European Journal of Education Studies
ISSN: 2501 - 1111
ISSN-L: 2501 - 1111
Available online at: www.oapub.org/edu

DOI: 10.46827/ejes.v10i5.4834 Volume 10 │ Issue 5 │ 2023

FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION OF TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN EKITI STATE, NIGERIA

Bolarinwa Dapo Alonge[i],
Ayodele Joseph Babatola,
Fagbohun Abiodun Akin
Department of Educational Management,
Faculty of Education,
P.M.B. 5363,
Ekiti State University,
Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria

Abstract:
The study examined the impact of funding on the administration of tertiary institutions in Ekiti State, Nigeria. A descriptive research design of the correlational study was employed for the study. The population for the study consisted of four bursars, 24 Deans and 142 Heads of Departments. The sample consisted of four Bursars, 20 Deans and 60 Heads of Departments. Two sets of validated instruments, Administration of Tertiary Institutions Questionnaire (ATIQ) and Funding of Tertiary Institutions Questionnaire (FTIQ) were used to collect data from a sample of 80 respondents. A purposive sampling technique was used to select four Bursars while a simple random sampling technique was used to select 80 Deans and Heads of Departments. Percentage and Pearson product-moment correlation statistics were used for the study. The study revealed that the level of administration of tertiary institutions in Ekiti State was moderate; the extent of funding in tertiary institutions was moderate; there was a significant relationship between funding and administration of tertiary institutions; there was no significant relationship between grants, internally generated revenue and administration of tertiary institutions. It was recommended that administrators of tertiary institutions should not relent on their efforts at improving upon the level of administration and ensuring that they look inward and outward to source for revenue; source for regular grants; and endeavour to increase investment on some viable projects that can improve internally generated revenue.

Keywords: funding, grants, internally generated revenue, administration, tertiary institutions

[i] Correspondence: email dapo.bolarinwa@eksu.edu.ng

1. Introduction

In Nigeria, tertiary institutions are regarded as the entire room for economic and national development. They are veritable tools for the realisation of national development; the development of cultured citizens and the promotion of basic research. According to Tolu-Kolawole (2023), World Bank asserted that tertiary education is instrumental in fostering growth, reducing poverty, and boosting shared prosperity. Abdu (2003) cited Olofin (2021) also asserted that tertiary institutions relate to all forms of post-secondary education which are Universities, Polytechnics, Monotechnics, Colleges of Education, Professional and Innovation Enterprise Institutions.

Funds could be likened to the pivot on which planning and implementations revolve because money appears to be central to the achievement of objectives since resources must be obtained with money directly or indirectly. Hence, the administrative functions of facilitating teaching, research and community service can only be carried out with adequate funding. Funding is a very significant issue which plays a crucial role in tertiary institutions. The federal and state government are considered to play a central role in funding the tertiary institutional system. Funding tertiary institutions in Nigeria today is a crucial national problem. The political, social and economic factors which are currently having a significant impact on the world economy, have necessitated the need to diversify the sources of education funding, mainly because reliance on only one source of revenue can inhibit educational growth. However, some possible options for funding are: subvention from the government; tuition and fees; gifts, donations and endowment; internally generated revenue and Education Trust Fund/Tertiary Education Trust fund.

It is highly unfortunate that the ability of the administrators of tertiary institutions in Ekiti State to act as an engine room for teaching, research and community service seems to be hindered by the long-standing problem of inadequate funding. Ezekwesili (2006) affirmed that underfunding of education, especially at the tertiary level has become a persistent occurrence in Nigeria as funds released to the tertiary sector can no longer meet the increasing demands and growth of Nigerian tertiary institutions. Nigerian government's priority in terms of funding institutions appears to have declined and this has limited the ability of the tertiary institutions' administrators to effectively and efficiently perform their duties, particularly in the area of teaching, research and community service. However, Nigerian government has not been able to fund tertiary institutions adequately in order to achieve the best results (Famade, Omiyale and Adebola, 2015). According to Adeniyi (2008), the subvention received by the tertiary institutions from the federal government is inadequate in meeting their financial demands in terms of teaching, research and community service.

It appears the problem of inadequate funding of tertiary institutions in Ekiti State is a consequence of the expansion of the educational system in response to the increasing demand for higher education without an increase in the corresponding rate of available financial resources. According to Okebukola (2018), all the communiqués and resolutions of major conferences and summits on the state of higher education in Nigeria have funding as issues that should be addressed in order to get university education back on track. In addition, Tejumaiye (2023) asserted that in today's university financing, the Federal Government of Nigeria is not doing enough.

The government for a long time has been the sole financier of tertiary institutions in Nigeria but as a result of economic depression and a drastic drop in oil receipts, the country now faces tight budget constraints. Consequently, the federal government has made it mandatory for federal tertiary institutions to generate 10 percent of their total fund internally while the government provides the remaining 90 percent. As a result, Nigeria federal universities have embarked on income-generating activities as directed by the National Universities Commission (Okojie, 2010). According to Adeyemi (2011), no organisation could survive or carry out its functions effectively without adequate finance at its disposal. This assertion could be due to the fact that an organisation is in need of resources to carry out their activities whether they are production or service-oriented, public or private and profit or non-profit driven. The resources are purchased or hired with exchanges of funds in a legally binding offer and acceptance procedure. The availability, adequacy, utilisation and control of funds become very important because these processes could determine the level of achievement of objectives or in specific terms, how far the organisation can go and will go in achieving its objectives.

Grants come from states, corporations and other private organisations. It appears these are not forthcoming to the administrators of tertiary institutions in Nigeria. In the case of internally generated revenue, it seems, individual tertiary institutions could not supplement their funding stream through the establishment of revenue-yielding ventures as such ventures like bookshop, hotel and catering services, printing press, and consultancy services are veritable means of raising funds needed to enhance their service delivery. The federal government had thought of centrally managing the internally generated revenue pool from all the federal tertiary institutions, such that each tertiary institution was required to forward the yearly internally generated revenue inflows to the government and to thereafter, apply for release back to it the amount needed for the local use. This directive did not survive because of its obvious resistance (Okojie, 2010).

The administration is the coordination of physical, human and financial resources towards the realisation of group objectives. The administration of tertiary institutions is the way in which tertiary institutions are operated. According to Arowosegbe (2021), the administration is a social process concerned with identifying, maintaining, motivating, controlling and unifying formally and informally organised human and material resources within an integrated system designed specifically to achieve predetermined objectives. Therefore, it has been observed by the researchers that tertiary institutions in Ekiti State are not well coordinated in terms of teaching, research and community service. A key variable that is of importance to the performance of academic staff is the work environment. According to Sadiku (2017), it appears that the constituents of a good work environment like internet facilities, relevant library books, laboratory equipment and so on which are relevant to academic staff job performance seem not to be sufficiently available in many Nigerian tertiary institutions. Academic staff participation in capacity-building programme seems significantly low with respect to workshops, seminars, conferences, internet communication technology training for research. According to Bell

(2011), the academic goals achievement parameter like research publications, community services, and performance is completely dependent on the adequate provision of instructional facilities. The implication is that when instructional facilities are in short supply, teaching and learning which the primary role of academic staff is impaired. In support, Afe (2017) opined that teaching tasks are done through conscious and deliberate effort. In the words of Adeboyeje (2010), for academic staff to perform their job creditably, the constituents of a good work environment must be provided in adequate quantity and quality. In the area of community service, it seems members of the staff are not ready to render any service. According to Sadiku (2017), staffs are unable to render their services as expected by the administrators and they cannot expedite action toward effective performance.

According to Lapworth (2004), the administration of tertiary institutions is the means by which tertiary institutions are formally organised and managed. Simply, the administration of tertiary institutions is the way in which universities are operated. Administrative structures for the administration of tertiary institutions are highly differentiated throughout the world but the different models nonetheless share a common heritage. Internationally, tertiary education includes private not-for-profit, private for-profit, and public institutions governed by differentiated structures of management. Administration of tertiary institutions become even more diverse with the differences in defining the relationships between higher and tertiary education (university education), post-secondary education, technical and vocational education, and community college models of education. The issues are complicated by current debates over collegial and shared forms of administration contrasted to corporate and business forms of institutional administration. Administration in tertiary institutions predominantly referred to the internal structure, organisation and management of autonomous institutions.

The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) was the first organisation to formulate a statement on the administration of tertiary institutions based on principles of democratic values and participation (which in this sense, correlates with the Yale Report of 1828 which has been referred to as the first attempt at a formally stated philosophy of education for tertiary institutions, emphasising at that time that enlightenment curricula following the establishment of democratic constitutional governance should not be replaced with retrogression to religious curricula). The AAUP published its first statement on the administration of colleges and universities in 1920 emphasising the importance of faculty involvement in personnel decisions, selection of administrators, preparation of the budget, and determination of educational policies. According to Waziri (2023), without a doubt, our public Universities are in a sorry state, and this should not surprise anyone. We cannot continue to run Universities like the regular civil service. We need to review the current governance structure and let go of some layers that do not necessarily conduce to good governance.

According to Bursars of Nigerian Universities (2010), a fund is a sum of money or other resources segregated for the purpose of carrying on specific activities or attaining certain objectives in accordance with specific regulations, restrictions or limitations and constitutes an independent fiscal accounting entity. In her words, Olofin (2021) opined that researchers agreed that funding is not the availability of funds alone but includes other activities that related to money and its management. Adedeji (2010) said that funding is the means usually employed to provide for the expenditure involved in staffing, equipment and maintenance of educational institutions. Oladeji (2010) opined that funding in the University setting includes the efficient and effective deployment of an institution's financial resources when needed to most preferred programmes in an effort to achieve its goals and objectives.

According to Sadiku (2017), the government is the major source of funds for federal universities in Nigeria. It provides 90 percent of the total income disbursed through the National Universities Commission (a buffer organisation that assists the government in coordinating the affairs of the universities), and the remaining 10 percent is locally generated by each university. He went further that some of the key agencies that have supported Nigerian federal universities include: John, D and Catherine, IT., MacArthur Foundation and others. In support, Bamiro and Adedeji (2010) gave instances that the University of Ibadan, Nigeria was awarded a total of $10.4 million between the year 2000 and 2010 and $3.1 million to Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria for the period 2008-2010 by MacArthur and Carnegie Foundation respectively for various development projects. According to Lee (2017), as states experience fiscal challenges, higher education institutions across Nigeria are facing a reduction in publicly funded support. One of the ways to counter this loss of revenue is by winning grants from the government and private entities. Babalola (2022) opined that to date, our public institutions are characterised by poor funding, infrastructural decay, non-payment of earned salaries of academic staff, and incessant industrial action. In support, Bakare (2021) asserted that Nigeria's 98 public Universities suffer from chronic underfunding; often leading to strikes by lecturers and staff over the payment of salaries and welfare issues. In a study carried out by Nakpodia (2011) on integrative funding and effective implementation of Universal Basic Education programme in Central District of Delta State, Nigeria; the study revealed that the government contributed adequate finance towards the effective implementation of the Universal Basic Education programme in the State.

Tertiary institutions all over the world have developed different channels of generating fund for their operations. According to Akinsanya (2007), in Nigeria, the federal government has compelled each university to generate at least 10 percent of its total revenue. In addition, as it has become obvious that the government cannot fully fund education and given the involvement of the private sector which the government is unwilling to support financially, the role of internally generated revenue, therefore, becomes more critical (Aina, 2005; Okojie, 2010). According to Hartnett (2017), student contributions for the period 1986-1994 increased from 0.28 percent to 3.89 percent. Also, between 1988 and 1998, the total income from students' fees in universities increased from 4 percent to 10 percent.

The four sources of revenue for Nigerian tertiary institutions according to Sanni (2015) are:

a) Subventions from the proprietors which account for 78% of the total funds which constitute more than 90% in the state tertiary institutions, 80% in the federal government tertiary institutions and 35% in the private tertiary institutions.
b) Revenues from tuition fees which are about 18% of the total funds in government tertiary institutions but it is as high as 64% in private tertiary institutions.
c) Investments and other internally generated revenue constitute just 2% of the total revenue.
d) Donations, endowment funds, grants and other forms of gifts constitute mere 1% of the revenue.

1.1 Principal-Agent Theory

Principal-Agent theory emerged in the 1970s from the combined discipline of Economics and institutional theory. There is some contention as to who originated the theory, with theorist Stephen Rose and Barry Mitnick both claiming authorship. It was developed with the aim of explaining how best to organise relationships between two involved parties. The two parties that are involved in this relationship are the principal (the government that delegates) and the agent (the administrators of tertiary institutions to whom authority is delegated). The expectation in this relationship is that the agent will make the best decisions that are in the best interest of the principal, and, in return, the principal will provide the agent with sufficient resources and payment to accomplish the established task (Asya, 2015). Since public institutions are formed and funded by the government, they are obliged to the government to fulfil the needs of society to create, preserve and transmit knowledge (Lane & Kivisto, 2008).

2. Research Questions

The following research questions were raised for the study:
1) What is the level of administration in tertiary institutions?
2) What is the extent of funding in tertiary institutions?

2.1 Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated for the study:
1) There is no significant relationship between funding and administration of tertiary institutions.
2) There is no significant relationship between grants and the administration of tertiary institutions.
3) There is no significant relationship between internally generated revenue and the administration of tertiary institutions.

3. Literature Review

3.1 Concept of Funding

A fund is a pool of money set aside for a specific purpose. The pool of money in a fund is often invested and professionally managed in order to generate returns for its investors. Some common types of funds include pension funds, insurance funds, foundations, and endowments. Fund according to Bursars of Nigerian Universities (2010) cited in Olofin (2021) could be likened to the pivot on which planning and implementations revolve because, money appears to be central to the achievement of objectives since resources must be obtained with money directly or indirectly. They went further than fund is a sum of money or other resources segregated for the purpose of carrying on specific activities or attaining certain objectives in accordance with specific regulations, restrictions or limitations and constitutes an independent fiscal accounting entity.

According to Oladeji (2010), funding is the organisation of funds in the university to achieve university's objective of teaching, research and community service and leadership. He went further that funding in the university setting includes the efficient and effective deployment of an institution's financial resources when needed to most preferred programmes in an effort to achieve its goals and objectives. Funding to Adedeji (2010) is the means usually employed to provide for the expenditure involved in staffing, equipment and maintenance of educational institutions.

3.2 Concept of Tertiary Institutions

Tertiary institutions are all formal post-secondary education, including public and private universities, colleges, technical training institutes, and vocational schools. In Nigeria, they are institutions offering higher and advanced forms of education in the nation's universities, colleges of education, polytechnics and monotechnics.

According to Olofin (2021), tertiary institutions relate to all forms of post-secondary education which are universities, polytechnics and monotechnics, colleges of education, and professional and innovative enterprise institutions. Federal Republic of Nigeria (2019) opined that these institutions are under the supervision of different Commissions such as the National Universities Commission (NUC), National Board for Technical Education (NBTE), National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) and Professional Institutes respectively.

4. Material and Methods

Descriptive survey and correlational research methods were used for this study. As of the time of this study, the population consisted of four Bursars, 24 Deans and 142 Heads of Departments in the four public tertiary institutions in Ekiti State, Nigeria (Source: Department of Planning and Statistics of each institution). The sample for the study consisted of 84 respondents comprising four Bursars, 20 Deans and 60 Heads of Departments. A purposive sampling technique was used to select one Bursar from each of the four institutions because, these institutions have four Bursars. A simple random sampling technique was used to select four Deans from each of the institutions and 15 Heads of Departments from each of the institutions. Two sets of instruments titled, Administration of Tertiary Institutions Questionnaire (ATIQ) and Funding of Tertiary Institutions Questionnaire (FTIQ) were used to collect data for the study. The instrument was shown to specialists in the field of Tests and Measurement and Educational Management who checked and read the contents for adequate coverage of the topic and clarity of the items for face and content validities. The reliability coefficient (r) calculated were 0.73 and 0.81 for ATIQ and FTIQ respectively through the test-retest method, which was high enough to ensure the reliability of the instruments. Two sets of the instrument were administered personally by the researchers. The hypotheses formulated were tested at a 0.05 level of significance using Pearson's product-moment correlation statistics.

5. Results

The research questions raised and the hypotheses formulated for the study were descriptively analysed and tested respectively as shown in tables 1-6.

Table 1: List of Tertiary Institutions, Deans and Heads of Departments in Ekiti State, Nigeria

Tertiary Institutions	Deans of Faculties	Number of Departments
Federal University, Oye-Ekiti	7	39
Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti	8	53
Federal Polytechnic, Ado-Ekiti	4	27
Ekiti State College of Education, Ikere-Ekiti	5	27

Source: Department of Planning and Statistics of each institution (2020)

The sample for this study consisted of 84 respondents comprising four Bursars selected purposively because these institutions have four bursars, 20 Deans and 60 Heads of Departments who were selected with a simple random sampling technique. Two sets of instruments are titled, Funding of Tertiary Institutions Questionnaire (FTIQ) and Administration of Tertiary Institutions Questionnaire (ATIQ).

Table 2: Level of Administration in Tertiary Institutions

Level of effectiveness	Frequency	Percentage
Low (22-49.82)	13	16.2
Moderate (49.83-51.98)	51	63.8
High (51.99-88)	16	20.0
Total	100	80

Table 2 presents the level of administration in tertiary institutions. The result shows that out of 80 respondents sampled, 13 representing 16.2 percent had a low level. Those who had moderate levels were 51 representing 63.8 percent while those with high levels were 16 representing 20.0 percent. This shows that the level of administration in tertiary institutions was moderate.

Table 3: Extent of Funding in Tertiary Institutions in Ekiti State

		100%	90%	80%	70%	>50%	<50%
Proportion of total annual institutional revenue	Grants	-	-	-	-	-	4(100%)
	Internally generated revenue	-	-	-	-	1(25%)	3(75%)
	Sundry sources	-	-	-	-	-	4(100%)
Proportion of expected annual revenue	Grants	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Internally generated revenue	-	-	-	-	1(25%)	3(75%)
	Sundry sources	-	-	-	-	1(25%)	3(75%)
Proportion of total annual institutional expenditure	Grants					2(50%)	2(50%)
	Internally generated revenue	-	-	-	-	2(50%)	2(50%)
	Sundry sources	-	-	-	-	4(100%)	-
Proportion of total annual expenditure covered from the three sources		-	-	-	2	2	-

Tertiary institutions in Ekiti State depend on government grants, internally generated revenue and sundry sources such as donations, endowments and gifts for their income (revenue). Table 3 shows that none of the identified three sources of revenue accounted for a substantial part of the income. None of the institutions received 100% of their annual income from government grants or expected this much. All four institutions reported that they received less than 50% of their income from grants. Internally generated revenue efforts equally yielded less than 50% of income to three of the institutions while one of them reported income greater than 50% from internally generated revenue sources. Sundry expenses also accounted for less than 50% of income in all the four institutions. Table 3 also shows that expected annual grants for the four institutions did not account for a substantial part of their income; only one of the institutions expected more than 50% of the internally generated revenue while the remaining three institutions expected less than 50% of internally generated revenue; and one of the institutions expected more than 50% from sundry sources while three of the institutions expected less than 50% from sundry sources.

In addition, Table 3 shows that none of the three sources of revenue accounted for a substantial part of their expenditures. None of the institutions covered 100% of the annual expenditure from government grants, internally generated revenue and other sources. Only two of the institutions reported that their sum of expenditure from grants was less than 50% from grants. Internally generated revenue effort equally yielded less than 50% of expenditure to two of the institutions while two of them reported greater than 50% from internally generated revenue sources. Sundry sources also accounted for more than 50% of expenditure in all the four institutions. The institutions were asked to estimate the proportion of their annual expenditure covered by the three sources. Two of the institutions were able to cover up to 80% of them from the three sources which means that they are running a budget deficit of 20% while the other two institutions were able to cover up to 70% of their expenditure from the three sources of revenue, indicating that they are having a deficit of 30%. From the above explanations, it can be deduced that none of the institutions were able to cover 100% of their expenditure which means that they are devising other means from other sources apart from the above-mentioned sources of revenue. Therefore, the extent of funding in tertiary institutions is inadequate.

Table 4: Test of Relationship between Funding and Administration of Tertiary Institutions

Variables	N	Mean	SD	r	P
Funding of tertiary institutions	4	5.75	0.500	0.524*	0.476
Administration of tertiary institutions	4	49.83	2.161		

*p<0.05 (significant result)

Table 4 shows the relationship between funding and administration of tertiary institutions. The result shows that the r-calculated value (0.524) is greater than the r-table value (0.476). Therefore, the null hypothesis earlier formulated is rejected. This then means that there was a significant relationship between funding and administration of tertiary institutions.

Table 5: Test of Relationship between Grants and Administration of Tertiary Institutions

Variables	N	Mean	SD	r	P
Grants	4	7.25	0.957	0.064	0.936
Administration of tertiary institutions	4	49.83	2.161		

p>0.05

Table 5 shows the relationship between grants and the administration of tertiary institutions. The result shows that the r-calculated value (0.064) is less than the r-table value (0.936). Therefore, the null hypothesis earlier formulated is accepted. This implies that there was no significant relationship between grants and administration of tertiary institutions.

Table 6: Test of Relationship between Internally Generated
Revenue and Administration of Tertiary Institutions

Variables	N	Mean	SD	r	P
Internally generated revenue	4	7.00	1.414	0.229	0.771
Administration of tertiary institutions	4	49.83	2.161		

p>0.05

Table 6 shows the relationship between internally generated revenue and the administration of institutions. The result shows that the r-calculated value (0.229) is less than the r-table value (0.771). Therefore, the null hypothesis earlier formulated is accepted. This implies that there was no significant relationship between internally generated revenue and the administration of tertiary institutions.

6. Discussion

The study revealed that the level of administration of tertiary institutions in Ekiti State, Nigeria, is moderate. This might be as a result of the administrators' planning, coordinating, organising and directing during the course of discharging their administrative duties. This is in agreement with Arowosegbe (2021) who asserted that administration is a social process concerned with identifying, maintaining, motivating, controlling and unifying formally and informally organised human and material resources within an integrated system designed specifically to achieve predetermined objectives; Lapworth (2004) who noted that administration of tertiary institution is the means by which tertiary institutions are formally organised and managed.

The study revealed that the extent of funding in tertiary institutions was inadequate. This might be as a result of underfunding. This finding is supported of Ezekwesili (2006) who affirmed that underfunding of education, especially at the tertiary level has become a persistent g. occurrence in Nigeria as funds released to the tertiary sector can no longer meet the increasing demands and growth of Nigerian tertiary institutions; Okebukola (2018) opined that all the communiqués and resolutions of major conferences and submits on the state of higher education in Nigeria have funding as issues that should be addressed in order to get University education back on track; and Tejumaiye (2023) who asserted that in today's university financing, the Federal Government of Nigeria is not doing enough.

The study revealed that there was a significant relationship between funding and administration of tertiary institutions. This means that funding will enhance the administration of tertiary institutions. This might be due to the ability of the tertiary institutions' administrators to generate revenue internally. This finding is in support of Adeyemi (2011) who opined that no organisation could survive or carry out its functions effectively without adequate finance at its disposal; Okojie (2010) who asserted that the federal government made it mandatory for federal tertiary institutions to generate 10 percent of her total fund internally while the government provides the remaining; and Sadiku (2017) who opined that government is the major source of funds for federal universities in Nigeria. It provides 90 percent of the total income disbursed through the National Universities Commission (a buffer organisation that assists the government in coordinating the affairs of the universities), the remaining 10 percent is locally generated by each university. He went further that some of the key agencies that have supported Nigerian federal universities include: John, D and Catherine, IT., MacArthur Foundation and others and in support, Bamiro and Adedeji (2010) gave instances that the University of Ibadan, Nigeria was awarded a total of $10.4 million between the year 2000 and 2010 and $3.1 million to Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria for the period 2008-2010 by MacArthur and Carnegie Foundation respectively for various development projects.

The study revealed that there was no significant relationship between grants and administration of tertiary institutions. This implies that grants will not enhance the administration of tertiary institutions. This might be due to the inability of the administrators of tertiary institutions to source for grants. This finding is in support of Lee (2017) who opined that as States experience fiscal challenges, higher education institutions across Nigeria are facing a reduction in publicly funded support. One of the ways to counter this loss of revenue is by winning grants from the government and private entities.

The study revealed that there was no significant relationship between internally generated revenue and the administration of tertiary institutions. This implies that internally generated revenue will not enhance the administration of tertiary institutions. This might be due to the inability of the administrators of tertiary institutions to know where to source for internally generated revenue. This finding is in support of Adeniyi (2008) who said that the subvention received by the tertiary institutions from the federal government is inadequate in meeting their financial demands in terms of teaching, research and community service; Akinsanya (2007) who said that in Nigeria, the federal government has compelled each university to generate at least 10 percent of its total revenue; Aina (2005), Okojie (2010) who asserted that as it has become obvious that the government cannot fully fund education and given the involvement of private sector which the government is unwilling to support financially, role of internally generated revenue, therefore, becomes more critical; and Hartnett (2017) opined that student contributions for the period 1986-1994 increased from 0.28 percent to 3.89 percent. Also, between 1988 and 1998, the total income from students' fees in universities increased from 4 percent to 10 percent.

7. Recommendations

School administrators should not relent on their efforts at improving the level of administration of tertiary institutions; efforts should also be made by the administrators to improve upon the level of their administration of tertiary institutions; federal and state governments should show greater commitment to the funding of tertiary institutions, and the government should not relent on their efforts at showing commitment to the funding of tertiary institutions; regular grants should be given to tertiary institutions to improve on administration; and tertiary institutions' management should endeavour to increase investment in some viable projects that can improve internally generated revenues.

8. Conclusion

This paper reviewed various literatures that are relevant to the funding and administration of tertiary institutions. Based on the finding of this study, it was concluded that the level of effectiveness of administrators in tertiary institutions was satisfactory; the area in which tertiary institutions are expected to be funded was not much; funding has a meaningful impact on the administration of tertiary institutions; and, grants and internally generated revenue have no influence on the administration of tertiary institutions.

Acknowledgments
We sincerely appreciate the tertiary institutions sampled for this study in Ekiti State for their assistance and cooperation during the administration of the instruments. We acknowledge with thanks and immense gratitude, all the sources cited in this study and

the ideas borrowed from published and unpublished sources. We cannot but express our sincere appreciation to Dr. Bolarinwa Dapo Alonge who typed the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Authors

Bolarinwa Dapo Alonge is a Lecturer 1. He holds PhD in Educational Management. His research interest is in Educational Administration.
Orcid ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-6399-4389
Ayodele Joseph Babatola is a Professor. He holds PhD in Educational Management. His research interest is in Educational Planning and Economics of Education.
Fagbohun Abiodun Akin is a Postgraduate student. His research interest is in Educational Planning.

References

Adeboyeje, R. A. (2010). *A practical approach to effective utilisation and maintenance of physical facilities in schools*. Publication of the National Institute for Educational Planning and Administration, Ondo, Nigeria.

Adedeji, A. O. (2010). *Principals' authority and teachers' performance in selected secondary schools in Akure Local Government Area of Ondo State, Nigeria.* Unpublished M.Ed Thesis, Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Adeniyi, P. O. (2008). *Repositioning Nigerian Universities for national sustainable development*. A paper presented at the 10th Iju quarterly public affairs forum services, Ondo State, Nigeria.

Adeyemi, T. O. (2011). Principal' leadership styles and teachers' job performance in Senior Secondary Schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Current Research Journal of Economic Theory*, 3, 84-92.

Afe, J. O. (2017). *Teacher education in Nigeria: Trend, issues and challenges.* Nigerian Educational Research Association, University of Benin, Nigeria.

Aina, O. I. (2005). Alternative modes of financing higher education in Nigeria and the implications for university governance. *Africa Development*, 27(1), 236-262. https://doi.org/10.43114/ad.v27i.22159

Akinsanya, O. O. (2007). Financing higher education in Nigeria. *International Journal of Africa and African America Studies*, 6(1), 69-72.

Arowosegbe, T. B. (2021). *Administrative challenges and secondary school effectiveness in Ekiti State, Nigeria.* Unpublished M.Ed Thesis, Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

Asya, C. (2015). Funding US higher education: Policy making theories reviewed. *Journal of Higher Education Policy and Management,* 37(6), 673-681. https://doi.org/10.1080/1360080x.2015.1102819

Babalola, A. (2023). *Proliferation of Universities despite government's poor funding of varsities.* The Vanguard, February 16.

Bakare, M. (2021). *Nigeria: Despite underfunding of existing institutions, Nigeria lawmakers want 200 new Universities, Colleges.* Premium Times, September, 26.

Bamiro, O. A. & Adedeji, O. S. (2010). *Sustainable financing of higher education in Nigeria.* Ibadan: University Press.

Bell, R. (2011). *Public-private partnership, infrastructural development and academic goals achievements of Nigeria University*. A seminar paper presented at the Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, University of Ilorin, Nigeria.

Bursars of Nigerian Universities (2010). *Funding higher education.* Abuja: National Universities Commission.

Ezekwesili, O. (2006). *Lack of funds is the bane of the Nigerian education system*. Nigeria Television Authority Network News, October 4.

Famade, O. A., Omiyale, G. T. & Adebola, Y. A. (2015). Towards improved funding of tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences,* 3(2), 83-90.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (2019). Federal Ministry of Education handbook. Page 26.

Lane, J. E. & Kivisto, J. A. (2008). Interest, information, and incentives in higher education: Principal-Agent theory and its potential applications to the study of higher education governance. In J. Smart (Ed.), *Higher education: Handbook of theory and research* (pp 221-261). New York: Agathon Press.

Lapworth, S. (2004). Arresting decline in shared governance: Towards a flexible model for academic participation. *Higher Education Quarterly,* 58(4), 299-314. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2273.2004.00275.x

Lee, D. I. (2017). *Grants: What they can, and cannot, do for higher education.* https://www.huffingtonpost.com/entry/grants-what-they-can-and-b-14526868.

Napodia, E. D. (2011). Integrative funding and effective implementation of Universal Basic Education programme in Delta State, Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and International Finance,* 2(3), 157-167.

Okebukola, A. P. (2018). *Can the bone rise again? A peep into the revitalisation story of Nigeria University system.* 23rd convocation lecture of the Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

Okojie, J. A. (2010). *System and strategies for funding Nigerian Universities*. A paper presented at the Nigerian Association of Petroleum Explorationist.

Oladeji, O. K. (2010). *Managing financial resources to deliver better academic services.* A paper delivered at a seminar organised by the Federal University of Technology, Akure, Nigeria.

Olofin, T. B. (2021). *Funding of tertiary institutions in Ekiti State, Nigeria.* Unpublished M.Ed Thesis, Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

Sadiku, B. O. (2017). *University funding and utilisation as correlates of academic staff job performance in Southwest, Nigeria*. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

Sanni, A. (2015). Public and private higher education financing in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal,* 11(7), 92-109.

Tejumaiye, A. (2023). *Awaiting full implementation of unbundled Mass Communication programme by Varsities.* The Guardian, March, 17.

Tolu-Kolawole, D. (2023). *Foreign varsities profit from Nigerian Universities' poor funding, crisis.* The Punch, February, 17.

Waziri, A. (2023). *Changing how we fund and run public Universities.* This Day, February 17.