MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND ITS AND TERTIARY EDUCATION TRUST FUND (TETFUND): THE NEXUS, A STUDY OF SELECTED TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN DELTA STATE, NIGERIA (2011-2020)

ASOYA, Nkem Patricia
Department of Public Administration
DELTA STATE POLYTECHNIC, OGWASHI-UKU,
NIGERIA
patify2001@yahoo.co.uk

Prof. Emma E.O Chukwuemeka
Department of Public Administration
NNAMDI AZIKIWE UNIVERSITY, AWKA,
NIGERIA
ee.chukwuemeka@unizik.edu.ng

ABSTRACT

The quality of manpower in tertiary institutions is crucial for the attainment of high educational standards, improved staff efficiency and enhanced productivity levels. Studies have confirmed the problem of poor funding of tertiary institutions in Nigeria which has been a major challenge as quality of education keeps falling. The Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) was therefore established in 2011 by the Federal Government to disburse, manage and monitor education tax to government owned tertiary institutions in Nigeria with the aim of addressing the issue of funding. It is against this background that this study assessed the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and Manpower development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State. The study focused on the relationship between TETFund and research development, academic staff training and development and staff attendance to conferences and workshops. The survey research method was adopted with copies of questionnaire distributed to Management and Staff of nine tertiary institutions in Delta State. Interviews were also conducted with individuals and

ARTICLE I N F O:
Keywords:
Tertiary institution, Manpower development, tertiary education trust fund

Article History
Received 22nd March 2023
Accepted: 15th April 2023

stakeholders while the hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The study revealed that TETFund has a significant and positive relationship with research development, academic staff training and development as well as staff attendance to conferences and workshops. However, the multi-institutional structure of tertiary institutions in the state hinders institutions from getting interventions annually and most state governments rely solely on TETFund for the development of their institutions. Other shortcomings were also identified which includes poor awareness of TETFund interventions by staff, bias selection of beneficiaries and cumbersome documentation processes involved in accessing interventions. Consequently, this research recommended among other things, the regulation and critical assessment of the proliferation of tertiary institutions, compliance of both federal and state governments to UNESCO's benchmark of 26% budgetary provision for education and reduction of bureaucratic processes involved in accessing funds by beneficiary institutions.

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The importance of higher education is further emphasized by the Federal Ministry of Higher Education (2004) Section 8 (59) which states that higher education is expected to; contribute to national development through high level relevant manpower training, develop and inculcate proper values for the survival of the individual and society, develop the intellectual capability of individuals to understand and appreciate their local and external environments, acquire both physical and intellectual skills which will enable individuals to be self-reliant and useful members of the society (Asiyai, 2013). This clearly shows the role of higher education in the development of the quality of life of both individuals and the society at large.

Tertiary education in Nigeria consists of universities, polytechnics, monotechnics, colleges of education and other specialized institutions. These institutions in Nigeria have been characterized by challenges and problems which has led to reduced productivity, poor performance and turn out of low quality graduates. According to Audu et al. (2014), the current state of education in Nigeria even in this 21st century leaves much to be desired as there is a general neglect and decay of educational facilities due to the culture of poor funding of education by successive

governments. The manpower of any organization is important for efficient quality service delivery to be achieved and for proper harnessing of resources for goal fulfilment.

The ETF was however overburdened as it provided services to all levels of public educational institutions and so its impact on tertiary institutions was minimal due to limited funds. The Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) was therefore established in 2011 by the Federal Government to disburse, manage and monitor education tax to government owned tertiary institutions in Nigeria. It is an intervention agency set up to provide supplementary support to all levels of public tertiary institutions with the main objective of using funding alongside project management for the rehabilitation, restoration and consolidation of tertiary education in Nigeria (TETFund, 2021). The main source of funding is the 2 percent accessible profit of companies in Nigeria collected by the Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) and the distribution is in the ratio of 2:1:1 as among universities, polytechnics and colleges of education respectively. The case of Delta State is peculiar as the state has quite a number of tertiary institutions and operates a multi institutional system which therefore means a lot of funding would be required for major impact to be made in the development of its academic institutions. TETFund Director of Staff Training & Development, Mohammed Sani-Suleiman in 2021 revealed that over N4.5b had been spent on training of 1,127 lecturers in Delta State since inception with 82 scholars benefitting from foreign Phd programme, 562 local PhD programme, 36 foreign Masters and 433 local Masters programme. A visit to most of the institutions in Delta State reveals that most infrastructural projects (buildings, furniture and equipment) as well as staff development efforts' are embarked upon to a very large extent by TETFund as most state governments concentrate on establishing these institutions without making adequate arrangements for continuous funding. To buttress this, the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) President, Prof. Emmanuel Osodeke noted that about 90% of projects in Delta State tertiary institutions are built by funds from TETFund which is a product of ASUU struggle.

Having established TETFund as a means of achieving government objectives, this study seeks to explore the extent to which TETFund has achieved government goals and objectives in improving tertiary education. The application of TETFund intervention in achieving manpower development especially in Delta State which operates multi- institution system forms the basis of this empirical investigation on TETFund and Manpower Development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) was subsequently established in 2011 to revive the nation's tertiary education sector and areas of intervention by the Fund include sponsorship of lecturers for acquisition of higher degree programmes, sponsorship of staff to conferences and workshops, funding intervention for infrastructure like construction of classroom blocks, laboratories, libraries among others, donation of institutional materials and equipment as well as provision of other forms of physical infrastructure and equipment for teaching and learning. TETFund allocates annual and special interventions to institutions for the purpose of embarking on viable projects for improvement of tertiary institutions. The question now is to what extent has TETFund been able to achieve its objectives in revamping tertiary education especially in the area of manpower development and improvement of staff productivity and performance?

Staff of various institutions have expressed difficulty in assessing these intervention funds due to the cumbersome documentation processes involved which excludes very eligible applicants

from benefitting. Many applicants struggle to meet many of the Fund's guidelines, conditions and timelines for no fault of theirs. These bureaucratic procedures involved in the implementation of TETFund policies by beneficiary institutions have been identified as part of the bottlenecks hindering the achievement of the manpower development goals of the Fund. Further compounding the problem is that some staff have developed nonchalant attitude to the available staff development interventions available by TETFund and so do not utilize these opportunities. They are either discouraged by previous failures to access the fund, the failure of their colleagues to access the fund or are generally not interested in what goes on in TETFund as an institution and their intervention programmes in particular. There are also cases of corrupt practices by staff who are beneficiaries of these funds but divert these allocations for their personal use and are unable to complete their academic and research programmes effectively and within the approved time frame of TETFund. This makes retirement of funds disbursed to institutions difficult thereby hindering access to new allocations.

The selection process by the Management of some of these institutions has been highly criticized due to acts of in-house politics, favoritism, ethnic and tribal sentiments which has greatly affected the objective selection of beneficiaries for TETFund interventions. Management and Desk officers have also been criticized in the area of delay in prompt submission of proposals of intending beneficiaries which has resulted to failure of staff in accessing these interventions as they are unable to meet up with the stipulated time frame of the fund.

The proliferation of tertiary institutions by most state governments also raise questions as to the extent to which TETFund can make positive impacts on manpower development in these institutions. TETFund ought to be an intervention agency established to complement the efforts of the State but most states have abandoned their responsibilities solely to TETFund and as a result, insufficient funds are available for staff development due to increased number of institutions. Delta State is home to several tertiary institutions and has a unique pattern of operating a multi-institutional structure.

For instance, up on till 2021, Delta State had three Polytechnics managed by the State government (Delta State Polytechnic, Ogwashi-Uku, Delta State Polytechnic, Ozoro and Delta State Polytechnic, Oghara), three state owned colleges of education (College of Education, Agbor, College of Education, Warri and College of Physical Education Mosogar), Delta State University with campuses cited in three senatorial districts, Federal University of Petroleum, Effurun and a Federal College of Technical Education (Asaba). Also in 2021, the state government upgraded some institutions and currently, the state alone has four (4) state owned universities.

The central issue in this research is to understand the extent to which TETFund is able to meet its obligations of manpower development in a state such as Delta which possesses multi-structured tertiary institutions. This fear has also been shared by the Executive Secretary of the National Universities Commission (NUC), Prof. Abubakar Rasheed who rightly observed that with the rising number of tertiary institutions, the value of TETFund's intervention is likely to be minimized due to reduced interventions to institutions. A lot has been written on TETFund intervention and tertiary institutions but none has been written on the impact of TETFund on tertiary institutions in Delta State which operates a multi- institutional structure. The above situation provides the motivation for this study to investigate TETFund and manpower Development in selected institutions in Delta state, Nigeria, 2011 - 2020 with the intention to fill the identified gap.

1.3 OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. Ascertain the relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and research development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.
2. Ascertain the relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and academic staff training and development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.
3. Establish the relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and staff attendance to workshops and conferences in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

1.4 HYPOTHESES

1. **H_O:** There is no significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and research development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.
2. **Ho:** There is no significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and academic staff training and development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.
3. **H_O:** Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) has no significant relationship with staff attendance to workshops and conferences in selected institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

2.0 REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. Conceptual Review

The review of major concepts in this study is necessary to facilitate proper understanding of the issues under discussion and to appropriately structure the study according to recent development on the subject matter.

2.1.1 Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND)

The education sector in Nigeria is one of the important and critical sectors of the Nigerian society. Constitutionally, education comes under the concurrent legislative list, meaning that both the federal and state government can legislate on it. Also, the private sector is an active player in the Nigerian educational system. This is evident with the plethora of privately owned primary, secondary and tertiary institutions scattered across the length and breadth of the country. According to Amaghionyeodiwe & Osinubi, (2006), the Nigerian government formulates education policies with a view to use education as a vehicle in engineering positive change and achieving national development. With the proliferation of higher institutions in the country and faced with dwindling government resources, there arose an urgent need for financial intervention in the education sector, especially the tertiary education sector in order to be able to meet the manpower development needs of the country. Akinsanya & Olusanya (2017) stated that the decay in Nigerian education became so worrisome from the 1980s as facilities began to collapse, school environment was no longer conducive for teaching and learning and teachers' morale was dampened. Successive governments over the years have made efforts to address the financial, material and human challenges facing our tertiary Institutions. The problem of underfunding led to series of strikes and agitations by the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) as the bone of contention then was that the government alone could not finance the education sector.

The Union proposed government's alignment with the private sector in funding education hence the Longe's Committee report and subsequent negotiation between the Federal Government and ASUU in 1993. This informed the establishment of intervention agencies like the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund).

The Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) is one of the Institutions established by Government for the purpose of monitoring the tertiary system of education in Nigeria. The Fund was originally established as the Education Trust Fund (ETF) by the Act no7. of 1993 as amended by the Act no. 40 now repealed and replaced by the TETFund Act of 2011. TETFund is an intervention agency created for the purpose of providing supplementary support to all levels of public tertiary institutions (universities, polytechnics and colleges of education) using funding alongside project management for the rehabilitation, restoration and consolidation of tertiary education in Nigeria (TETFund, 2021). However, Okediran (2020) opined that the government's attitude towards the pressing needs and issues of tertiary education is lackadaisical which is as a result of deviating from the stated 26% of the national budget that should be allocated to the educational sector as recommended by UNESCO. This was further buttressed by Adesanya (2018) who identified that in the year 2018, just 7.04% was allocated to education which is a far cry from the recommended bench mark.

The main source of Fund for the institution's activities is the 2 percent accessible profit of companies registered in Nigeria and the tax is collected by the Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS). Funds are disbursed for the general improvement of education in Federal and State tertiary institutions for the provision or maintenance of:

(a) Essential Physical structure for teaching and learning
(b) Institutional material and equipment
(c) Research and Publication
(d) Academic Staff Training & Development
(e) Any other need which in the opinion of the Board of Trustees is critical for improvement and maintenance of standards in higher education (TETFund, 2021).

To achieve the core mandates above, some intervention lines were created to attend to the needs of beneficiary institutions. These are:

(a) Physical Infrastructure/Programme upgrade
(b) Project maintenance
(c) Teaching Practice for Colleges of education only.
(d) Equipment Fabrication for Polytechnics only.
(e) Entrepreneurship for Universities only
(f) Journal Publication
(g) Manuscript development
(h) Conference attendance
(i) ICT Support
(j) Advocacy
(k) Institution Based Research
(l) National Research Fund (NRF)
(m) Library Development (Nwaogwugwu & Nwaogwugwu, 2020)

TETFund provides funds only to public tertiary institutions in Nigeria and so no consideration is given to private tertiary institutions. This issue has given rise to a lot of arguments as the private sector is also involved in the payment of tax which is a major source of fund for TETFund in carrying out its mandate. The Fund's presence no doubt has been felt in virtually most of the

public universities, polytechnics and colleges of education in the country (Yusuf et al., 2021). Amin et al. (2020) identified three (3) key areas in which TETFund functions i.e. funding, projects facilitation and staff training and development.

2.1.2. Manpower Development

A good place to begin our conceptualization on manpower development will be to first, discuss the concept of manpower. Manpower can be referred to the total number of persons that put in their effort to actualize an assignment or get a job done. It can be termed as the human beings involved in providing goods or rendering services. Manpower is the critical element in the development of any nation and refers to human power supplied by physical and or mental work of people rather than machines (Hassan, 2011). In any organization, manpower has been identified as the most essential factor required for any organization to perform optimally, attain efficiency, maximize objectives and achieve increased productivity. When there is sufficient number of manpower who are well skilled and trained in their jobs, it translates to greater productivity and output, increased innovation and more motivation for workers. Manpower can also be termed as "human resource", "labour force", "workforce", workers, personnel, human capital etc. It is not every human being that can function in an organization, those deemed qualified must possess some general and specific knowledge, skills and work attributes that can be employed into the organization to achieve the desired result.

Manpower Development according to Sujata (2018) is an ongoing process that seeks to optimize an organisation's usage of its human resources. In order to actualize the full potentials of the personnel in an organization, they must be continuously trained in their line of duty. Manpower development can also be referred to as the improvement of knowledge, skill, attitude and endowment of labour force so as to bring about sustained economic growth (Hassan, 2011). Folayan (2010), in elaborating on the efficacy of training and development identified training and development as the process of acquiring and increasing the number of persons who have the skills, education and experience which are critical for the socio-economic and political development of the country. The role of manpower training and development cannot be over emphasized as society continues to experience change, technological innovations and scientific improvements. Nwogwugwu & Nwogwugwu (2020) identified the significance of capacity building to include the following:

- To help minimize over reliance on outside experts as sources of knowledge resources and solutions to community issues
- Fosters sense of ownership and empowerment
- Boost productivity of employees.
- Helps reduce staff turnover
- Strengthen employee confidence, skills, knowledge and resources.

The World Bank (2003) has called for a knowledge based economy which depends on the utilization of ideas and applications. The four (4) pillars of technology identified by the World Bank which brings about a knowledge based economy includes:

- A supportive economic and institutional regime which can provide incentives for the efficient use of existing and new knowledge.
- Educated and skilled population who can create, share and use knowledge.
- A dynamic information infrastructure which can facilitate the effective communication dissemination and processing of information.

- An efficient innovation system of firms, research centers, universities, consultants and other organisations who can tap the growing stock of global knowledge, assimilate and create new technology.

This knowledge based economy desired by nations relies heavily on the skills and competence of the available human resource as innovation, up to date knowledge and application of ideas is a necessity. The central idea underlying manpower development in any sector including the education sector is how best to keep employees current, vibrant and versatile so that they can continuously perform their roles effectively in this age of rapid socio-economic, political, scientific and technological changes and globalization (Kurama & Idris, 2019).

2.1.2 Tertiary Education Infrastructural and Manpower Development

Tertiary Education is the education given after secondary education in universities, Polytechnics, Monotechnics and Colleges of Education and the goals of tertiary education includes development of relevant high level manpower, development of intellectual capability of individuals and acquisition of physical and intellectual skills (FRN, 2004). The National Policy on Education (FGN, 2013a), section 5 subsection 80-85 specifies that the goals of tertiary education shall be to:

- Contribute to national development through high level manpower training
- Provide accessible and affordable quality learning opportunities in formal and informal education in response to the needs and interest of Nigerians
- Provide high quality career counselling and lifelong learning opportunity that prepares students with knowledge and skills for self-reliance
- Reduce skills shortages through the production of relevant skilled workers
- Promote and encourage scholarship, entrepreneurship and community service.
- Forge and cement national unity
- Promote national and international understanding and interaction.

The situation therefore depicts that tertiary education is a major facilitator of societal development and advancement. Daigneau et al. (1999) in a seminar work carried out noted that physical and environmental facilities are integral in meeting the objectives of tertiary institutions. Facilities were identified to be an essential component of the educational enterprise and to be successful, modern and well equipped buildings, skilled and sufficient manpower as well as scholarly resources must be available to achieve desired objectives. Another benefit highlighted by the authors is that the design of an institution's physical environment reflects its goals and values as well as educational outcomes. Olatunji (2018) identified that functional tertiary education is the bedrock of any society that has made remarkable development over the years and is equally the secret of the success of nations that are fast developing as its quality determines the quality of human resources and development. The number of tertiary institutions in Nigeria has been on the increase and as at 2011, there were 36 Federal Universities, 37 State Universities and 45 private universities making a total of 118 far higher than the three indigenous universities in 1963 (Oyebade & Dike, 2013). The Federal Ministry of Education report as at 2020 revealed that the number of tertiary institutions have increased further to 43 federal universities, 47 state universities and 75 private universities. Alongside increase in the number of tertiary institutions is also the issue of modern technological and socio-economic changes in the society resulting in the need for modification and improvement of teaching and learning methods. These changes in

number and quality of operations in our tertiary institutions calls for the expansion of our infrastructural facilities as well as suitable qualified trained workforce to meet with the changing trends in the educational sector. Teixeria et al. (2017) as educational specialists and consultants of the worldbank posited that there is strong evidence that high quality infrastructure facilitates better instruction, improves student outcomes and reduces dropout rates among other benefits. The authors went further to refer to a recent study in the United Kingdom which established that environmental and design elements of school infrastructure explained 16% of variation in students' academic performance. Khawaja (2022) identified that high-quality teaching and learning environment and students' experience are dependent on classroom resources, libraries, computer laboratories and equipment. It was also observed that office workers spend most of their office hours inside buildings where their physical environments directly impact their well-being, work performance and productivity. Provision of basic infrastructure and facilities, learning aids and equipment, increased staff training and development programs as well as improving research activities all require substantial financial expenditure. It therefore means that there must be concerted effort in improved funding on the part of government to ensure these institutions are of world class standard. Unfortunately, tertiary institutions in Nigeria have not been able to meet up with expectations of achieving their goals hence the drop in standard of education in Nigeria. Adesanya (2018), identified that as at 2018, the best university in Nigeria ranked 1099 and the next ranked after 2000 in the world which reveals the poor state of the nation's tertiary institutions. The United Nations (UNESCO) provides that 26% of a country's local budget must be set aside for educational development but in Nigeria, 6.7% only was allocated to education in 2020 (Appendix B). The information in Appendix B reveals that the Nigeria government over the years has allocated far less than the UNICEF approved 26% for educational development and this therefore explains the reason for poor funding of our tertiary institutions. Ojoye (2018), posited that the resultant effect of poor policy implementation and poor funding of tertiary institutions is lack of or grossly inadequate facilities and this poor state of our school environment is bound to breed high level of mediocrity.

A comparative analysis of Ghana's budgetary allocation to education (Appendix C) depicts that Nigeria is still lagging behind in funding of its tertiary education which has greatly affected manpower, infrastructural and research development. The National President of the Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), Professor Emmanuel Osodeke reiterated that the budgetary allocation to the education sector in Nigeria keeps going down and rather than moving forward, the nation is marching backward (Adesina, 2021). Oyebade & Dike (2013) identified factors such as limited infrastructure, poor funding, poor staffing, poor record keeping and socio-political interferences as reasons for poor performance of Nigeria's tertiary institutions. The general neglect and decay of educational facilities at all levels of education has been attributed to the long standing culture of poor funding of education by successive governments. Most tertiary institutions do not have enough funds for infrastructural and manpower development which is needed most especially with the increase in number of students on a yearly basis. Facilities are overstretched, classrooms and lecture theatres are overcrowded, non-availability of teaching aids and internet facilities, low manpower training and poor level of research activities which is fundamental in solving our numerous problems as a nation. Nigeria has also lost quite a huge sum of foreign exchange as a lot of Nigerians are seeking foreign university education due to the poor state of our indigenous institutions (Ibrahim, 2009). Jegede (2017) stated major factors contributing to low quality higher education in Africa as surveyed by Unesco which includes:

- depreciating quality teachers
- Research capacity deficit

- Inadequacies in facilities for teaching, learning and research
- Lack of a regional quality assurance framework and accreditation system
- Slow adoption of ICT for delivering quality higher education

2.1.3 Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and Human Capacity Development

Education has been identified as a key component for the attainment of national development. Manpower and human capacity building is very essential for tertiary institutions to operate at its minimum and to achieve its objective of knowledge advancement. The human element in any organization must be well trained, equipped and skilled to perform efficiently and optimally.

TETfund was created by the Federal Government as an intervention agency with the purpose of ensuring the rehabilitation, restoration and consolidation of Nigeria's tertiary education. TETFund in carrying out its objectives in promoting manpower and infrastructural development has well established machineries through its various interventions for the enhancement of human capital development. These interventions includes:

- **Academic Staff Training & Development:** This is an intervention that provides sponsorship for lecturers in Nigeria public tertiary institutions to undertake Masters and Doctorate programmes in Nigeria and abroad. Sponsorship is also provided for benchwork which is a programme accessed by those pursuing Ph.D programmes in sciences in Nigeria universities to carry out research work in foreign institutions with advanced facilities. TETFund also recently has approved postdoctoral fellowship programmes to enable applicants who have completed their doctorate programmes within a period of not more than five years acquire additional research experience with the aim of expanding their research skills and prepare them for leadership in their respective academic fields. In accessing this intervention, applicants are expected to make their submissions by forwarding relevant documents such as admission letters, medical certificate of fitness, properly filled TETFund application form, signed bond form and curriculum vitae. Applicants forward their submissions through their respective institutions and also get feedback of their application status through their institutions.
  Amin et al. (2020) identified that the productivity of an employee especially in the educational sector is majorly dependent on the level of training acquired. It is expected that staff development which is an on-going process culminates to improvement of staff morale, reduction in staff turnover, creates a sense of belonging, enhance job satisfaction and employee motivation as well fostering greater productivity and efficiency.
- **Research Development:** Research is the process of creating new knowledge or new insights on knowledge or unlocking knowledge (Anorue & Ikediugu, 2020). Knowledge generated is expected to be utilized in the creation of new technology, products, services or systems. Research is necessary for socio-economic development of any globalized society, establishing fundamentals of government policies round the world (Ighalo & Ighalo, 2018). The benefits of research includes improvement in standard of living, liberation from ignorance and poverty, quantitative education, provision of solutions to counterpart problems and overall national development and progress (Nwakpa, 2015). Major challenges to research development includes poor funding, poor interaction between researchers and policy makers, low quality of staff and inadequate infrastructure.

The TETFund research intervention is responsible for coordinating, managing and implementing Academic Research Journal (ARJ), National Research Fund (NRF) and Institution Based Research (IBR).

- ***Academic Research Journal***: This intervention was established for the purpose of encouraging the production of good quality academic journals based on research findings conducted by academic staff in public tertiary institutions. In making submissions for accessing this intervention, institutions are expected to forward details of the composition of the Editorial Board, Editorial policy and evidence of registration of title with the National Library of Nigeria as an international serial (ISSN).
- ***National Research Fund***: This is an intervention established with the objective of tackling major challenges in the nation through research engaged by multi-disciplinary teams. The NRF was created to encourage cutting edge research and explore areas of research relevant to social needs particularly in the areas of power and energy, health, security, employment and wealth creation (TETFund, 2021). Institutions are to make submissions after the Research Committee has previewed and made adequate recommendations. Selection is based on merit and a step by step implementation plan which outlines funds disbursement according to phases must be stated.
- ***Institution Based Research (IBR)***: TETFund established this intervention for the purpose of resuscitating research activities in the nation's tertiary institutions. Research proposals are submitted at two levels which is the level of the institution where the Institution's committee on research reviews proposals and give recommendations for approvals for qualified proposals. After submission of five copies of approved proposals to TETFund, further screening is carried out which entails review of all relevant documents submitted such as minutes of Research Committee meetings, evidence of approval by the Research committee, detailed profile of the researchers and covering letter to TETFund by Principal researchers. Successful applicants are communicated through the beneficiary institutions and it is expected that at the middle of the period approved for the research, progress reports are to be submitted to TETFund.

- **Workshop/Conference Attendance:** This intervention provides opportunity for teaching and non-teaching staff of government owned tertiary institutions in Nigeria to attend workshops, academic and professional conferences both locally and internationally. Academic Staff are expected to present papers at these conferences which avails them the opportunity of interacting and brainstorming with academia from other institutions. Non-teaching staff are expected to attend workshops organized by recognized professional bodies and it is expected that knowledge acquired would improve their job efficiency. The allocation of this intervention between teaching and non-teaching staff is 70:30 respectively.

The various interventions have been accessed by employees in the respective beneficiary institutions which has made an impact in capacity building. Appendix D is the total number of beneficiary institutions in Nigeria and Appendix E contains the number of beneficiaries of the various capacity building interventions.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The research design of this study is a combination of survey and qualitative research designs.

3.2 Population of the Study

The population of the study consists of staff members of all the tertiary institutions in Delta state, Nigeria. The staff strength is 7,325.

3.3 Sample Size Determination

For determination of the sample size Taro Yamane formula was used. The Taro Yamane formula was adopted because the sample size is definite and known. This formula is as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

Where n sample size
N = Population of the study
e = Sampling error (in this case 5 percent)

The sample size is therefore computed as follows:

$$n = \frac{N}{1+N(e)^2}$$

$$n = \frac{7325}{1+7325\ (0.05)^2)}$$

$$n = \frac{7325}{1+7325\ (0.0025)}$$

$$n = \frac{7325}{1+18.3125}$$

$$n = \frac{7325}{19.3125} \qquad n = 379$$

The number of questionnaires administered was 379.

3.4 Methods of Data Collection

Questionnaire, focus group discussion guide, face to face interview were the major tools used in collecting data.

3.5 Method of Data Analysis

Data generated from primary sources will be analyzed using descriptive statistics such as tables and simple percentages. Consequently, in order to test the hypotheses and establish the degree of relationship of the variables under consideration, the Pearson's Product Moment correlation coefficient statistical tool will be adopted for this study. Correlation coefficient test is an inferential statistic and a non-parametric technique used as a tool for establishing the degree of

relationship between two variables. The results of the returned questionnaires will be captured on Microsoft Excel and then exported to Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS) for analysis and interpretation.

4.0 DATA ANALYSIS

4.1 Analysis of Questions

Data obtained from part 'B' of the questionnaire were analyzed consistent with the research questions and the hypotheses and presented in the tables below. A mean value of 3.0 was taken as a benchmark to judge the mean for the items in the respective sections. Therefore, any item in the instrument which has a mean equal to or higher than 3.0 will be regarded as 'agreed' while items with less than 3.0 will be regarded as 'disagreed.'

Table 4.2.1.

Respondents' Mean Responses on TETFund Intervention and Research Development

N=360

S/N	Questions	Efx	X	Decision
1	TETFund allocates funds to your institution for research development on an annual basis	965	2.7	Disagree
2	TETFund has supported in providing funds for promotion of research activities	1653	4.6	Agree
3	Staff are well informed about the various research interventions available by TETFund and modalities for accessing the funds	1013	2.8	Disagree
4	The selection process of beneficiaries for TETFund research funds in your institution is objective and merit driven.	1001	2.8	Disagree
5	TETFund research intervention has enabled more staff to be involved in research activities	1406	3.9	Agree
6	The National Research Fund (NRF) Intervention has been fully accessed by your institution from 2011-2020	940	2.6	Disagree
7	Academic staff of your institution have optimally utilised the Institution Based Research (IBR) intervention	1224	3.4	Agree
8	Processing of documents for Tetfund research intervention grants are easy to access and not cumbersome.	885	2.4	Disagree
9	Funds allocated to staff for research by TETFund is sufficient in financing cost of individual research works.	1333	3.7	Agree
10	TETFund Research Intervention fund is considered adequate in promoting research activities in the institutions.	1003	2.8	Disagree

11	Research activities apart from TETFund are also supported by your Institution's Internally Generated Revenue (IGR) and other sources.	718	2.0	Disagree
12	TETFund research intervention has contributed majorly in solving the problem of poor funding of research in our tertiary institutions.	1294	3.6	Agree

Source: Field Survey, 2022

The data shown on Table 4.21 focuses on the responses obtained in relation to TETFund and research development in tertiary institutions in Delta State. Research is key for the purpose of solving major problems in the society and has also been identified as one of the basic functions of tertiary institutions. However, it has been acknowledged that poor funding among other challenges has affected research in tertiary institutions. The questions above were utilized in eliciting responses on the activities of TETFund towards research development. The first statement sought to know if tertiary institutions in Delta State get annual allocations from TETFund in the area of research development. Responses here depicted that most institutions do not get annual interventions which is as a result of the multi institutional structure of the Polytechnics and Colleges of Education. The Fund therefore distributes allocation annually on a rotational basis and so state polytechnics which are three in number get allocations once in three years likewise the state colleges of education. The impact of this rotational allocation is revealed in the responses from statement ten where respondents disagreed that the TETFund research fund was considered adequate in promoting research activities. Institutions having TETFund as a means of promoting research also need to source for funds from internally generated revenue and other sources to augment the availability of funds but this is not the case as depicted from responses from statement eleven disagreeing that apart from TETFund, research activities are being sponsored from IGR and other sources. Responses from the second statement reveals that though there is a need for more fund allocation in the area of research, TETFund has actually supported in providing funds for the promotion of research activities and also solved the problem of poor funding while accommodating more staff to be involved in research activities. This assertion was also corroborated by responses from the fifth, ninth and last statements. Statement three and four looks into the issue of awareness of TETFund research intervention by staff and fair consideration for applicants. Respondents disagreed that there was proper dissemination of information on how to access the research funds and also noted that the selection processes for beneficiaries by school authorities was not objectively done and fair to all. In the area of which research fund has been greatly accessed by staff, responses from statements six and seven depicts that the Institutional Based Research Fund has been more accessed while the National Research Fund (NRF) has few beneficiaries revealing the need for more sensitization and awareness in this area. Responses to statement eight however highlights the challenges faced by beneficiary institutions in meeting up with the cumbersome documentation processes involved in accessing these TETFund interventions which has been a major impediment to accessing these funds. The general implication of respondents' responses to the various question items on table 4.2.1 is that funding for research development has actually been promoted by TETFund with little or no contribution from internally generated revenue of institutions or other sources.

Table 4.2

Respondents' Mean Responses on TETFund Intervention and Academic Staff Training & Development

				N=360
S/N	**Questions**	**Efx**	**X**	**Decision**
13	TETFund allocates funds to your institution for AST&D on an annual basis	984	2.7	Disagree
14	TETFund has contributed significantly to staff acquisition of higher degrees	1354	3.8	Agree
15	Staff are well informed about the TETFund Academic Staff Training & Development programmes available to further their studies and modalities for accessing the funds.	1168	3.2	Agree
16	The selection process of beneficiaries for TETFund AST&D intervention in your institution is objective and based on merit	877	2.4	Disagree
17	Tetfund AST&D intervention has enhanced staff development in institutions	1237	3.4	Agree
18	Apart from TETFund, Academic staff are being sponsored for Masters and PhD programmes from internally generated revenue (IGR) of institutions or other sources.	717	2.0	Disagree
19	Staff are able to access the Tetfund AST&D scholarship whenever they are ready to further their education.	946	2.6	Disagree
20	The requirements and procedure for accessing funds for sponsorship from TETFund are very easy and not cumbersome.	874	2.4	Disagree
21	Management of Institutions encourages and approves staff application for TETFund AST&D sponsorship	1201	3.3	Agree
22	TETFund intervention has greatly helped in solving the problem of low access to funds for further studies by academic staff	1179	3.3	Agree

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Academic Staff Training & Development intervention aims towards sponsorship of scholars in the area of acquisition of higher degrees which has been considered essential for improvement in the quality of education offered by tertiary institutions. Table 4.2.2 above presents the analysis of responses on TETFund's contribution towards manpower development in the area of academic staff training & development (Masters and PhD sponsorship). Respondents with a mean response of 2.7 disagreed that their institutions get annual allocations from TETFund for this intervention and this is attributed to the fact that due to the multi institutional structure of some institutions in Delta State notably the Polytechnics and Colleges of education, some of the institutions get their annual allocations once in three years as the fund is disbursed on a rotational basis. This has

greatly affected fund availability compared to some other states that have just one category of institution and enjoy allocations on an annual basis. Notwithstanding, responses from the second statement identified that TETFund has actually contributed towards the acquisition of higher degrees by staff as most institutions do not sponsor staff from their internally generated revenue or other sources which was clearly revealed from responses from statement eighteen. Respondents to question twenty two with a mean average of 3.3 agreed that TETFund AST&D intervention has greatly helped in the area of poor funding when it comes to staff acquisition of higher degrees which has significantly enhanced staff development in Institutions as revealed by response seventeen with a positive mean response of 3.4.

Looking at the internal operations of the institutions, respondents in statement fifteen agreed that there was proper information dissemination about TETFund AST&D interventions as well as modalities for accessing the fund which corroborates their agreement in response twenty one that Management of institutions encourage and approve staff applications for TETFund sponsorship. However, the process of selecting beneficiaries poses a problem as respondents to question sixteen disagreed that the process was objective and free from bias which is part of the reasons why some eligible applicants are yet to benefit from this intervention. Responses to questions nineteen and twenty further identifies difficulties encountered by staff in accessing this fund as it reveals that the documentation process required by TETFund and other requirements and conditions to be fulfilled are cumbersome. Prospective applicants are expected to produce current admission letters and beneficiary institutions must have available funds in their allocations for eligibility. This poses difficulties as circumstances such as ASUU strike delays staff from getting necessary admission letters and at times institutions have to wait for their annual financial allocations. When these issues are finally resolved and scholars have their documents processed, TETFund responds and categorizes such cases as 'belated admissions' due to delays encountered which are unfortunately turned down. The implication of the responses to the issues raised in table 4.2.2 is that TETFund has enabled staff acquire higher degrees which has improved the quality of tertiary education. However challenges and bottle-necks hindering full utilization of funds must be addressed for maximum benefits in the area of academic staff training and development.

Table 4.3

Respondents' Mean Responses on TETFund Intervention and Conference/Workshop Attendance

N=360

S/N	Questions	Efx	X	Decision
23	TETFund allocates funds to your institution for Conference/ Workshop attendance on an annual basis.	927	2.6	Disagree
24	TETFund has contributed considerably to staff attendance to conferences & workshop	1112	3.1	Agree
25	Staff are well informed about the TETFund sponsorship for Conference/workshop attendance as well as modalities for accessing the funds	1240	3.4	Agree

26	The selection process of beneficiaries for Conference/Workshop intervention in your institution is objective and free from bias.	993	2.8	Disagree
27	Tetfund Conference/Workshop intervention has enhanced staff development in institutions.	1241	3.4	Agree
28	Apart from TETFund, Staff are being sponsored for Conference/workshop attendance from internally generated revenue (IGR) of institutions or other sources.	882	2.5	Disagree
29	TETFund allocation for workshop/conference attendance for staff in your institution is considered adequate.	1082	3.0	Agree
30	The requirements and procedure for accessing funds for conference/workshop sponsorship from TETFund are very easy and not cumbersome.	836	2.3	Disagree
31	Management of Institutions encourages and approves staff application for TETFund Conference/workshop sponsorship	1221	3.4	Agree
32	Quality of tertiary education in your institution has improved as a result of TETFund sponsorship in Conference and Workshop attendance.	1164	3.2	Agree

Field Survey, 2022

Staff attendance to conferences and workshops is key to manpower development as it affords staff the opportunity to develop relevant skills, acquire more knowledge in their respective disciplines and interact with other scholars from various fields. Statements in this section were presented to get information on TETFund and its contribution towards staff attendance to Conferences and Workshops. The first statement also revealed that the multi-institutional structure of institutions in Delta State denies institutions especially the Polytechnics and Colleges of Education from getting annual allocations. TETFund decided to give allocations on a rotational basis as each state is entitled to annual allocation for just an institution. This no doubt has reduced the available funds for conferences and workshop when compared to other institutions that have just one category of institution in their states. Respondents in the twenty-fourth, twenty-seventh, twenty-ninth and last statement however lauded TETFund for their funding role as this has greatly enabled staff to attend workshops and conferences which has resulted to staff development equipping them for better efficiency and overall improvement in tertiary education.

Responses to statement twenty-eight emphasized that most institutions do not support staff attendance to conferences through internally generated revenue as there is almost a 100% reliance on TETFund for staff development. This corroborates the fact that state governments unfortunately establish institutions without concrete plans on infrastructural and manpower development from their budgetary allocations. TETFund is therefore overburdened and saddled with the sole responsibility of facilitating manpower and infrastructural development in these institutions.

Respondents in statement twenty-five and twenty-six respectively agreed that there is proper information dissemination of the availability of TETFund conference intervention and modalities for accessing the funds among staff but the process of selection of beneficiaries was not free and

fair. Interactions with some staff revealed that though the various school Managements encourage and approve staff benefiting from TETFund interventions as revealed in response thirty-one, ethnic considerations were sometimes involved as well as favoritism and God-fatherism making the selection process questionable and full of bias.

This study as depicted in response to statement thirty also observed that the process of accessing the fund from TETFund was quite cumbersome with difficult criteria to be met making most institutions unable to access the funds allocated to them. Major complains came from Academic Staff who stated that TETFund turns down most of their applications as they term some conferences as being organized by unrecognized bodies and organizations. Academic staff are expected to present papers at conferences but sometimes, abstract acceptance letters do not reach applicants early enough. This has denied some staff the opportunity of accessing this fund as TETFund does not consider such applications awaiting abstract acceptance letters. When eventually the abstract acceptance arrives and the submission does not get to TETFund minimum two months to the date of the conference, such applications are not approved as TETFund terms such as belated. The criteria for assessing these funds have actually made the process quite difficult. Interaction with senior officials in TETFund however revealed that some of these measures were put in place to avoid cases where scholars take these fund for their personal use without attending the conference or workshop which has been the case in some institutions.

The overall implication of the responses to the issues raised in table 4.2.3 above is the fact that TETFund has played a major role towards staff attendance to workshops and conferences in the area of funding and efforts must be made by institutions to access these funds for optimum benefit and general manpower development.

Table 4.4 Problems affecting the efficient performance of TETFund in your Institution

Options	**Number of Respondents N = 360**	**Percentage Response**	**Rating**
Insufficient information about TETFund interventions amongst staff	200	55.5%	5th
Favoritism and in house politics in selection of beneficiaries of TETFund interventions	335	93%	2nd
Delay in release of approved funds	185	51%	6th
Bureaucratic procedures involved in accessing funds	325	90%	3rd
Nonchalant attitude of staff to TETFund interventions	166	46%	7th
Fund released by TETFund is not sufficient for completion of academic programmes, conferences and research activities.	121	34%	8th
Multi-structural Institutions in Delta State which makes it difficult to get TETFund allocation on an annual basis	348	97%	1st
Minimal support from other sources to complement the efforts of TETFund	307	85%	4th

Source: Field Survey, 2022

Table 4.2.4 above reveals that due to the multi-structural nature of institutions in Delta State, most of them do not get TETFund interventions annually as it is being allocated on a rotational basis which was confirmed by 97% of respondents thereby placing the option 1st among others.

This was further corroborated by interviews conducted with Management teams of these institutions and TETFund officials. The problem of favoritism and in house politics in the selection of beneficiaries ranked 2nd with the rating of 93% and this has denied some qualified staff the opportunity of benefitting from TETFund interventions. Bureaucratic procedures and cumbersome processes involved in accessing these interventions followed in the ranking of challenges to the efficient performance of TETFund with a rating of 90%. Fourth on the ranking revealed that 85% of respondents identified that a lot of burden has been placed on TETFund to bring about infrastructural and manpower development as most state governments do not assist in the funding of these institutions. Interactions also revealed that Management of institutions also do not consider the use of internally generated revenue to complement TETFund's efforts in enhancing the quality of manpower. Other problems identified are the insufficient information about TETFund interventions amongst staff, delay in release of approved funds and nonchalant attitude of staff to TETFund interventions which ranked 5th, 6th and 7th respectively. A minimal number of staff (34% and 8th on the ranking) were of the opinion that fund released by TETFund is not sufficient for completion of academic programmes, conferences and research activities. Interaction with stakeholders of these beneficiary institutions affirmed that the issue is not about fund availability but the challenge of meeting up with the Fund's guidelines in utilizing these allocations.

4.5 Test of Hypotheses

This section focuses on the test of three hypotheses formulated for the study. The hypotheses were tested using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The results of the returned questionnaires were captured on Microsoft Excel and then exported to Statistical Packages for Social Science (SPSS) for analysis and interpretation. Data used for the test were obtained from the responses of the respondents to various questions in the questionnaire item that relate to the various hypotheses. A 0.05 level of significance was adopted for the study.

Hypothesis One

Ho: There is no significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and research development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

Hi: There is a significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and research development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

Table 4.5.1: Relationship between TETFund and Research Development

Variables		TETFund	Research Development
TETFund	Pearson Correlation	1	.752
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.041
	N	360	360
Research Development	Pearson Correlation	.752	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.041	

	N	360	360

Data presented in Table 4.3.1 above shows the relationship between TETFund and research development. The correlation coefficient (r) value of .752 obtained indicates that there is strong relationship between TETFund and research development in the institutions under investigation. The table further revealed a p-value of .041 which was less than the alpha value of .05 indicating there was a positive relationship between TETFund and research development; hence the alternative hypothesis stated above that there is a significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and research development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria was accepted.

Hypothesis Two

Ho: There is no significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and academic staff training and development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

Hi: There is a significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and academic staff training and development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

Table 4.5.2: Relationship between TETFund and Academic Staff Training

Variables		TETFund	Academic Staff Training
TETFund	Pearson Correlation	1	.838
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.046
	N	360	360
Academic Staff Training	Pearson Correlation	.838	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	
	N	360	360

Data presented in Table 4.3.2 above displays the relationship between TETFund and academic staff training in the selected institutions under investigation. The correlation coefficient (r) value of .838 obtained indicates that, there is a strong relationship between TETFund and academic staff training in the selected institutions under investigation. The table further revealed a p-value of .046 which was less than the alpha value of .05 indicating there was a positive relationship between TETFund and academic staff training in the selected institutions under investigation, therefore, the alternative hypothesis stated above that there is a significant relationship between Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and academic staff training and development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria was accepted.

Hypothesis Three

Ho: Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) has no significant relationship with staff attendance to workshops and conferences in selected institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

Hi: Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) has a significant relationship with staff attendance to workshops and conferences in selected institutions in Delta State, Nigeria.

Table 4.5.3: Relationship between TETFund and Conference/Workshop Attendance

Variables		TETFund	Staff Development
TETFund	Pearson Correlation	1	.981**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.030
	N	360	360
Conference/Workshop Attendance	Pearson Correlation	.981**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.030	
	N	360	360

Data presented in Table 4.3.3 above shows the relationship between TETFund and staff attendance to workshops and conferences in the selected institutions in Delta State, Nigeria. The correlation coefficient (r) value of .981 obtained indicates that, there is strong relationship between TETFund and staff attendance to workshops and conferences in the selected institutions in Delta State, Nigeria. The table further revealed a p-value of .030 which was less than the alpha value of .05 indicating there was statistically significant and positive relationship between TETFund and staff attendance to workshops and conferences in the selected institutions in Delta State, Nigeria; hence, the alternative hypothesis stated above was also accepted.

5.0 FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes the research findings, draw conclusions and make appropriate recommendations. The findings are discussed according to the different aspects covered in the research questions and hypotheses.

5.1. Summary of the Findings

1. That Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) has a significant relationship with research development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria. (P value = 0.041 < 0.05, r = 0.752).
2. That Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) has a significant relationship with academic staff training and development in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria. (P value = 0.046 < 0.05, r = 0.838).
3. That Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) has a significant relationship with staff attendance to workshops and conferences in selected tertiary institutions in Delta State, Nigeria. (P value = 0.030 < 0.05, r = 0.981).

5.2 Conclusion

Manpower development is key for the attainment of improved staff efficiency, productivity and overall job performance of the workforce in organizations. From the findings of the study, it can be seen that Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) has improved and made major contributions towards manpower development in the area of research development, academic staff training and development and sponsorship of staff to workshops and conferences. Notwithstanding TETFund's contributions, more funding is required especially for states operating multi-structured institutions and unfortunately most state governments rely solely on TETFund for the development of their tertiary institutions. This laxity has encouraged state governments to establish more institutions without consideration for adequate funding. Challenges such as poor awareness of TETFund's interventions by staff, bias selection policy and cumbersome documentation processes involved in assessing interventions are impediments to the actualization of TETFund's objectives. Thus, to ensure maximum utilization of the Fund's allocations and improve TETFund's efficiency, the following recommendations are proffered:

5.3 Recommendations

Relative to the findings of this study, the following recommendations were suggested;

1. Proliferation and establishment of more tertiary institutions should be seriously regulated and critically assessed by the Federal and State governments as well as the National and State Houses of Assembly. Emphasis should be on adequate funding and improvement of existing institutions to ensure qualitative education and turn out of high quality graduates who can compete adequately with their peers from other world class institutions. Political patronage should not be a yardstick for establishing new institutions and as such regulatory bodies such as the National Universities Commission (NUC), National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) and National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) should play major roles in the consideration of establishment of Institutions.
2. State governments should be adequately involved in infrastructural and manpower development of their institutions to reduce the burden on TETFund. There should be adequate budgetary provisions for education according to the UNESCO's benchmark of 26% to provide required funds for development of their respective institutions.
3. Management of tertiary institutions must create necessary awareness of TETFund's interventions especially in the area of available research interventions to ensure maximum utilization of allocations. These Institutions can disseminate information through notice boards, special bulletins and also responsible social media platforms such as staff/departmental WhatsApp platforms for wider coverage.
4. The selection process of beneficiaries by Management of Institutions must be objectively done and free from every form of bias. A selection committee must be established with representatives of relevant departments and units constituting membership of the committee. Selection of beneficiaries should be based on the criteria stipulated by TETFund and all qualified applicants must be considered and have their submissions forwarded to TETFund for approval.
5. TETFund is called upon to review some of its difficult and cumbersome conditions which has hindered a lot of prospective candidates from benefitting from these interventions. Bureaucratic bottlenecks and stringent requirements should be reviewed to ensure full utilization of allocations to these institutions. TETFund can interface with these institutions periodically to obtain adequate information on areas where they need necessary adjustments.

REFERENCES

Abba, M. (2020). An assessment of contribution of TETFund to the development of Higher Education in North East Nigeria; A case study of Bauchi, Borno and Yobe States. *International Academic Research Journal.* 1(4). https://doi.org/10.47310/iarjhss.2020.v01i04.007

Abdulaziz, I., Olokooba, I. N., & Iyekolo, A. O. (2020). Tertiary Education Trust Fund intervention on academic staff capacity building in Lagos State University, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn).* 14 (2), 155 – 161. https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v14i2.14544

Adamu, Y., Ogu, M., & Abdullahi, S. (2021). Impact of TETFund Interventions on Human Capital Development in the Federal Polytechnics in the Northern Western Nigeria. *EPRA, International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research,* 7 (7). https://doi.org/10.36713/epra7942

Adesanya, T. (2018). The State of Nigeria's Tertiary Institutions-Enough is Enough. *EIE Publication*. https://eie.ng/the-state-of-nigerias-tertiary-institutions

Adesina, W. (2021, October 4). Against UNESCO's recommendation, Nigeria budgets only N3.6trn of N55.3 trn for education in 6 years. *Vanguard Newspaper*. https://www.vanguardngr.com/2021/10/against-unescos-recommendation-nigeria-budgets-only-n3-6trn-of-n55-3trn-for-education-in-6yrs/

Amin, A., Babaita, T., Olowookere, A., & Abioye, O. (2020). Assessment of Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) in Kwara State Polytechnic, Ilorin, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Research and Management Technology,* 5 (2).

Asiyai, R. I. (2013). Challenges of quality in Higher Education in Nigeria in the 21st century. *International Journal of Educational Planning and Administration.* 3 (2): 159 - 172.

Audu, C., Lukman, A., & Nyah, N. (2014). A Nexus between Higher Education, Security challenges and Sustainable Development in Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Research and Method in Education, 4*(4). 16 – 22. https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-04411622

Babalola, A.A (2022, February 9). Proliferation of Universities despite government's poor funding of existing Universities. *Vanguard Newspapers.* https://www.vanguardngr.com/2022/02/proliferation-of-universities-despite-governments-poor-funding-of existing-universities/

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

Becker, G. (1964). *Human Capital: A theoretical and empirical analysis with special reference to education*. Columbia University Press.

Brum, S. (2007). *What Impact Does Training Have on Employee Commitment and Employee Turnover?* Seminar Research Paper Series. Paper 45. https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/irc_paper_series/

Budget Analysis Brief, Delta State. (2009). Niger Delta Citizens and Budget Platform. https://resourcegovernance.org/sites/default/files/delta.pdf

Daigneau, W.A., Foucault J., Rushforth J., & Yelland R. (1999, October). *The Changing Infrastructure of Tertiary Education.* PPEB OECD Exchange, Programme on Educational Building 2000/07. Seminar held at Quebec City and Montreal. https://dx.doi.org/10.1787/840041748815

DailyPost (2019, July 11). FG shares N208bn to Tertiary Institutions. DailyPost. https://www.dailypost.com

Edeh, H. (2021, February 2). Over ₦6trn received from 13% derivation fails to lift Niger Delta-report. *Business Day*. https://businessday.ng/news/article/over-n6trn-received-from-13-derivation-fails-to-lift-niger-delta-report/

Ejechi, V. (2022, February 26). 13% Derivation: Nine Oil-Producing States shared ₦450bn in 2021. *The Cable News.* https://www.thecable.ng/13-derivation-nine-oil-producing-states-shared-n450bn-in-2021

Ekundayo, H. T., & Ajayi, I. A. (2009). Towards Effective Management of University Education in Nigeria. *International NGO Journal.* 4 (8): 342 - 347.

Ezeali, B. O. (2017). Impact of TETFund Intervention on Human Resources in Government Owned Tertiary Institutions in South Eastern Nigeria (2011-2016). *International Journal of Finance & management in Practice.* 5 (2). 68-80

Federal Ministry of Education Report (2020)

FGN (2013a). National Policy on Education. Lagos, Nigeria: Nigerian Educational Research Development Council.

Folayan, I.G (2010). *Personnel Management Process*. Fourth Edition. Mittlin Publishing Company.

FRN (2004). National Policy on Education, Lagos: Nigerian Educational Research Development Council (NERDC)

Gangwar, S. (2023). Structural Functionalism: Definition, Theories and Criticism. *Sociology group.* https://www.sociologygroup.com/structural-functionalism-meaning-theories/

Ghana Education Spending (1980-2022), Macro Trends. http://www.macrotrends.net/countries/GHA

Hamisu, A. A. & Musa, W. B. (2015). The Impact of Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) in Higher Institutions in Nigeria: A case study of tertiary institutions in three north-eastern states (Yobe, Bauchi & Gombe). *International Academic Journal of Empirical Research,* 1 (1): 15 – 36

Hassan, M.A (2011). Manpower Development for Workers in Tertiary Institutions: Distance Learning Approach. *International Education Studies,* Vol. 4 No. 2. https://dx.doi..org/10.5539/ies.v4n2p89

Hillman, A. J., Withers, M. C., & Collins, B. J. (2009). Resource Dependency Theory: A review. *Journal of Management*, 35(6) 1404-1427. https://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0149206309343469

Ibrahim, A. (2009, March 16). *Electoral reforms and good governance: Path to a new dawn*. [Paper presentation] at the inauguration of Governor of Anambra State, Awka.

Ighalo, N., & Ighalo, G. (2018). Research and Innovation in Higher Education for sustainable growth and development in Nigeria. *World Educators Forum,* 10(1), 2350-2401.

Jegede, O. (2017, November 3). *Quality of University Education in Nigeria: The challenge of social relevance*. [Paper presentation] Convocation lecture at the 22nd and 23rd combined convocation ceremony. University of Uyo, Nigeria.

Jones, G. R., George, J.M., & Hill, C. (2000). *Contemporary Management.* Irwin and McGraw Hills.

Kayode, A., Kajang, J., & Anyio, F. (2013). Human Resource Development and Educational Standard in Nigeria. *Global journal of Human Social Science Linguistic and Education,* 13 (7): 1 - 6. https://socialscienceresearch.org/index.php/GJHSS/article/view/637

Khawaja, S. (2022) Insight on Infrastructure and Resources for Private Higher Education Institutions in the U.K. *European Journal of Education Studies.* Vol.9 No.3. http://dx.doi.org/10.46827/ejes.v9i3.4189

Koontz, H., & Wiehrich, H. (2008). *Management*. 9th Ed. MsQrawHill.

Kurama, M., & Idris, H. (2019). Assessing the extent of the utilization of TETFund for manpower training and development in Tertiary Institutions in Maiduguri, Borno State. *Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences.* 19 (6): 155 – 168.

Malatesta, D., & Smith, C. R. (2014). Lessons from Resource Dependency Theory for Contemporary Public and Non Profit Management. *Public Administration Review,* 74 (1): 14 - 25.

Mathew, I.A (2016). Financial Allocation to Education: Trends, Issues and Way forward in Nigeria. *Journal Plus Education.* Vol XIV, (1) 227-242.

Milkovich, T. G., & Boudreau, W.J. (2009). *Personnel/ Human Resource Management.* Prentice Hall.

Mullins, L.J. (1999). *Management and Organisational Behaviour.* Prentice Hall.

Nagbi, Z., & Micah, L. C. (2019). Tertiary Education Trust Fund and Development of Higher Institutions in Nigeria. *International journal of innovative Finance and Economics Research.* 7 (2): 10 – 23.

Nassazi, A. (2013). *Effects of Training on Employee Performance. Evidence from Uganda.* [Unpublished MSc. Thesis]. University of Applied Sciences, Vaasa Finland.

Nduagu, N.J., & Saidu, Y.A (2021). Influence of TETFund Intervention on Staff and Infrastructural Development for improving quality tertiary education in Abia State, Nigeria. *International journal of Management Studies and Social science Research.* 3(6).

Neelam, T., Israr, K.Y., Shahid, J., & Muhammad, H. (2014). The impact of training and development on employees' performance and productivity: a case study of United Bank Limited Peshawar City, Pakistan, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences,* 4 (4): 86 - 94. http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i4/756

Nienhuser, W. (2008). Resource Dependency Theory: How Well Does it explain behavior of Organisations? *Management Revue*, 19 (1/2): 9 - 32.

Nigeria Education Research & Development Council (NERDC) (2014). National Policy of Education, 4th Ed. Abuja: NERDC.

Nwogwugwu, N. O., & Nwogwugwu, C. N. (2020). Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) Interventions & Capacity Building Programmes for Librarians in University in South-East Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice Journal.* *https://www.digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/4030*.

Ogar, M. (2012). Registrars Implore TETFund to sponsor Non-Academic Staff for Trainings. *The Guardian*. http://www.guardiannewsngr.com

Ojedele, P. K., & Fadokun, J. B. (2009). Problems and Issues in Higher Education. in J. B. Babalola and A. O. Ayeni (Eds.), *Educational Management Theories and Tasks.* Macmillian Nigerian Publishers Ltd. 110 - 129.

Ojo, J. (2022, August 3). Unwise Proliferation of Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. *Punch Newspapers.* https://punchng.com/unwise-proliferation-of-tertiary-institutions-in-Nigeria/

Ojoye, T. (2018, December 18). Expert laments Poor Infrastructure in Tertiary Institutions. *Punch Newspapers.* https://punchng.com/expert-laments-poor-infrastructure-in-tertiary-institutions/

Okediran, A. (2020, June 22). The State of Education in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. *Decent E-News.* https://www.decentenews.com/the-state-of-education-in-tertiary-institutions

Okoye, J. (2014). *Management Techniques for Effective Organisations.* Base 5 Publishers.

Olatunji, O.M (2018). The Goals of Tertiary Education: A Philosophical Assessment of Nigeria's National Policy on Education. *Journal plus education*. 20(2) 230-253.

Onwumelu, O. P., & Dialoke, I. (2018). Impact of Human Capital Development on Employee Performance: A Study of Selected Oil Service Firms in Rivers State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Management Research.* 4 (3): 56 – 69.

Onyeike, V. C., & Eseyin, E. O. (2014). Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and the Management of University Education in Nigeria. *Iglobal Journal of Educational Research.* 13, 63-73. http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/gjer.v13i2.2

Orji, F.O. (2015). Youths the Light to Better Leadership. *Radiant Magazine.* Pp 1-3.

Oyebade, S.A., & Dike, C. (2013). Restructuring Nigeria Tertiary (University) Education for Better Performance. *Higher Education lifelong learning & social inclusion.* (4) 317-326

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The External control of Organisations. A Resource Dependency Perspective*. Harper & Row.

Sahinidis, A. G., & Bouris, J. (2008). Employee perceived training effectiveness relationship to employee attitudes, *Journal of European industrial training*, 32(1), 63-76. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/03090590810846575

Teixeira, J., Amoroso, J., & Gresham J. (2017). Why Education Infrastructure matters for learning. *Education for Global Development* https://blogs.worldbank.org/why-education-infrastructure-matters-for-learning

Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFUND) (2021). History: https://www.tetfundserver.com/index.php/history.

Onabu, O. (2021, August 4). TETFund Disburses N300b to 226 Institutions. *ThisDay*. https://www.thisdaylive.com/index.php/2021/08/04/tetfund-disburses-n300bn-to-220-institutions/

Udu, L. E., & Nkwede, J. O. (2014). Tertiary Education Trust Fund Interventions and Sustainable Development in Nigerian Universities: Evidence from Ebonyi State University, Abakiliki. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 7 (4): 191 – 205. http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/jsd.v7n4p191

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), (2015). Delta State Development Report. https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/migration/ng/UNDP-NG-Delta-State-Dev-Report-2015.pdf

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) Institute of Statistics (2011). International Standard of classification of education (ISCED, 2011). https://www.uis.unesco.org.

Uyeri, A.O. (2016). The Relationship between manpower development and Lecturers' Productivity in Colleges of Education in Delta State. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research.* 16 (10), 64-78

Uzochukwu, O .C., Orogbu, O. L., & Igbodo, R. O. (2016). TETFund International Programmes and Academic Staff Development of Selected Universities in South-East Nigeria.

Journal of Economics and Public Finance. 2 (1). https://doi.org/10.22158/jepf.v2n1p171

Wapmuk, S., & Amini C. (2018). The Impact of TETFund in Funding Public Higher Education in Lagos State. *West African Journal of Open and Flexible Learning*, 7 (1), 89-118. https://wajofel.org/index.php/wajofel/article/view/23

White, W. (2010). *Relationship between Employee Engagement and Commitment in Barclays Bank of Kenya*. [Unpublished Masters Thesis] School of Business, University of Nairobi.

World Bank (2003). Lifelong Learning in the Global Knowledge Economy: Challenges for Developing Countries, Washington, D.C: The International Bank for Reconstruction/The World Bank.