

## **Refocusing Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria through Effective Budget Implementation: an Issue towards a Knowledge-Based Economy**

---

<sup>1</sup>Nyikyaa Miriam Nguavese, <sup>2</sup>Iliya Bawa, <sup>3</sup>Omaku, Peter Enesi & <sup>4</sup>Bilkisu Abdulganiyi Fagbemi

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Accountancy, Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Marketing, Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa*

<sup>3</sup>*Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Business Administration & Management Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa*

---

### **Abstract**

**E**ducation is basic to development and an instrument through which the society can be transformed. Knowledge cannot be created in the absence of proper funding of tertiary institutions. The process of raising, allocating, controlling and prudently managing funds for the purpose of refocusing tertiary institutional objectives has been a problem in Nigeria. This study aim at examining the impact of effective budget implementation on the development of tertiary institution in Nigeria. The budget units of the federal ministry of education and federal ministry of finance along with three (3) tertiary institutions were used for this research. Eighty four (84) questionnaires were administered out of which fifty six (56) were filled and returned representing 66.67%. The statistical tools used is the regression analysis adopting the stepwise method that iterates to select variables that contributes significantly to a regression model and the pearson product moment correlation . The result shows that budget formulation and implementation with regards Naira value of Research grant (RG) have a significant impact on the development of Nigeria tertiary institutions. It is recommended that both public and private tertiary institutions should be properly monitored for prudent management of funds and implementations of projects especially for variables that were found not significant and excluded from the model via the iterative process.

**Keywords:** *Education, Implementation, Tertiary institution, Budget, Economy, Funds*

*Corresponding Author:* Nyikyaa Miriam Nguavese

### **Background to the Study**

Tertiary institutions require well trained personnel, skilled labour and research institutions among others. It is a ministerial requirement that educational institutions develop plans as a means of enhancing results based management and efficiency in their operations. These plans provide directions in regard to resource targeting and program implementation.

Knowledge is crucial for development and because everything we do depend on knowledge, if we want a better tomorrow than today, if we want to raise our living standard as a household or as a country and improve our health, better education for our children, and preserve our common environment, then we need knowledge. Funding is central to unhindered access to University education. As it has been found that virtually all the problem of Universities in Nigeria are attributed to inadequate funding (Ajayi and Adeniji 2009).

Infrastructural facilities like functional laboratories, electricity and so on are paramount to the development of education in Nigeria and students who enjoyed good quality learning. Functional laboratories and classrooms have the highest average scores (Gafar and Akanbi, 2009). Fadipe (2000) observed that budget systems were designed to support systems of accountability on administrative structures. Funds are allocated to ministries who, in turn, allocated funds to subordinate, institutions and departments. This provides little or no information on the spending, particularly where allocations are consolidated and controlled at ministry level, or several agencies are involved in the delivery of a particular service. Yogish (2006), noted that budgeting mission is to touch the lives of people at the grassroots by incorporating what people need to better their lives. Budgeting involves understanding of how much money you can earn and spend over a period of time. The budget is used as an instrument to tract the flow of resources. In other to overcome the lapses of incremental budgeting in Nigeria a clean slate type of budgeting is introduced, which is otherwise known as zero based budgeting. At the end of the year all unspent money is returned to the treasury. Some ministries often find it difficult to return such money, so they resort to looking for activities that will allow spending of more money in order to spend their budget. This act has prompted a new terminology called 'Budget engineering' (Nichor, 2008). This raises the questions of the challenges facing the education sector in Nigeria especially on the issue of budget implementation.

### **Statement of the Problem**

Nigerian society is in transition and this affects the student learning environment. The education sector operates in this changing environment and its faces challenges such as corruption, delays in disbursement of funds to support its activities, ineffective management of the educational system, mismanagement of funds, the process of raising, allocating, controlling and prudently managing funds for the purpose of achieving institutional objectives is a call for concern.

### **Objectives of the Study**

The general and specific objective of the study is to:

1. Examine the impact of effective budget implementation and the development of tertiary institution in Nigeria
2. To determine and access the nature of relationship between the project Implementation and indicators of development in tertiary institutions.

### **Research Question**

What relationship exists between project implementation and development of tertiary institutions in Nigeria?

### **Research hypothesis**

**Ho:** Project Implementation does not significantly have impact on development in tertiary institution.

### **Identification of Variables**

Dependent variable:- Value of Project implementation (PI).

Independent variables:-Naira Value of New Classroom (NVNCR), Naira Value of lab equipment (NVLE), Research grant (RG), Salaries of Lecturers (SL), Cash backing (CB),

### **Literature Review**

In Nigeria, higher education is available in four main types of institutions: The Polytechnics, originally intended for middle and high level technical/professional education, Colleges of Education, intended for high-level non-graduate teacher education, but some of which have since become 'degree-granting institutions', with emphasis on bachelors' degrees in Education. Monotechnics: higher institutions that offer courses in specific professional areas such as: Nursing, Agriculture, Veterinary Studies and others.

One notable feature of the development of universities in Nigeria is the emergence of specialized universities. Most of these focus on Science and Technology. Today, there are three of such universities in Makurdi, Abeokuta, and Umudike that focus on Agriculture. Polytechnics and Monotechnics were established during the colonial era, long before the emergence of universities for high level technical manpower in a variety of technical and professional disciplines: Yaba Higher College, schools of survey, veterinary medicine, forestry, and agriculture in various parts of the country (Ukeje 2002). The early 1950s witnessed the establishment on the Nigerian College of Arts, Science and Technology, which were later absorbed by three of the first generation universities in Ife, Zaria, and Nsukka (Ibrahim, Usman and Bagudu 2013).

The first Advanced Teachers' Colleges (for producing 'highly qualified non-graduate teachers', mainly for secondary schools) were established in the wake of independence in the early 1960s – Zaria (Northern region), Owerri (Eastern region), Ibadan (Western region), and Abraka (Mid West region). The creation of more states in the Federation, and the increasing demand for teachers, due to educational expansion in the country) led to the establishment of more of such institutions, now re-named Colleges of Education, in every part of the country (Ololube 2006). Most of the institutions are either federally owned or State government-owned, but there has been a rapid increase in private colleges of education in recent years. Like Polytechnics, the popularity of colleges of education is steadily waning.

The major resource control instrument at the disposal of Government is its budget. However, in the National Budget, social services (under which Education falls) have consistently received poor budgetary allocations when compared with other sectors: 12.6% in 1999, a decrease to 12.2% in 2001, culminating in a fall to 7.5% in 2002. It is noteworthy that in the period 1997-2002, the Federal Government's expenditure on education was below 12% of its overall expenditure, the trend being largely downward (Ajayi and Ayodele 2004).

Although each level of education has, at various times, been a concurrent responsibility of both Federal and State Governments, the Federal Government has been involved most heavily at the tertiary level, allocating an average of 68% of its total education expenditure to this level of education between 1996 and 2002. In the same years, the average share of the secondary level was 14.5% (for Federal Unity Schools) and that of the primary level was 11.5%. In 2004, however, total allocation to Education stood at N93.8bn and allocation to tertiary education grew from N48.2bn in 2003 to N55.4bn in 2004 representing about 15% growth in allocation for both Recurrent and Capital (Akubue 2001).

Federal allocations from the Federation Account and from contributions centrally collected are the main source of State revenue. Internally-generated revenues constituted only between 20-25% of the total revenues accruing to states between 1995 and 2000. Education as with other social services is on the concurrent list of the constitution. This means that both Federal and State governments can participate at all levels of education.

Existing literature has only dwelt on the nature, features, characteristics and weaknesses of Public Expenditure Management (PEM) System and the reform that ensued. Akubue (2001) explored Nigeria's Public Expenditure Management between 1946 and 1966. He identified the four stages of its evolution as 1946 to 1952 (an era of three regions with two sources of revenue, namely: regional taxes and federal block grant, with expenditure guided purely by the derivation principle), 1952 to 1954 (an era when regions were given independent tax jurisdiction, with the statutory share of federal revenue whereas national interest and revenue derivation principle were the primary indices for sharing or expending the revenue). The third phase was the 1954 to 1959, when the North and West aligned to reintroduce revenue derivation principle as the only expenditure determinant. The final phase, 1959 to 1966, was necessitated by the discovery of oil in the East and the consequent abrogation of derivation as the only determinant factor. The phase was characterized by absence of fiscal adjustment process, lack of effective coordination of producer price policy in the regions and their harmonization with the national monetary and fiscal policies.

### **Budget Formulation and Implementation**

Budget formulation and implementation is very pertinent in the development of all institutions and nations. By observation, Norton and Elson (2002) realized that, there are several politics, rights and accountability in the budget process. They also found that, a good understanding of the political context in budget process is indispensable.

Budgets, by definition, have to be prepared in advance; and for this reason, they are often referred to in terms of their being part of a feed forward system (Ebong, 2007). Feedback is a term frequently heard both in accounting and ordinary use. Feed forward, on the other hand tends to be less frequently heard, yet this word incorporates the most important aspect of budgeting: looking at situations in advance, thinking about the impact and implications of things in advance and attempting to take control of situations in advance. A budget is a plan expressed in quantitative and money terms (Black, 2003). Budgets need to be prepared and approved in advance of the period in which they are to be used. Budgets can include some or all of income, expenditure, and the capital to be employed. Moreover, a budget can be drawn up for an entire organization, any segment of the organization such as a department or sales territory or division, or for a significant activity such as the production and sale of a specific product (Cope, 2007).

Winter-Ebner and Wirz (2003) added that, public funding and enrolment into higher education is faced with challenges which reduce school enrolment. This implies that funding of higher education which should be catered for in the national budget is very critical to the development of education and even enrollment. Memon (2007) also expounded that, though education plays the great role in human capital development in the society, also develop the people mentally, physically, spiritually, psychologically and socially and improves political, social, cultural and economic life of a nation, higher education is poorly funded. This was found out after more than five decades of research. They also added that, poor funding of students, staff, library and laboratories contribute to the challenges of higher education. Poor higher educational funding continues to be one of the main challenges of educational development in Nigeria. This was asserted by Odior (2011) when he intimated that funding of educational structures, inadequate classrooms, projectors, laboratories, computers, libraries, inadequate qualify lecturers and poor learning environment happens to be the canker of education in Nigeria. Apart from the impact of inadequate funding on the quality of the teaching and learning process in our institutions of higher education, students support is now inadequate. The number of students from poor and disadvantaged background attending our higher institutions has become insignificant. The funding of higher education has also become regressive over the years.

### **Empirical Studies on Budget and Economic Development**

Jasim (2012) investigated government budgeting and economic development in Iraq. He found that, critical factors relating to the weakness in the administrative arrangement of the government organization and the process of budgetary planning and control system do have a great effect on national development of which higher education is also affected. Omole (2012) extended this challenge when he assessed strategic budgeting system and management of public resources in Nigeria. He discovered that there is a significant relationship between budgetary system and management of public resources in Nigeria. That Nigeria economy is not developing due to financial indiscipline and wastages in the system as a result of poor budgeting in the public sector. Abdullah (2000) examined the relationship between government expenditure and economic growth. He found that the size of government is very important in economic performance of a nation. He advised that government should increase its spending on social, economic activities and infrastructures.

### **Research Methodology**

The study adopted a cross sectional survey research design. The population of the study comprise of the budget units of the federal ministry of education and federal ministry of finance also. Using purposive sampling technique, the internal control unit, physical planning unit and budget unit of selected tertiary institutions were used.

Questionnaire were administered to eighty four (84) respondents drawn from the population in this order:-

Federal Polytechnic Nasarawa	Federal University Lafia	University of Agriculture Makurdi	Federal Ministry of Education	Federal Ministry of Finance	Total
20	22	18	11	13	84

**Source:** Field survey, 2015.

Out of the eighty four (84) questionnaires administered fifty six (56) were filled and returned, representing 66.67%.

### Data Analysis

The statistical tools used are Pearson regression analysis and multiple regression analysis. Pearson regression analysis was carried out to see whether there is any relationship between budget formulation and implementation, while multiple regression analysis was used to determine the impact of budget implementation on development of tertiary institutions. The data collected was coded into the statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

In analyzing the primary data, the fifty six (56) questionnaires retrieved from the respondents were used. In analyzing the secondary data, the data set from the budget monitoring unit of the federal ministry of education and the ministry of finance from 2010 to 2014 was used for the analysis. This period offered a good range of data analysis because of the general availability of data, newer reformation in policies in the Nigeria educational sector.

### Total Amount of Budget Formulation and Implementation

**Table 1: Total Amount of Budget formulation and Implementation for the Tertiary schools**

Items	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
<b>Naira value of new classroom</b>	56,460,000	73,262,000	186,240,971	195,219,215	215,239,444
<b>Naira value of lab equipment</b>	42,838,402	58,951,029	214,388,491	230,717,594	60,974,687
<b>Research grants</b>	47,114,447	62,678,182	104,412,080	94,821,705	116,499,501
<b>Salaries of lecturer</b>	95,394,449	75,141,724	147,724,952	192,607,819	273,602,766
<b>Budget figure</b>	3,761,618,169	4,198,510,108	8,722,896,721	8,924,945,770	9,951,372,642
<b>Cash backing</b>	2,990,952,678	3,355,533,486	6,515,286,505	6,246,882,974	7,989,549,736
<b>Project implementation</b>	2,222,928,176	2,429,856,735	3,496,133,774	4,486,035,026	6,287,033,660

Source: Field Survey 2015

**Table 2: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.992 <sup>a</sup>	.985	.980	2.35654E8	.985	197.090	1	3	.001

a. Predictors: (Constant), Research grant

### Comment

Table 2 displays the model summary, we see an R-Square which suggest that 99% of the variability in Project Implementation is explain by Research grant, we also observe that the model is significant with p-value of 0.001

**Table 3: ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.094E19	1	1.094E19	197.090	.001 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	1.666E17	3	5.553E16		
	Total	1.111E19	4			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Research grant

b. Dependent Variable: Project implementation

### Test of Significance

The Test

$H_0$  : The model is inadequate i.e. the model of Project Implementation on Research grants (the variable selected from the stepwise regression) is not adequate to influence development in tertiary institution.

$H_1$ : Not  $H_0$

**The selected significant level  $\alpha = 0.05$**

Decision Rule: Reject  $H_0$  if P-value < 0.05

Decision: we reject  $H_0$  since P-value (0.000) < 0.05

Conclusion: we conclude that the model of the value of Project Implementation on Research grants is adequate and will significantly enhance the development of tertiary institution.

**Table 4: Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.425E9	1.984E8		7.184	.006
	Research grant	17.337	1.235	.992	14.039	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Project implementation

### The Model

**Project Implementation = 1.425E9 + 17.337 Research grants**

We notice that the coefficients also contributes significantly to the model with p-values (0.006 and 0.001) observed to be < the threshold (significant level 0.05), this yet strengthens the fact that the model is good and useful for further evaluations

**Table 5: Excluded Variables<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Beta In	t	Sig.	Partial Correlation	Collinearity Statistics
						Tolerance
1	Salaries of Lecturers	.445 <sup>a</sup>	1.478	.278	.722	.040
	Naira value of lab equipment	-.011 <sup>a</sup>	-.128	.910	-.090	.966
	Naira Value of Classrom	.096 <sup>a</sup>	.625	.596	.404	.265

a. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Research grant

b. Dependent Variable: Project implementation

All values excluded from the model do not contribute significantly to the model as their p-values exceeds the threshold 0.10

**Table 6: Correlations**

		Project implementation	Research grant	Salaries of Lecturers	Naira value of lab equipment	Naira Value of Classroom
Project implementation (PI)	Pearson Correlation	1	.992**	.990**	.172	.876
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.001	.783	.051
	N	5	5	5	5	5
Research grant (RG)	Pearson Correlation	.992**	1	.980**	.184	.857
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.003	.767	.063
	N	5	5	5	5	5
Salaries of Lecturers (SL)	Pearson Correlation	.990**	.980**	1	.201	.882*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.003		.746	.048
	N	5	5	5	5	5
Naira value of lab equipment (NVLE)	Pearson Correlation	.172	.184	.201	1	.599
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.783	.767	.746		.286
	N	5	5	5	5	5
Naira Value of Classroom (NVCR)	Pearson Correlation	.876	.857	.882*	.599	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051	.063	.048	.286	
	N	5	5	5	5	5

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2 tailed).

### Interpretation

From table 6, we observed that the degree of relationship between Project Implementation (PI) and research grant (RG) is higher with a positive value of 0.992 and statistically significant with p-value (0.001) less than the level of significance 0.01 and 0.05, the relationship between PI & SL is also seen to be significant here but excluded from our model because it exceeded the threshold 0.10 as shown in table 5

### Empirical Analysis of Primary Data

The test of hypothesis in this section (primary data) is intended to corroborate the result of the secondary data. To achieve this, the hypothesis is tested on the general objective of the study which is to determine the impact of budget implementation on development of tertiary institutions in Nigeria.

To predict the impact of government budgeting and implementation in the selected tertiary schools, a Pearson regression analysis was carried out on the model below to see if there was any relationship between the variables or parameters.



**Model 1**

$$BUI = b_0 + b_1BUF + U_t$$

Where:

Y = BUI = Budget Implementation

$b_0$  = base constant or the intercept

$b_1$  = beta regression coefficients for budget formation

$X_1$  = BUF = Budget formation

$U_t$  = Stochastic variable.

**Table 7: Goodness of fit of primary data**

Model Summary							
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics		
					R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
1	.145 <sup>a</sup>	.021	.003	12.177	.021	1.162	.286

a. Predictors: (Constant), formation

Source: Field survey 2015

**Table 8: ANOVA of Primary data**

ANOVA <sup>b</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	172.264	1	172.264	1.162	.286 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	8006.593	54	148.270		
	Total	8178.857	55			

a. Predictors: (Constant), formation  
b. Dependent Variable: implementation

Source: Field survey 2015

**Table 9: Regression analysis of primary data**

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	41.878	11.232		3.729	.000
	formation	.217	.201	.145	1.078	.286

a. Dependent Variable: implementation

Source: Field survey 2015

### **Data Interpretation**

From table 9,  $b_0$  intercept when regression line crosses Y axis (Constant) is 41.878 when  $X = 0$ . Hence, the following equation result was obtained:

$BUI = 41.878 + 0.217BUF$ . The estimated unstandardized coefficient model shows that, the estimates of model parameters in their natural units is consistent with prior expectations for  $b_1$ . The coefficients (parameter estimate) of  $b_1$  (0.217), the regression weight for the model is predicted, holding other variable constant. There was no relationship ( $b = 0.217$ ,  $\beta = 0.145$   $P = 0.286 > 0.05$ ) between Budget formation and budget implementation implying that government budget and implementation had no significant impact on development of the tertiary schools.

### **Findings**

The stepwise regression model is one that iterates to pick explanatory variable(s) that contribute significantly to the model, the researchers consider this method to access the project implementation on some variables relating to development in Tertiary institutions, to ascertain which of these variables contribute (most) to project Implementation (PI). The fitted model was obtain after the first iteration the researchers observe that the variable "Research grant (RG)" contributes significantly to Project Implementation amongst every other variables considered, the model is given as:

$$\text{Project Implementation} = 1.425E9 + 17.337 \text{ Research grants}$$

Again, the R-square further indicates a whopping 99% variability in Project Implementation explained by RG, the test of significance however buttress this as the p-value ( $=0.001$ ) is seen to be less than the threshold 0.05. However, variables excluded from the model are deemed not significant, since their p-values are greater than the significant level ( $\alpha + 0.10$ ), the test for strength of relationship again suggest that variable (Research grant) included in the regression model is best.

The finding of this study is related to the empirical assertions of Haque (2003) who opined expenditure on education is still very low. This study adds more to the study by portraying the fact that despite the huge amount of budget figure and budget implementation there is no noticeable effect on development. This supports the view of Scott (2000) who stated that a country can have a sound budget and financial system and still fail to achieve its intended targets. This suggests that the rules of the game by which the budget is formulated and implemented are important and that they do influence outcomes (Kosemani, 2005).

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

In conclusion, Budget formulation and implementation have a significant impact on development of Nigeria tertiary institution. The level of input from the tertiary institutions in the budget formulation process was high but the level of this input being translated is average. There was no relationship between budget formation and implementation, implying that government budget and implementation had no significant impact on the development of tertiary schools. Despite the huge amount of budget figure and budget implementation, there is no noticeable effect on development of tertiary institutions.

The following recommendations are therefore made:-

- i. Government should set up budget monitory committee to monitor budget performance
- ii. Tertiary institutions should be properly monitored by government to ensure that

adequate funds are made available for running the schools. Government can do this by mandating them to submit their annual budget to the ministry of education for assessment before they are implemented.

- iii. Tertiary institutions should be properly monitored to ensure project management and accountability.
- iv. Government both state and federal level should provide adequate funds for rehabilitation of students hostels, classrooms, laboratories, workshops, studios, electricity supply, teaching facilities and research facilities in tertiary institutions.
- v. Should there be any shortfalls; government should provide stabilization funds to make up the shortfalls in budgetary allocation to tertiary institutions.

### References

- Abdullah, A.M. (2000). Budget in Nigerian public sector: Need for balanced scorecard perspective. *International Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 1(6), 1-6.
- Ajayi, I. A. & Ayodele, J. B. (2004). *Fundamentals of educational management*. Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria: Green Line Publishers.
- Ajayi, K. & Adeniji, A. (2009). Access to university education in Nigeria. In B.G. Nworgu and E.I. Eke (Eds.), *Access, quality and cost in Nigerian education* (pp.35- 60). Published proceeding of the 23rd annual congress of the Nigerian Academy of Education.
- Akubue, A. U. (2001). *Classroom organization and management: A 5-point strategy*. Ibadan, Nigeria: Wisdom Publishers.
- ASSUU, National Executive Council (2005). ASUU's response to the Federal Ministry of Education Press Release. Daily Sun, 38-39.
- Black, J. (2003). *Dictionary of economics*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cohn, E. & Geske, T.G. (1990). *The economics of education*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Cope, G. (2007) Bureaucratic Reform and Issues of Political Responsiveness. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 461 – 471.
- Drucker, P. F. (2010). *Managing for the future, the 1990s and beyond*. New York: Truman Taley Books/Plume.
- Ebong, J.M. (2007). Time management techniques for the avoidance of time wasters in education. *Journal of Education in Developing Areas*, X(1), 13-19.
- Gafar, T. I. & Akanmbi, S. B. (2009). An empirical review of the long-run effect of infrastructure on industrialization in Nigeria. *Journal of International Economic Review*, 2(1), 135-149.
- Hague, A. (2003), Edmund Burke: The role of public administration in a constitutional order. In T.D. Lynch & T. Dicker (Eds), *Handbook of Organizational Theory and Management*. New York.

- Ibrahim, A. M., Usman, B. U. & Bagudu, M.W. (2013). Improving productivity in Nigerian firms through staff training and development programmes. *Journal of Business and Organisational Development*, 5 (2), 1-12.
- Jasim, A. (2012). Government budgeting and economic development in Iraq. *International Journal of contemporary Iraq studies*, 6(2), 181-193
- Kosemani, J. M. (2005). Education and National Character. In J.M. Kosemani (Ed), *Comparative Education: Emergent National System*. Port Harcourt: Abe Publishers.
- Memon, G. R. (2007). Education in Pakistan: The key issues, problem and the new challenges. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 3(1), 47-54.
- Nichor, A. N. (2008). Instructional materials and resources in Nigerian secondary schools: Problems and prospects. *Akampa Journal of Education*, 2, 37-42.
- Norton, A. & Elson, D. (2002). *What is behind the budget? Politics, rights and accountability in the budget process*. London (U.K): Overseas Development Institute.
- Odior, E. S. O. (2011). Government spending on education, economic growth and long waves in a CGE micro-simulation analysis: The case of Nigeria. *British Journal Economics, Finance and Management Science*, 1(2), 74 - 87.
- Ololube, N. P. (2006). *Teacher education, school effectiveness and improvement: A study of academic and professional qualification on teachers' job effectiveness in Nigerian secondary schools* [Doctoral Dissertation]. Department of Applied Sciences of Education, Faculty of Behavioral Sciences, University of Helsinki.
- Omole, B. (2012). VCs can't succeed solely on government funding for Universities. *Business day Newspaper*, p. 44
- Scott, J. (2000). *A matter of record: Documentary sources in social research*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ukeje, B. O. (2002). *Educational administration*. Enugu: Fourth Dimension Publishers Ltd.
- Winter, E. & Wirz, O. (2003). *Public funding and enrollment into higher education in Europe*.
- Yogish, S. N. (2006). Education and economic development. *Indian Journal of Social Development*, 6(2), 255-270.