Funding Regularities In The Management Of Higher Education In Rivers State, Nigeria

Isi, Fortune Ihuoma

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

Aleru, Gladys E.

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

Abstract: The focus of this study was to ascertain the funding regularities in the management of higher institutions in Rivers State. The study was guided by four objectives, four Research Questions and Four Synchronising Hypotheses. The study adopted descriptive design using random sampling technique. A sample size of 175 determined using Krejcie and Morgan sampling Table (1970) obtained from population of 320 comprise of University managers, and other categories of workers. After careful validation of instrument, One hundred and Eighty-Two (182) questionnaires were distributed and One Hundred and Seventy- Five (175) copies were retrieved. Mean and standard deviation were used to analyse the questionnaires while the Spearman Rank Order Correlation Statistical Tool was employed to analyse the hypotheses. Findings revealed that funds for higher institutions were consistently far lower than the projected amounts. That funds are not released when there is need, but until problems are accumulated so much that funds actually disbursed becomes meaningless. It was also revealed that declining economic situation in Nigeria has been one of the problems of funding regularities in higher institutions. It was therefore recommended that university leadership should be sensitive to the need of the universities and respond to the most urgent and important matter.

Keywords: Funding, Regularities, Higher Institution, University management

I. INTRODUCTION

Higher Education is the foundation of any Nation's development, a Country that is developed is a country that considers her education as priority instrument for development. Higher Education is organised in Universities, Colleges of Education, Polytechnics, and Monotechnics etc.

It is the principal instrument for developing human skills and knowledge at very high level. A country that is developed is a country that has invested on her education than roads and factories. The work of (Schultz, Harbison, Kendrick and Bowman revealed in NTE, 2005 in Isi, 2008)

A great country like Nigeria ought to have a huge appetite for the education of her people. The major source of income for a public Higher University is the Federal, State and Local Government. Considering the intensive nature of Education, it can be argued that Higher Education tends to be absorbing a rising share of national income and expenditure. Marcel,

(2007) Observed that the new ways of funding higher education budget appears political and the role of the government in developing education is greatly anchored on the institutional leadership.

Higher Education in Nigeria has been grappling with government's directive for increased graduate turn out. The problem has been compounded by the obvious declining economic situation in the country. Data from National Universities Commission as examined by Enaohwo revealed that Government actual performance for funds is far lower than the budgeted amounts. Nigerian economy has become depressed closely and relatively associated with this observation, the fact that, funds approved for Higher Education are not being released as expected regularly. Therefore the aim and objective were hardly achieved.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

A major problem facing the management of Higher Education is the problem of irregularity in the disbursement of funds allotted to the institutions. Strenhi, Reisingera& kalatschan, (2007) stated that Universities have become more engaged in the market place due to financial cutbacks and the rapid growth to supply education in terms of expert's advice for good rewards. Universities are expected to meet up with certain specifications and standard in order to achieve all this, the universities requires regular funding and efficient resources; they must have the means to serve their clients effectively and efficiently.

The crisis of funding and university management is inconsiderable because, to a great extent, funding and regular funding determines the success and effectiveness of the university management.

Succinctly, facilities and infrastructures which are essential for educational delivery are either not available or grossly inadequate. There is serious deterioration of infrastructure notably roads, building and equipment due to budgetary and disbursement process which does not make adequate provision for the maintenance, restoration and rehabilitation of structures at least in terms of a percentage of the annual budget. Dearth of materials for studies, Libraries filled with obsolete books, inadequate chemicals in laboratory for experiments, unconducive working environment. Higher Education is a capital intensive project cutting across the supply of calibre of human capital involved.

Funding problems of higher Education seem to be worsening as budgetary request of the institutions are often cut down in the availability and regularity of funds. This study was undertaken to ascertain the impact of funding regularities in the management of Higher Education.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The result of this study will provide reasonable information to the financer of education, it will enable the government to adopt a measure that will help them to be able to regulate and monitor the resources released to the institutions, how they are being spent , who spend them and know when to release more money and how much to release.

AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aim of the study was to investigate the impact of funding regularities on the management of Higher Education in Rivers State. The study will address the following objectives:
- ✓ Ascertain the impact of technologies on the Management of Higher Education in Rivers State
- ✓ Determine the impact of budgetary allocation on the management of Higher Education in Rivers State
- ✓ Examine the impact of Accountability on the management of Higher Education in River State
- ✓ Ascertain the impact of Leadership Ability on the management of Higher Education in Rivers State

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Four research questions were posed to guide the study
- ✓ To what extent has Technology affected the management of Higher Education in Rivers State?
- ✓ To what extent has budgetary allocation affected management of Higher Education in Rivers State?
- ✓ To what extent has accountability affected the management of Higher Education in Rivers State?
- ✓ To what extent has Leadership ability affected the management of Higher education in Rivers State?

HYPOTHESES

Four hypotheses were tested for the study
- ✓ Technologies has not significantly affected the management of Higher Education in Rivers State
- ✓ Budgetary allocation has not significantly affected the management of Higher Education in Rivers State
- ✓ Accountability has not significantly affected the Management of Higher Education in Rivers State
- ✓ Leadership has not significantly affected the management of higher Education in Rivers State.

STUDY AREA

The location for this research is Port Harcourt Metropolis one of the Local Government Area in Rivers State, Nigeria. This city is one of the largest council areas in Rivers State and one of the fastest growing cities in Nigeria along with Lagos and Abuja and has a rapidly growing population which has grown to 3, 20,000 in 2020 at 5.12% increase from 2019. (United Nations World Population Prospects, 2020) Availability of efficient transport networks and its large industrialization is the reason for the rapid growth in population hence the reason for the study of this nature to look into educational sector of its younger generation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

OVERVIEW OF FUNDING REGULARITY

Funding regularity is simply the steady flow of fund and resources within a higher education. It is a scenario that occurs when allocations are sufficiently available. Funding of university education should be the utmost priority in the budget because of its significance in the developmental growth of the nation. Funding brings about development in the universities, it informs the resources that contribute to the learning of the students that empowers them with the knowledge and skills to compete with counter parts in the market industries.

Regular and adequate funding is the key to achieve national goal. (Dimunah, 2017)

In the recent time, basic education has become the right of citizen and responsibilities of government to ensure that citizens have access to it; Expansion of higher education programme has become phenomenon in many developing countries. Funding of education by government does not

exclude payment of worker's or lecturer's salaries and purchase of teaching accessories. In Nigeria, research has it that about 10.5 million children do not have access to education despite being free and compulsory for all. (Ajayi & Ekundayo, 2009)

It is paramount to consider the amount to be spent on education and the resources to be utilised and how much will be required for maintenance. Education may not be sufficient even though there are appropriate budget allocations but the little that is released should be managed appropriately. Over the years there have been cries for standard education and adequate educational facilities in order to achieve educational goals and objectives and produce nbquality results for a competitive employment market. If universities must be functional and effective, they have to be adequately and regularly funded.

Irregular funding is a global issue, not a peculiar case with Nigerian Universities.

Standler, (2009) asserts that all research institutions suffer irregular funding. Irregular funding can lead to increase in tuition which makes education very expensive for low income earners. The education of a country should be affordable and not a luxury

The goals of university education is to provide the needed manpower to explore the socio- economic development of the nation among others, to achieve this, universities have to be regularly and adequately funded. (NPE, 2004)

Bamiro & Adedeji, (2010) declared that Government funding has declined drastically and it has negative effect on the capacity of the university in achieving their goals and objectives.

UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE

Management is inherent in every organisation with a major aim to achieve a goal. Management is a process whereby a manager, an administrator organises and coordinates the resources placed in his control, both the human and material resources for the achievement of the organisational goal. University management is viewed in dimension of the Government in-charge of universities which is the National Universities Commission (NUC) this body is charged with the responsibilities of coordinating and monitoring the universities and the approval of all programme run in the universities (Isi, 2015).

The NUC ensures that the universities are run smoothly and orderly. Okojie, (2007) highlighted the activities of NUC to include:

Approval of courses and programmes, accreditation of courses and programmes, maintenance of minimum academic standard, monitoring, establishment of universities, giving appropriate sanctions and prevention of illegal establishment of private universities.

The other dimension of University management is the internal management which is represented in this hierarchy:

Visitor (The Governor of States or president at the federal level, who graces the convocation ceremony and use the avenue to address academic community,

Chancellor who takes precedence before all other members of the university and presides at all meetings of convocation ,Governing council (headed by chairman of council who is charged with the administrative functions of setting the goals, policy formulation, staff discipline, staff development, budget approval and liaison activities with the visitor).

Nevertheless the major organ that organises and regulates the internal body of the universities is the Senate which is headed by the Vice Chancellor and the registrar as the secretary. This organ regulates the academic activities following the NUC guidelines. And they are assisted by various committees constituted internally Umesi. (2018) in Ololube (Ed.)

It is imperative to stress on the need for effective leadership in the management of the university. Leadership of institutions has a great role in deploring managerial strategies, their ability to internally generate revenues and utilise them meaningfully has a great impact on the survival of the university, that way whether or not government funds the school the inadequate impact will not be drastically felt by way of declining the standard of the university. Ayodo,(2016) corroborated this view that leadership in educational management will be effective if the leaders are knowledgeable of how to effectively manage resources, adjust to what is available, become proactive to issues ad devise means of maintaining standard and remaining competitive and viable.

IMPACT OF FUNDING REGULARITIES IN THE UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

TECHNOLOGIES: Higher Education is facing problems of insignificant financial support from Government, the world is technologically advanced, in recent times many organisations are gradually becoming paperless, computerised world, online processes and so on. Until now many universities are yet to key into this innovation. Some that have keyed in are yet to familiarised with the process, lack of familiarisation has caused many disagreement with issues of missing scores, wrong computation of scores being uploaded online, because of in competencies in the management strategies, the clients tend to go through rigorous processes to be attended to when ordinarily, the online process should make it easier. (Heera, Rajesh, and Bimal 2013). Being globally alienated is not an issue of contention but adopting it and making it viable and efficient. Consider the issue of National Identification Number (NIM) which was made a compulsory requirement for the 2020 JAMB registration, it couldn't work because we are still lagging behind in knowledge, acquisition and usage of technology, even if we have the manpower, the facilities are not there, the Federal Government is not interested in funding that project and making it effective or those in-charge sees it as a cash cow for their financial growth. There is need to be technologically advance but the question is do we have the needed equipment? Laptops, copiers, equipped offices, the technologies are they available in our offices, does staff have the needed training to flow with the changing time? Universities have to be regularly funded to achieve some of these feet. Otamiri, (2020) confirmed that technology rule the world, that management of education revolve around an effective communication

channels which helps to transmit the school vision and mission to stakeholders. Creation of school websites, remote chat tools, etc requires regular funding.

Higher Education Industry is barely meeting up with demand for university education in Nigeria. Education now is for sale and only those from rich background can afford it, the high cost of education has pushed so many students into engaging in part time job thereby neglecting their academic demand which has resulted to poor academic performance. When they perform poorly, they cannot compete with their counterpart in the employment market. The question that will be raised is which university is he or she coming from; it will definitely rob on the name of the institution.

BUDGETARY ALLOCATION: The inability of the major financer of higher education to allocate the actual amount of the actual percentage meant for education has resulted to the inability of the universities to acquire facilities for the effective running of the schools, the universities are engulf with dilapidated facilities, obsolete libraries, outdated curricula (Ukpai, 2013)

Political interest is playing a major role in the disbursement of funds to the institutions; if you don't belong or support a particular it goes a long way to affect what your institution gate when they are in power. The same way it is affecting the governing bodies of the institutions they insight the leadership; they get involved in the student matter with political concern. They exploit the students and engage for their selfish interest as a result of this, the students forgets their objective and begin to build interest in political career.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Accountability involves efficient utilization of every available resources provided by the Federal and State Government to the Federal and State institutions. It embraces all activities such as reading in the library, using all the tools and equipment for engineering studies, using the chairs, machines in the typing pools, and tools in the mechanics workshops. Studying outside the institution environment that is going for excursions for industrial studies all these are academic activities. All these activities enhance lectures and students to achieve their academic objectives and increases productivity in educational system. It is goal oriented, excellent performance in examination because students have seen the tools, materials, equipment, machines, chemicals name it, even studied in conducive environment for their teaching and learning, all these enhances productivity and achievement.

Observation shows that accountability demands more than teaching in the lectures halls or giving assignment to the students. The extent of the resources put into the institution is expected valuable result, if well utilized. So accountability also involves resources facilities and investment and results because all these put together contribute to the goal, objectives and achievement of educational system.

Accountability is asking what is being done with all the money and physical resources bestowed on the institution. Is the money utilized efficiently and effectively to serve the needs and interest of the students and institutions? The public would want to know who is accountable for problems in the educational system and how well monies are being effectively utilized for its purposes.

Another aspect of accountability is materials resources. The bursar/accountant, Dean/Head of Department or Directorate as the case may be should take inventory of books, equipment, furniture, stationary and others. He should check all these periodically even radios, fans, and walky-talky, and chairs in various offices. Accountability could not be judged with the level of student passes in the examination because they are not only aimed on passing examination. There is more than education can do in one's life. The institution should ensure that students are really making input in the system and could be transformed into more desirable Products.

What is happening in Nigeria seems to confirm that naivety and half education is drawing the social order to a possible half if not a possible destruction. The government every day talks about prison congestion without recalling asking why are most of our youths behind bars? Unless this situation is redressed, more youth will go behind bars, as crime wave will obviously continue to be on the increase. There is generally unemployment because the education industry is not graduating people who practically study their course as to be able to employ themselves. Many youth are carrying about certificates which are earned only through classroom theoretical lessons without sufficient practical exposure because the materials are not there.

LEADERSHIP ABILITY

Often time, leadership of universities divert the funds to other projects instead of the proposed project which the government intend to fund. Accountability is one major and important trait of a good leader or leadership, a leader that is accountable is a leader that is predictable, open door policy, a rigidity free leadership. A leader should be committed and win the trust of his followers and those at the top. When a leader builds up confidence in the people, goals and objectives are achieved collectively and timely.

In the management of universities and perhaps other organisation, Ololube, Elechi and Uriah (2018) declares that leaders develop weak attitude toward presenting themselves for appraisal hence they are afraid of being held accountable, and has failed to pursue character base leadership. Only very few universities have transformational leadership, leaders with innovative ideas, quality leadership charisma to lead and direct a minimum and acceptable academic standard system, who should effectively and efficiently manage the academic resources available. The idea to establish quality programmes that will transform the institution and contest the expectation of the public. Most university leadership has turned the organisation into a loose market place whose entity are not committed to other's interest but committed to their personal gain. Leaders confine their ability to what will benefit them rather than the institution.(Bass & Riggio, 2008), the selfish and irrational attitude of some leaders toward the growth of the oragnisation has led to lack of resources availability. The fear they have sometimes had made them surround themselves with people who are not acquainted with the policy and rules governing the organisation; casual and part time staff that cannot question their actions, this is another major problems

that are associated with regular funding. Government should have accurate and regular data of the money released to the institutions heads and monitor how they are spent.

III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The design adopted for this research is the descriptive design. Data was collected through the use of questionnaire; the population for this study was Three Hundred and Ten (310) members (Academic /Non- Teaching Staff) of Universities in Rivers State. One Hundred and Ten (110)from University of Port Harcourt, Ninety - Six (96)from Rivers State University and Ninety-Four(94) from Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt. in Rivers State, Nigeria

SAMPLE/SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

The sample for this study was One Hundred and Seventy Five (175) staff members of the Universities out of the Three Hundred and Ten (310) population of the study. This is representing the heads of institutions, the HODS of accounts and the Administrative workers of the selected Universities, the sample size were determined through Krejcie and Morgan sample table (1970).

The sampling technique used is the random sampling technique. Efforts will be put in place to ensure that the participants have adequate understanding of the questionnaire items as a means of interpreting the researcher's message and to guide the participants on their choice of answers for the items. Each of the research questions will comprise ten items (10)

IV. RESULTS

The results of this study are hereby presented in tables in accordance with the guiding research questions and hypotheses. All statistics were computed with SPSS 22.0 for windows.

RESEARCH QUESTION 1: To what extent does Technologies affect University Management?

N=175

Items	VH	H	L	VL	Mean	SD	Decision
1.Slows down activities	94	65	10	6	3.50	0.64	Agreed
2.Teaching methods are monopolised	82	77	12	4	3.44	0.59	Agreed
3. No innovations	82	73	16	4	3.41	0.63	Agreed
4.Students and lecturer s have access to new skills	88	53	26	8	**3.34**	**0.81**	**Agreed**
5.It ia affects research and learning outcomes	88	71	12	4	3.48	0.59	Agreed
6.Technologies is affected by lack of fund	126	37	8	4	**3.74**	**0.50**	**Agreed**
7.Technology scheme of my organization is not satisfactory	102	57	10	6	3.55	0.63	Agreed
8.I am satisfied with level of technological advancement in my university	94	67	10	4	3.53	0.57	Agreed
9.Your performance and your input is equal to the technology knowledge you are getting	110	51	10	4	3.63	0.56	Agreed
10.Technology increases output	106	47	18	4	3.52	0.67	Agreed
Grand Mean & SD					**3.51**	**0.62**	**Agreed**

Table 1: The Mean and standard deviation on the extent to which Technologies affect University management?

Table 1 show outline of mean and standard deviation on the degree to which

Technology impact on the management of universities in rivers State, Nigeria The outcomes on the degree to which technology impact on university management show thus; items 1 to 10 have mean scores of 3.50(SD=0.64), 3.44(SD=0.59), 3.41(SD=0.63), 3.34 (SD = 0.81), 3.48(SD= 0.59). to 3.74 (SD = 0.50), 3.55(0.63), 3.53(SD=0.57), 3.63(SD=0.56), 3.52(SD=0.67) and 3.51(SD=0.62) The most noteworthy scored item in this sub scale is related with fund (Mean = 3.74; SD = 0.50). This suggests fund is related with technology and is a key persuasive factor in the management of universities The most reduced scored was 'Students and Lecturers have access to new skills (Mean = 3.34; SD = 0.81). This suggests ' students and lecturers have access to new skills was minimal factor among others, similarly as organisation needs is boundless. That is how all the items are exceptionally evaluated with their different and a fabulous mean of 3.51(SD=0.62).

RESEARCH QUESTION 2: How budgetary allocation affects the management of universities in Rivers State?

N=175

Items	VH	H	L	VL	Mean	SD	Decision
1.Appropriated fund are not released to the universities to purchase equipment for study	106	53	12	4	3.59	0.59	Agreed
2.The 26% budgeted for universities are not given the them	92	63	16	4	3.40	0.69	Agreed
3.Money given to the universities are not enough to get facilities needed	74	75	22	4	3.32	0.67	Agreed
4.Inadequate funding does not really affect my studies	71	73	27	4	**3.30**	**0.75**	**Agreed**
5.Lack of funds results to brain drain	96	63	12	4	3.53	0.59	Agreed
6.It affects the standards of research, teaching and learning	134	31	6	4	**3.68**	**0.50**	**Agreed**
7.Lack of adequate facilities results to poor output of	88	75	8	4	3.50	0.55	Agreed

	VH	H	L	VL	Mean	SD	Decision
graduates							
8.Universities are bedevilled with dilapidated structure	112	51	8	4	3.65	0.53	Agreed
9.Graduates are not able to face counterparts from advanced countries	88	71	12	4	3.48	0.59	Agreed
10.information are un reliably communicated	74	85	12	4	3.39	0.58	Agreed
Grand Mean & SD					**3.48**	**0.60**	**Agreed**

Table 2: Mean and standard deviation on how budgetary allocation affects university management

Results in Table 2 show the outline of mean and standard deviation on how budgetary allocation impacts university management in Rivers State. The outcomes on how budgetary allocation impacts university management in Rivers State demonstrate that the items means for this subscale ran from 3.30 (SD = 0.75) to 3.68 (SD = 0.50). The most noteworthy scored thing in this subscale was item 6 'It affects teaching and research' (Mean = 3.68; SD = 0.50). This infers 'this means fund has a great impact in teaching and research which is a vital factor in the management of Universities. The most minimal scored item was 'inadequate funding does not really affect my studies' (Mean = 3.30; SD = 0.75). This suggests 'there is still need for adequate funding in the organization which prompts effective management ' and this was minimal elements among others. All the same every one of the items is exceptionally evaluated with their different and an acceptable mean of 3.48 (SD=0.60).

RESEARCH QUESTION 3: What is the impact of accountability on University Management?

N=175

Items	VH	H	L	VL	Mean	SD	Decision
1.I am accountable to resources allocated to me	116	41	12	6	3.63	**0.64**	**Agreed**
2.I have an opportunity to grow my organisation if i work in transparency	84	83	4	4	3.50	0.50	Agreed
3.Universities should be giving account of what was allocated to them periodically	90	63	19	3	3.42	0.76	Agreed
4.State government should monitor how resources are spent by the universities managers	98	59	12	6	3.51	0.66	Agreed
5.State government should know when to disburse fund to the universities	48	69	52	6	2.95	**0.79**	**Agreed**
6.State government should hold heads of institutions accountable	62	93	14	6	3.28	0.64	Agreed
7.State government should disburse the actual amount allocated in the budget	74	75	20	6	3.33	0.71	Agreed
8.They should know who spends the money	104	43	22	6	3.49	0.75	Agreed
9.There should be relationship between the government and the organisation	60	75	32	8	3.13	0.79	Agreed
10.State government	112	35	18	10	3.51	0.811	Agreed

Items	VH	H	L	VL	Mean	SD	Decision
should visit the universities to know what they need from time to time and fund them							
Grand Mean & SD					**3.38**	**0.71**	**Agreed**

Table 3: Mean and standard deviation on the impact of accountability on university management in Rivers State

Results in Table 3 show the outline of mean and standard deviation on the effect of accountability on the university management in universities in Rivers State. The outcomes on the effect of accountability on the university management in universities in Rivers State shows that item means for this subscale ran from 2.95(SD = 0.79) to 3.63 (SD = 0.64). The very high scored item in this table was 'I am accountable for the fund allocated to me' (Mean = 3.63; SD = 0.63). This infers 'the important of transparency in management of universities'. The very low scored item was item 5 'Government should know when to disburse funds to the universities ' (Mean = 2.95; SD = 0.79). This interprets that government should monitor the fund released to the university and know when to release more however, all items properly appraised with their different and a total mean score of 3.38 (SD=0.71).

RESEARCH QUESTION 4: What is the influence of leadership on University Management in Rivers State?

N=175

Items	VH	H	L	VL	Mean	SD	Decision
1.My Leadership ability to manage what is available helps the university to grow	136	29	6	4	**3.81**	**0.42**	**Agreed**
2.I have the confidence to work harder as a leader	104	61	6	4	3.61	0.52	Agreed
3.Leadership is based on transparency and accountability	110	57	4	4	3.66	0.48	Agreed
4.I feel good if my efforts are recognized and acknowledged	126	37	6	6	3.73	0.55	Agreed
5.Respect and integrity are rewards of a good leader	112	47	10	6	3.61	0.63	Agreed
6.I don't hide anything from my subjects	130	35	4	6	3.75	0.52	Agreed
7.The organization depends on my good leadership	94	63	10	8	3.48	0.69	Agreed
8.I will succeed if i serve without fear of favour	88	69	12	6	3.45	0.65	Agreed
9.I will work harder and interestingly if I have sufficient fund	74	69	20	12	**3.24**	**0.83**	**Agreed**
10.People values organization with transparent and innovative leaders	120	39	10	6	3.66	0.62	Agreed
Grand Mean & SD					**3.60**	**0.59**	**Agreed**

Table 4: Mean and standard deviation on the impact of Leadership ability on the management of university in Rivers State

Results in table 4 show rundown of mean and standard deviation of the impact of leadership on university management in universities in Rivers state. The result shows that the means for this table went from 3.24(SD = 0.83) to

3.81 (SD = 0.42). The very high scored item in this table was item 1 'my leadership ability to manage what is available helps the university to grow' (Mean = 3.81; SD = 0.42). This implies 'leadership ability helps the university to grow'. The very low scored item was item 8 'I will work harder and interestingly if I have more fund more diligently and strangely in on the off chance that I have employer stability' (Mean = 3.24; SD = 0.83). This implies that leadership does not depend on elaborate income but the ability to manage the available resources ' and was minimal variables among others. Thus all of the items is uniquely appraised with their different and a fabulous mean of 3.60 (SD=0.59).

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA TO TEST HYPOTHESES

HYPOTHESIS 1: There is no significant relationship between Technologies and Management of Universities in Rivers State
Correlations

			Motivation	Job Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Technologies	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.154*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.042
		N	175	175
	University management	Correlation Coefficient	-.154*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.042	.
		N	175	175

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 5: Comparing relationship between technologies and university's Management in River State

The result in table 5 above shows that the relationship between technology and university management in universities in Rivers State (r(175)=-.154*; p=.042) is negative and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H_o1) while retaining the alternative (H_1) at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between technology and University management in universities in Rivers State.

HYPOTHESIS 2: There is no significant relationship between budgetary allocation and management of University in Rivers State.
Correlations

			Communication	Job Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Budgetary Allocation	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.198**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.009
		N	175	175
	University management	Correlation Coefficient	-.198**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.009	.
		N	175	175

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 6: Comparing relationship between budgetary allocation and management of university in River State

The result in table 6 above shows that the relationship between budgetary allocation and University management in universities in Rivers State (r(175)=-.198**; p=.009) is strongly negative and not significant at .05 alpha level rather it is significant at .01 level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H_o2) as we retain the alternative (H_2) at .05 alpha level. This shows that there is a significant relationship between budgetary allocation and university management in universities in Rivers State.

HYPOTHESIS 3: There is no significant relationship between accountability and university management in River State.
Correlations

			Good Working Environment	Job Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Accountability	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.263**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	175	175
	University management	Correlation Coefficient	-.263**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	175	175

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 7: Comparing relationship between accountability and University management in Rivers State

The result in table 7 above shows that the relationship between accountability and University management in universities in Rivers State (r(175)=-.263**; p<.001) is strongly negative and not significant at .05 alpha level rather it is significant at .01 level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H_o3) while retaining the alternative (H_3) at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between accountability and University management in universities in Rivers State.

HYPOTHESIS 4: There is no significant relationship between Leadership Ability and management of Universities in Rivers State.
Correlations

			Staff Retention	Job Satisfaction
Spearman's rho	Leadership ability	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	-.184*
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.015
		N	175	175
	University Management	Correlation Coefficient	-.184*	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.015	.
		N	175	175

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Table 8: Comparing relationship between Leadership ability and University management in Rivers State

The result in table 8 above shows that the relationship between leadership ability and university management in universities in Rivers State (r(175)=-.184*; p=.015) is strongly negative and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H_o4) while retaining the alternative (H_4) at .05 alpha level. This shows that there is a significant relationship between leadership ability and university management in universities in Rivers State.

V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The motivation behind this investigation is to look at the above mentioned. This was confirmed by exploring question one which expresses that; 'To what degree does technologies impact on university management in Rivers State?' It was additionally tried with theory one which expresses that 'There is no significant difference between the availabilities of Technologies and University management in Rivers State, ' Items 1-10 on the B some portion of the survey was deliberately built to address this inquiry. The mean remained at 3.51(SD=0.62). The outcome shows that the relationship between technologies and University's management in Rivers State $(r(175)=-.154^*; p=.042)$ is negative at .05 alpha level. The invalid theory (Ho1) was dismissed at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a noteworthy connection between Technologies and University's management in Rivers State.

There ought to be regular funding to put the needed technologies in place to meet with the changing times and space

Research question Two revealed that there is need for sufficient budgetary allocation. This was checked by examining question two which expresses that; 'to what extent does budgetary allocation impact in the management of universities in Rivers State?' It was likewise tried with theory two which expresses that 'There is no significant relationship between budgetary allocation and university management in Rivers State. The mean remained at 3.48 (SD=0.60). The result shows that the relationship between budgetary allocation and university management in Rivers State $(r(175)=-.198^{**}; p=.009)$ is negative yet not critical at .05 alpha level rather it is huge at .01 level. The invalid (Ho2) was disconnected at .05 alpha level. This shows that there is a significant relationship between budgetary allocations in the management of universities in Rivers State.

This examination is associated with the explanation that insufficient budgetary allocation will affect the functioning and equipping of the universities for maximum productivity.

The third research question revealed that 'There is no significant relationship between accountability and university management in Rivers State' the amazing mean remained at 3.38 (SD=0.71). The outcome shows that the relationship between budgetary allocation and university management in Rivers State $(r(175)=-.263^{**}; p<.001)$ is highly negative and not huge at .05 alpha level rather it is critical at .01 level. The invalid theory (Ho3) was disconnected at .05 alpha level. This shows that there is a significant relationship between accountability and university management in Rivers State.

This examination is related to the explanation that accountability is paramount for efficient and transparent administration

The fourth research question revealed that there is no significant relationship between leadership and university management in Rivers State. 'to what extent does leadership impact on university management in Rivers State?' It was additionally tried with theory four which expresses that 'There is no e adequate relationship between leadership and university management in universities in Rivers State. The amazing mean was retained at 3.60 (SD=0.59). The result shows that the relationship between Rivers State $(r(175)=-$ .184*; p=.015)$ is negative and huge at .05 alpha level. The invalid theory (Ho4) was dismissed at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between leadership and management of universities in universities in Rivers State

This result explained that leadership ability is a serious factor in the university management; leaders should ensure transparency in the administration. This is a significant factor in any organisation.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

To effectively manage the university administration adequate funding is paramount, the managers need fund to upgrade the universities with current materials to meet up with changing times. How it, accountability and leadership ability be is critical phenomena.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

✓ The state of academics in Nigeria now demands declaring an emergency to forestall an imminent state of total collapse. Funds provided should be properly utilized for sustaining the tertiary education programmes and training of teachers.
✓ Accurate projections and effective cost analysis should be carried out to avoid under-funding of such programmes.
✓ The expenditure should be properly monitored to avoid wastage of scarce resources and embezzlement.
✓ The tertiary institutions should hoop-up to the internet and sell their services. Let the outside world know what services they can offer for a price. This will attract more revenue to the institution. Very soon our institutions will be for sale, where every institution will have to advertise their product to make students choose them.
✓ Other sources for internally generated revenue should be explored for the benefit of the universities so that whether Government releases fund or not the universities will remain and maintain standard without any financial hinge.

REFERENCES

[1] Ajayi, I.A and Ekundayo, H.T, (2009) Towards Effective management of University Education in Nigeria, Department of Educational foundations and Management Faculty of Education, Ado-Ekiti, Ekiti Sate, International NGO Journal 4(8).
[2] Ayodo, I.A (2016) Effective Change Management in Institution of Higher Learning in Kenya, International Journal of Management and Review, University of Agriculture Kenya. 6(6)
[3] Bass, B. and Riggio, E.G (2007) Transformational Leadership (2nd. Ed.) The Psychologist- Manager Journal 10(2)
[4] Bamiro, O.A and Adedeji, O.S (2010) Sustainable Financing of Higher Education in Nigeria. University of Ibadan, Ibadan

[5] Dimunah, V.O (2017) Underfunding of Federal University in Nigeria and Perceived impact on Administration: An Exploratory Case Study

[6] Heera LAL,S, D.R Bimal, A and Rajesh, T (2013) Management and of Higher Education institutions: Journal of Business Education & International Management Research 3(12)

[7] Marcel, H (2007) Financing Public Universities: The case Performance Funding Higher Education. Dynamics (Newer Practices to Increase the Quality of Universities System)

[8] Ololube, N.P, Elechi, S.K & Uriah, O.A (2018) Educational Leadership and management (ELM): Institutional Leaders Value Functions for Effective Management of Universities in N.P Ololube (Ed),

Encyclopedia of Institutional Leadership, Policy and Management (pp.111-133). Port Harcourt, Pearl Publications

[9] Otamiri S. (2020) Communicating the Business of Educational Management in Nigeria: Experimenting the Stakeholder Continuum Model, Inaugural Lecture, Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Port Harcourt.

[10] Strenhi, F.S, Reisingher and Katatschan, Sabine, SD, R and Michael K. (2007) Funding System and their effects on Higher Education System OCDE, Education. Working Papers

[11] Umesi, (2018) Funding Challenges to Higher Education Sector in N.P Ololube(Ed), Encyclopedia of Institutional leadership, Policy and Management. Port Harcourt, Pearl Publications