the Federal Military Government of Nigeria established by fiat seven universities, namely: Universities of Calabar, Ilorin, Jos, Sokoto, Maiduguri, Port Harcourt and Ado Bayero University, Kano. These are the second generation universities. The third generation universities were those established between 1980 and early 1990. They are: the Federal Universities of Technology situated respectively in Owerri, Makurdi, Yola, Akure and Bauchi. Also established during the period were state (regional) universities of Imo, Ondo, Lagos, Akwa-Ibom, and Cross River States. Nearly all of these started operations from make-shift/temporary campuses. The fourth generation universities are those established between 1991 and the present date, most of them without adequate planning, nor feasibility studies. Today, Nigeria has 174 Universities (45 Federal government-owned; 59 state/regional controlled; and 79 private owned).

Universities are role models of innovation and change and they are expected to play a critical role in promoting sustainable economic, social and cultural development. They are the major drivers of economic knowledge-driven global economy. Thus, the universities as higher institutions are established to accomplish specified objectives.

According to National Policy on Education (2016), the teaching and research functions of higher educational institutions have an important role to play in national development particularly in development of high level manpower. Specifically, the aims of higher education in Nigeria as articulated in the National Policy on Education include:

- (a) The acquisition, development and inculcation of the proper value-orientation for the survival of individual and society.
- (b) The development of intellectual capacities of individuals to understand and appreciate their environment.
- (c) The acquisition of both physical and intellectual skills which enable individuals to develop into useful members of the community.
- (d) The acquisition of an objective view of the local and external environments.

The Universities are expected to achieve these objectives through teaching, research, dissemination of existing and new information and service to the community. The extent to which these objectives can be achieved depends greatly funding. The development of effective administrative system in the university administration is a key component and may bring about resource improvement in the system. The roles of university administrators can never be underestimated in this light. Administrators are the most important factors in success of quality assurance maintenance in universities. For effective funding, administrators must be planners, motivators, supervisors, assessors and effective communicators. When administrators understand clearly what their roles are and the impact their contribution has on the quality of university management and administration, they can begin to take major steps toward achieving standards by improving the resources within the system. These can only be achieved by university administrators through strict observation of the educational policies of the country. Grants and contract administration, and institutional compliance with federal and state regulations are also essential responsibilities of university administrators (Graham, 2013).

Public private partnership is defines as a wide range of arrangements opening up to private sector (for-profit and not-for-profit) involvement in delivering public education. Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) is an intervention agency under the TETFund ACT - Tertiary Education Trust Fund (Establishment, etc) Act, 2011; charged with the responsibility for managing, disbursing and monitoring the education tax to public tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

### Statement of the Problem

University, be it publicly or privately owned is the most complex educational institution, in terms of functions,

facilities and scope of operation, designed and established to offer candidates the highest degree of training in various fields than can be expected of any other level of tertiary institution. Universities in Nigeria lack a lot of equipment, materials, facilities and infrastructure for effective teaching, learning and research. Neither the teaching nor research functions have been adequately achieved by lecturers. From available, it has been discovered that south-south universities are lacking so many facilities desks, adequate classroom, hostels, laboratories, teaching aids, computer equipment. This lack of facilities had affected teaching and learning negatively and some negative effects on education, staff and students. It is in search of answers to the above problem that the research work assessed administrator's adoption of some funding strategies for resource improvement in South-South universities.

### **Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the study center on administrators' adoption of funding strategies for Resource Improvement in South-South Universities. Specifically, the study was carried out to find the following:

1. Administrators' adoption of public private partnership funding strategies for resource improvement in South-South Universities.
2. Administrators' adoption of tertiary education trust fund funding strategies for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

### **Research Questions**

The study was guided by the following research questions;

1. What are the public private partnerships funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities?
2. What are the tertiary education trust funds funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities?

### **Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study and were tested at 0.05 levels of significance;

1. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Federal and State Universities on the public private partnership funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South universities.
2. There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Federal and State Universities on the tertiary education

trust fund funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South universities.

### **METHOD**

The research design for the study is evaluative research design. It is a process that critically examines a program. It is the collection of, analysis and interpretation of information about any aspect of a programme of education or training as part of a recognized process of judging its effectiveness. The study was carried out in the Six (6) Federal Universities and Six (6) State Universities in South-South Nigeria. The population of this study comprised seven hundred and thirty (730) university's administrators from the twelve government funded universities in south – south Nigerian. These universities are six federal (394 University administrators) and six state (336 University administrators) universities. Since the population size is not too large for the study; the researcher used the Census sampling technique where all the members of the population were used for the study. However, due to instrument mortality in the administration process, a total of 670 instruments were successfully returned, these formed the final sample size. The instrument for data collection was a questionnaire titled: Administrators Adoption of Funding Strategies for Resource Improvement Questionnaire (AFSRIQ). It consists of Twenty-Three (23) items based on patterned rating scale of Strongly Agree (SA) = 4 points, Agree (A), 3 points, Disagree (D) = 2 points, and Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1 point.

The research purpose, research questions, hypotheses and draft copies of the questionnaire were submitted to two experts in Educational Management & Policy and one expert in Measurement and Evaluation all from the Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikwe University, Awka for validation. These experts examined the items, as well as to ascertain if the items are related to the objectives of the study. The experts reviewed and affirmed the face validation. In answering the research questions, the respondents' mean rating on each item were computed separately and the average mean for the respondents obtained. The aggregate mean for each cluster were computed separately for federal and state universities respondents on each research question. In scoring the questionnaire items, the five clusters in section B were measured on a weighted value of four through one 4= Strongly Agree (SA), 3= Agree (A), 2= Disagree (D), 1= Strongly Disagree (SD). Since the 4point rating scale was used for the instruments, the decision rule was based on the midpoints of 2.50. Therefore, only mean scores of 2.50 and above were accepted as indications of Agree while mean scores below 2.50 were regarded as indications of Disagree. In analyzing the data for the null hypotheses, the IBM

**Table 1.** Summary of Mean Ratings of the Responses of Federal and State Universities on the public private partnership funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

S/N	Items on Public Private Partnership Funding Strategies	Federal Universities		State Universities	
		Mean	Dec.	Mean	Dec.
1	Create service partnership with firms for resource improvement.	3.5	Agree	3.1	Agree
2	Encourage partnerships with Nigerian and foreign higher education institutions for use of resources and exchange of staff and student for resource improvement.	3.5	Agree	2.6	Agree
3	Introduce elements in the tax system to create incentives for private sector participation in the university education for resource improvement.	3.4	Agree	3.1	Agree
4	Provide a direct subsidy to students and staff for resource improvement	3.4	Agree	2.9	Agree
5	Establish a joint company with a private supplier for resource improvement.	3.6	Agree	2.7	Agree
6	Establish a research and development committee constitute of selected members from the university, ministry of education and private sector firms for resource improvement.	3.4	Agree	2.6	Agree
7	Establish PPP Model to involve the private sector in various ways for resource improvement.	3.4	Agree	3.6	Agree
8	Establish specific time frames for the expected tender for resource improvement.	3.5	Agree	3.4	Agree
9	Establish partnership with civil society for resource improvement.	3.3	Agree	3.5	Agree
10	Identify potential private bidder for resource improvement	3.5	Agree	3.2	Agree
11	Increase the availability of infrastructural services for resource improvement.	3.5	Agree	2.8	Agree
	Grand Mean	3.5		3.0	

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS Statistics) was used to compare the variability of scores among respondents on the issues raised in the research questions. The t-test statistical tool was adopted to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. The decision rule was to accept a null hypothesis where the significance value is greater than or equal to the alpha value and where the significance value is less than the alpha value, the null hypothesis is rejected.

## RESULTS

### Research Question 1

What are the public private partnerships funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities?

From table 1 above, items 1 - 11 had mean scores of 3.5, 3.5, 3.4, 3.4, 3.6, 3.4, 3.4, 3.5, 3.3, 3.5, and 3.5 with grand mean of 3.5 for administrators from federal universities. This indicates that administrators from federal universities adopt public private partnership funding strategies. Also from the same table, items 1 - 11

had mean score of 3.1, 2.6, 3.1, 2.9, 2.7, 2.6, 3.6, 3.4, 3.5, 3.2, and 2.8 with grand mean of 3.0 for administrators from state universities. This equally indicates that administrators from state universities adopt all public private partnership funding strategies listed in the study. Looking at the items one after the other, all the items scored high. Therefore, the mean scores of 2.50 and above were accepted as indications of agreed.

In conclusion, the grand mean obtained in the table above indicates that administrators from Federal Universities obtained a grand mean of 3.5 while State Universities obtained a grand mean of 3.0 respectively. Based on the results obtained, both federal and state universities have agreed on the public private partnership funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

### Research Question 2

What are the tertiary education trust funds funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities?

**Table 2.** Summary of Mean Ratings of the Responses of Federal and State Universities on the Tertiary Education Trust Fund funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

S/N	Items on Tertiary Education Trust Fund Funding Strategies	Federal Universities		State Universities	
		Mean	Dec.	Mean	Dec.
12	Promulgation of education tax Act for resource improvement	3.1	Agree	2.7	Agree
13	Enforcement of 2percent of tax on companies for resource improvement	2.9	Agree	3.4	Agree
14	Liaise with Minister for safe keeping of the tax for resource improvement	3.4	Agree	2.7	Agree
15	Collection of tax to be monitor by Federal Inland Revenue Services for resource improvement.	2.9	Agree	3.9	Agree
16	Invest funds in appropriate and safe securities for resource improvement	3.2	Agree	3.2	Agree
17	Ensure funds generated from education tax are utilized for resource improvement.	3.2	Agree	2.7	Agree
18	Ensure disbursement of funds to various institutions for resource improvement.	3.3	Agree	3.0	Agree
19	Establish board of trustee to oversee the agency for resource improvement	3.5	Agree	3.1	Agree
20	Establish special grant from Federal government for resource improvement	3.4	Agree	2.7	Agree
21	Update the Federal government on the activities for resource improvement	2.9	Agree	2.8	Agree
22	Fund allocation to operate as an intervention fund for resource improvement.	2.5	Agree	3.4	Agree
23	Monitor and evaluate execution of the projects for resource improvement.	2.9	Agree	3.1	Agree
	Grand Mean	3.1		3.0	

**Table 3.** The t-test Comparison of mean ratings of Federal and State Universities respondents on the Public Private Partnership funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

Universities	N	$\bar{x}$	S.D	$\partial$	df	Sign.	Decision
Federal	366	51.89	13.21				Insignificant
State	304	12.99	14.97	0.05	668	0.31	H0 <sub>4</sub> Accepted

From table 2 above, items 12 - 23 had mean scores of 3.1, 2.9, 3.4, 2.9, 3.2, 3.2, 3.3, 3.5, 3.4, 2.9, 2.5 and 2.9 with grand mean of 3.1 for administrators from federal universities. This indicates that administrators from federal universities adopt tertiary education trust fund funding strategies. Also from the same table, items 12 - 23 had mean score of 2.7, 3.4, 2.7, 3.9, 3.2, 2.7, 3.0, 3.1, 2.7, 2.8, 3.4, and 3.1 with grand mean of 3.0 for administrators from state universities. This equally indicates that administrators from state universities adopt all tertiary education trust fund funding strategies listed in the study. Looking at the items one after the other, all the items scored high. Therefore, the mean scores of 2.50 and above were accepted as indications of agreed.

In conclusion, the grand mean obtained in the table above indicates that administrators from Federal Universities obtained a grand mean of 3.1 while State Universities obtained a grand mean of 3.0 respectively.

Based on the results obtained, both federal and state universities have agreed on the tertiary education trust fund funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

### Hypothesis

#### Null Hypothesis 1

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Federal and State Universities on the public private partnership funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South universities.

Table 3 shows a summary of means, standard deviations and significant value on the difference between Federal and State Universities on the public

**Table 4.** The t-test Comparison of mean ratings of Federal and State Universities respondents on the tertiary education trust fund funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

Universities	N	$\bar{x}$	S.D	$\partial$	df	Sign.	Decision
Federal	366	51.40	13.98				Significant
State	304	48.35	18.42	0.05	668	0.02	H <sub>05</sub> Rejected

private partnership funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities. The significant value stood at 0.31 using 668 degrees of freedom at 0.05 alpha level of significant. At the 668 degrees of freedom and 0.05 level of significant, the significant value is 0.31, therefore, null hypothesis is accepted. Based on the above observation, the researcher accepted the hypothesis and hence concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Federal and State Universities respondents on the public private partnership funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

### Null Hypothesis 2

There is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Federal and State Universities on the tertiary education trust fund funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South universities.

Table 4 shows a summary of means, standard deviations and significant value on the difference between Federal and State Universities on the tertiary education trust fund funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities. The significant value stood at 0.02 using 668 degrees of freedom at 0.05 alpha level of significant. At the 668 degrees of freedom and 0.05 alpha level of significant, the significant value is 0.02, therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Based on the above observation, the researcher accepted the hypothesis and hence concluded that there is no significant difference in the mean ratings of Federal and State Universities respondents on the tertiary education trust fund funding strategies adopted by the administrators for resource improvement in South-South Universities.

### DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The result of the findings for both federal and state universities indicates support to the strategies listed in the study for public private partnership funding. It shows that both federal universities and state universities in South-South Nigeria agreed on the strategies mentioned. The strategies among others include; creating service

partnership with firms, encourage partnerships with Nigerian and foreign higher education, introduce elements in the tax system to create incentives for private sector participation in the university education, and to establish a joint company with a private supplier etc. above all, to establish a research and development committee from the university and private sector firm.

This finding is in support with the view of Charles (2002) who posited that private sector is the part of country's economy owned, operated and managed by private individuals. This is also in agreement with the view Oduleye (2002) who state that Government can no longer single handedly fund educational institution in the country. It should be noted that public private partnership of great importance to economic growth of any university and it reduces Government burden for infrastructural development. This finding agrees with Emunenu (2008) that government alone cannot meet the demand of the university; hence, there is need, therefore for a greater community and civil society participation in provision managing and funding education. It is in this regard that private sector contributions are inevitable in managing university education. For example, the governor of Akwa Ibom State Obong Godswill Akpabio gave a donation of 50million and a bus (UNIZIK.NEWSLETTER, 2011).

programmes where professionals ad entrepreneurs have links with students, among others. If there strategies are The finding also is in agreement with Okuwa (2004) who noted that considering the enormous cost of running education in this country it is generally advocated among policy makers that education funding should be the joint responsibility of the government, the private sectors and the beneficiaries. The findings again agree with Emunenu (2008) who suggested a number of strategies that could promote more private sector contributions to university educational as: making provision for management expertise partnership among the private sector to set up academics for a particular industry. Example; Tourism, mentor fully harnessed by South-south Universities management, much improvement would be achieved in areas of funding and academic progress.

The result of the findings for both federal and state universities implies that both federal and state universities in south-south Nigeria are in support of the Tertiary education trust fund funding strategies adopted by administrators for resource improvement in South-South Federal and State Universities. The strategies among others include; promulgation of education tax Act,

enforcement of 2percent of tax on companies, monitor and evaluation of the projects, establish board of trustee to oversee the agency etc. These findings agreed with the view of an act that established the tertiary education trust fund (TETFund). The findings further revealed in agreement with Bahayo (2010) that against the background of deteriorating educational infrastructure and failing standard of education in the late 80's and early 90's in Nigerian agitations arose for reforms in the education sector, in response, the Education Tax Fund was established in 1993 under decree No.7 as amended by Act No.40 of 1998 as a Trust Fund, with the objective of using funding with project management to improve the quality of education in Nigeria. Act No.40 of 1998 amended the law establishing the Fund to reposition it to meet with new challenges. Anuku (2011) also stated that in repositioning the Fund, the law was again amended in May 2011as Tertiary Education Trust Fund to carter for educational problems of tertiary institutions only.

This findings agrees with Bogoro (2015) which states that tertiary education Act 2011 as intervention agency set up to provide supplementary support to all levels of public tertiary institutions with the main objectives of using funding alongside project management for the rehabilitation, restoration and consolidation of tertiary education in Nigeria. The main source of income available to the fund is the two percent education tax paid from the assessable profit of companies registered in Nigeria. The federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) assesses and collects the tax on behalf of the fund. The funds should be disbursed for the general improvement of education in federal and state tertiary educational institutions especially for the provision or maintenance of; essential physical infrastructure for teaching learning, instructional materials and equipment, research and publication, academic staff training and development and any other need which in the opinion of the Board of Trustees is critical and essential for the improvement and maintenance of standards in the higher educational institutions.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, both federal and state universities supported the strategies universities adopt for public private partnership funding for resource improvement in south-south universities. The implication is that universities administrators are aware of public-private partnership relationships between private sectors and government agencies with the intention of implementation projects that are designed for public good. Furthermore, both federal and state universities agreed on the strategies universities adopt for tertiary education trust fund funding for resource improvement in south-south Universities. There is the implication that the universities

administrators are becoming aware of the tertiary education trust fund establishment act enacted by the National Assembly of the Federal Republic of Nigeria that the tax at the rate of two (2) percent shall be charged on the assessable profit of a company registered in Nigeria.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the finding of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Universities administrators should seek for intervention of public private partnership in the development of university. A PPP allows both the public and private sectors to take on certain roles and enjoy certain advantages relative to each other while performing their specific tasks. The government's contribution to a PPP may take the form of capital for investment, a transfer of assets, or other commitments or in-kind contributions that support the partnership.
2. The universities administrators should approach the board of trustee of TETFund agency to reviewed programmes to accommodate non-teaching staff in academic programmes and the 30% allocation to non-teaching staff be reviewed upward.
3. The university management needs to close monitor and supervision of these funding strategies to ensure accountability and profitability. The proceeds from these can then be effectively utilized to enable qualitative university education.
4. It is advisable that university administrators adopt transformational leadership style based on improvement of staff and student welfare while not neglecting infrastructural development through prudent management of the resources.

## REFERENCES

- Anuku W (2011). *Tertiary education trust fund bill*. Retrieved from <http://www.elendureports.com>.
- Babayo M (2010). ETF (2009). *Annual report*. Cavalet Publications Ltd.
- Bogoro S (2015). Why Private Institutions Can't Benefit from TETFund. Vanguard Nigeria. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2015/01/private-institutions-cant-benefit-tetfund-bogoro/>. Accessed 20/12/2014
- Emunenu BO (2008). Private sector participation in education and skills development in nigeria. *European Journal of Social Sciences* 6(4), 615-170 Retrieved from [www.eurojournals.com](http://www.eurojournals.com)
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2016). *National policy on education, Lagos*: Federal ministry of Education press.
- Graham C (2013). "Changing technologies, changing identities: A case study of professional staff and their contributions to learning and teaching". Perspectives: Policy and Practice in Higher Education. 17 (2): 62–70
- Okuwa OB (2004, March). *Private returns to higher education in Nigeria*. Paper presented at the conference of the AFRICAN Economic Research Consortium (AERC), Nairobi.
- UNIZIK NEWS (2011). *Special anniversary magazine of nnamdi azikiwe university, Awka*. 2(1):1