

American Journal of Education and Practice (AJEP)



Infrastructural Development and TET Fund Participation in some Selected Higher Institutions in Anambra State – Nigeria

*Obi, Yves Mary Virginia, PhD, Emenike Ekene, Okoye, Sunday
Nonso, Achinike, Daniel Chimaobim*



Infrastructural Development and TET Fund Participation in some Selected Higher Institutions in Anambra State – Nigeria

 **Obi, Yves Mary Virginia, PhD^{1*}, Emenike Ekene², Okoye, Sunday Nonso³, Achinike, Daniel Chimaobim⁴**

¹Department of Public Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State

Email: obi.maryvirginia2023@yahoo.com, darlyves31@gmail.com

Phone: +2348037448399

²Department of Public Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State

Email: gaietykits@gmail.com

³Department of Public Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State

Email: chinonsookoye41@yahoo.com

⁴Department of Public Administration, Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University, Anambra State

Email: obim_2006@yahoo.com



Article History

Submitted 18.12.2023 Revised Version Received 05.01.2023 Accepted 09.01.2024

Abstract

Purpose: This study examined TETFund interventions in the development of infrastructure in selected tertiary institutions in Anambra state using Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Federal Polytechnic Oko, and Nwafor Orizu College of Education Nsugbe as areas of study.

Materials and Methods: It adopted a descriptive survey design wherein a structured questionnaire was used to collect information from a sample of 125 participants. With the aid of SPSS version 20.0 tools of analysis, and public good theory, the data generated was extensively analysed and discussed.

Findings: Results of the analysis reveal that infrastructural decay persists in the tertiary

institutions in spite of the intervention. It reveals also that TETFund does not engage in the rehabilitation of existing infrastructures and focuses on the provision of up-to-date textbooks and construction of new buildings to the neglect of other infrastructures.

Implications to Theory, Practice and Policy:

Among others, the paper recommends the expansion of TETFund intervention to include rehabilitation of old infrastructures and the diversification of its interventions in new projects to include all forms of infrastructures.

Keywords: *Tetfund, Intervention, Infrastructural Development, Tertiary Institutions, Anambra State*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

In pursuit of skills and knowledge acquisition, and national development, administrations at all level of governance in Nigeria established, managed, funded, and controlled different types and levels of educational institutions i.e. primary, secondary, and tertiary institutions. These institutions exist to promote acquisition of knowledge, teaching, research and community service. Specifically, the essence of establishing tertiary institutions is to develop the innate human traits and enhance the quality and diversity of human resources/skills for the management and growth of Nigerian economy. From 1958 when the University College Ibadan, and 1960 when the University of Nigeria were established as first indigenous tertiary institutions till date, millions of graduates have been produced while hundreds of tertiary institutions – both public and private have been established to accomplish this task. These institutions include universities, colleges of education, polytechnics, and colleges of education technical, institute of technologies, defence academies, and academies among others.

Nevertheless, as the number of registered students and graduates of these institutions rises continually, the quality or standard of knowledge they acquire continues to degenerate due to challenges and problems. These institutions began to experience total decay from early 1980s as facilities began to collapse without repair, inadequate funding, shortage of work force, poor staff quality, policy inconsistency, unionism and incessant strikes, managerial incompetence, and corruption overwhelmed the institutions (Ezeali & Esiagu, 2009; Agabi & Ogah, 2010). Tayo, Okotoni, Adebakin & Azeez (2012) and Okebukola (2005) observed that the population of students significantly exceeded infrastructural capacity in these institutions, lecture halls/rooms are either not available or too small to accommodate students during lectures, while teaching materials and aid are either mal-functional or non-existing. Further, most of the lecturers do not have offices while existing ones are poorly equipped, laboratories are ill-equipped or not existing, absence of standard library, insufficient number of hostels to accommodate student, and dilapidated and mal-functioning water system and energy supply (Subair, 2011; Adedipe, 2007).

Consequently, President Ibrahim Babangida Constituted the Gray Longe Commission in December 1990 to review of tertiary education. The report of the Commission led to the promulgation of Education Tax Act of No7 of January 1993 and other education related decrees. The Act imposed a 2% Education Tax Fund on all annual profits of Companies in Nigeria to fund the rehabilitation of decaying infrastructure in higher institutions; build capacity of teachers and lecturers; and restore the lost glory of education sector etc. (Okekezeanyanwu & Okpala, 2021; Nagbi & Micah, 2019). The Fund, which operates as an Intervention Agency to all levels of public education i.e. federal, state, and local, lasted from 1999 to May 2011 when the Act was repealed and replaced by the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TetFund) Act due to lapses and challenges (Ezeali, 2017). *International Journal of Finance and Management in Practice*, 5(2), 68-80.). The challenges include:

- a) ETF project was overburdened and overstretched, and could render palliative support to all levels of public education institutions in Nigeria.
- b) Duplications of functions and mandate of other Agencies set up after the Fund such as the UBE and MDG.
- c) Infrastructural decay and dilapidation of facilities continued because of the Fund's narrow presence in tertiary institutions.

The negative consequences of the observed lapses led to the establishment of the National Universities Commission (NUC) to regulate the activities of all universities; the National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) to regulate all polytechnics; and the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) to regulate all Colleges of Education (Balkie, 2002). The NUC then constituted a Presidential Visitation Panel in 2004 that investigated and evaluated the activities of federal universities between 1999 and 2003.

The panel equally observed the deplorable condition of infrastructures in the university system, and that “equipment for research, teaching and learning are either lacking or very inadequate and in a bad shape to permit the universities the freedom of embarking on the basic functions of academics” (Tayo, Okotoni, Adebakin & Azeez, 2012, p. 114). This dearth of equipment and facilities, which led to rampant crises such as strikes by academic and non-academic staff (Agha, 2014; World Bank, 2009), equally led to the establishment of the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) as an intervention agency in 2011 through the enactment of the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (Establishment), Act No. 16 of 2011. Officially, the Act became effective on June 3, 2011.

TETFund as an intervention agency was empowered by section 7 (1) (a) to (e) of the TETFund Act, 2011 to impose, manage, and disburse proceeds from the education tax to public Tertiary Institutions in the country. The TETFund Act, 2011 imposed a 2% Education Tax on the Assessable Profit of all registered companies in Nigeria and empowered the Federal Inland Revenue Service (FIRS) to assess and collect the Tax from companies. In addition, the Fund monitors all projects executed by tertiary institutions with the funds allocated to the beneficiaries. Specifically, the funds are provided for the provision and maintenance of:

- a. Essential physical infrastructure for teaching and learning
- b. Instructional material and equipment
- c. Research and publication
- d. Academic Staff Training and Development, and
- e. Any other need, which in the opinion of the Board of Trustees is critical and essential for the development and growth of tertiary institutions

Ibrahim (2017) and Suleiman (2019) outlined the various intervention programmes of TETFund in Nigeria tertiary institutions as follows:

A. Normal Intervention Programme:

- i. The provision of physical infrastructure and equipment, and library development;
- ii. Sponsorship of in-service training for academic staff at both Masters’ and PhD levels locally and internationally;
- iii. The National Research Fund that assist lecturers to produce research reports;
- iv. The National Book Development Programme that enables them to publish books, and the funding of research and publication of basic textbooks in different disciplines;
- v. Sponsorship of academic and non-academic staff to international and local conferences;
- vi. Award of scholarships to deserving first class and second-class graduates for Masters’ and PhD programmes;

B. High Impact Intervention

Allocation of huge funds into selected tertiary institutions across the six geo-political zones for quick and major turnaround in the provision and/or maintenance of:

- i. Essential physical infrastructure for teaching and learning
- ii. Instructional material and equipment
- iii. Research and publication
- iv. Academic staff training and development, and
- v. Any other need that is critical and essential for the improvement of quality and maintenance of standards in such institutions.

In its first and second phases, the funds disbursed and monitored the use of the following funds:

Table 1: TETFund Special Intervention Funds

| s/n | Zone | 1 st Phase | | 2 nd Phase | | 3 rd Phase | |
|---------------------|---------------|---|---------------|---|--------------------|--|--------------------|
| | | Institution | Amount | Institution | Amount | Institution | Amount |
| 1 | North Central | University of Ilorin | N3 billion | University of Jos | N3 billion | Nil | Nil |
| | | Federal College of Educ. Kontagora, Niger State | N1.1 billion | Kogi State Polytechnic, Lokoja | N1 billion | Benue State polytechnic, Ugbokolo | N3 billion |
| 2 | North East | University of Maiduguri | N3 billion | AbubakarTafawa Balewa Univ. | N3 billion | Nil | Nil |
| | | Federal College of Education (Technical) Gombe | N1.1 billion | Federal Poly, Mubi Adamawa State | N1 billion | UmarSuleiman College of Ed, Gashua, Yobe | N1 billion |
| 3 | North West | Ahmadu Bello University | N3 billion | Bayero University Kano | N3 billion | Usman Dan Fodio University | N3 billion |
| | | Kaduna Polytechnic | N1.1 billion | Jigawa College of Education, Gumel | N1 billion | Nil | Nil |
| | | Nigerian Defence Academy (NDA) | N1.5 billion | Nil | Nil | Nil | Nil |
| 4 | South East | University of Nigeria | N3 billion | Federal Univ. of Technology Owerri | N3 billion | Nil | Nil |
| | | Akanulbiam Polytechnic, Uwana, Afikpo | N1.2 billion | Institute of Management and Tech. (IMT) Enugu | N1 billion | Abia State Polytechnic, Abia | N1 billion |
| 5 | South South | University of Benin | N3 billion | University of Port Harcourt | N3 billion | Niger Delta Univ., Amassoma | N3 billion |
| | | Federal College of Education (Technical) Omoku, River State | N1.1 billion | Akwalbom State of Education, Afaha-Nsit | N1.1 billion | Nil | Nil |
| 6 | South West | University of Ibadan | N3 billion | ObafemiAwolowo University, Ile-Ife | N3 billion | Nil | Nil |
| | | Yaba College of Technology Lagos | N1.2 billion | Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo State | N1.2 billion | Federal College of Education Abeokuta | N1 billion |
| Ground Total | | | N26.4b | | N24 billion | | N10 billion |

Source: Review of Literature, 2022

However, a more comprehensive data generated from literature review from 2011 to 2016 reveals the following disbursement to tertiary institutions in Nigeria:

Table 2: Fund Allocations to Nigeria Tertiary Institutions (2011 – 2016)

| Years | University N | College of Education | Polytechnics N | Total N | Students' Enrolment |
|-------|----------------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------------|
| 2011 | 10,365,000,000 | 2,443,000,000 | 4,700,000,000 | 23,701,000,000 | 2,183,918 |
| 2012 | 28,203,000,000 | 5,411,000,000 | 8,133,000,000 | 49,126,000,000 | 2,297,257 |
| 2013 | 26,727,000,000 | 4,207,000,000 | 7,879,000,000 | 50,002,000,000 | 2,994,734 |
| 2014 | 34,757,000,000 | 4,785,000,000 | 8,832,000,000 | 62,818,000,000 | 2,909,809 |
| 2015 | 36,367,000,000 | 6,471,000,000 | 10,483,000,000 | 70,107,000,000 | 3,212,654 |
| 2016 | 43,548,000,000 | 10,344,000,000 | 15,509,000,000 | 90,166,000,000 | 3,564,779 |

Table 2 above reveals that an average of 50% of the total yearly allocations by TETFund goes to the university system while 50% is shared between Colleges of Education and Polytechnics. Further breakdown shows that with this budget, each 40 Federal Universities, and 34 state Universities will receive the sum of N1.9bn. Each of the 54 public Polytechnics get the sum of N67957000 only. In addition to this statistics, anecdotal evidence shows that TETFund rehabilitated and upgraded laboratories in 51 federal and state polytechnics, constructed microteaching laboratories in 58 federal and state Colleges of Education, trained and developed close to 10,000 academic staff, and supported 29 institutions to develop and publish research journals both locally and internationally between 2011 and 2016 (see Ibrahim, 2017).

The 2017 interventions budget of the Fund shows that tertiary institutions got almost three times the allocation in previous years i.e. 2016. However, Idowu (2020) observed that in 2019 TETFUND disbursed N826, 684, 392. 00 to each university, polytechnic got N566, 701, 842. 00 while college of education received N542, 226, 346. 00 as annual allocation. One university, polytechnic, and college of education from each of the six geo-political zones received special intervention of about N30bn.

In spite of these interventions, many higher institutions of learning in Nigeria particularly Anambra state are still experiencing poor development of infrastructures and educational facilities (Okeke-ezeanyanwu & Okpala, 2021). Infinitesimal investigations have been carried out to assess the impact of these intervention's disbursements to tertiary institutions in Nigeria, and why many of the institutions are still experiencing infrastructural challenges. Ugwuanyi (2014); Fejoh & Adesanwo (2021) assessed the impact of Education Trust Fund's interventions on the development of Nigerian Tertiary Institutions for a ten-year period and observed that the Fund exerts a significant positive impact on infrastructural development, research, teaching, and learning in Nigeria tertiary institutions. While Afolayan (2015), Agha (2014), Ekundayo & Ajayi (2009), Ugwoke (2013), and Adeyemi (2011) among others investigated and/or evaluated the funding of tertiary institutions in Nigeria generally and not TETFund activities. Consequently, this paper examines the level of intervention by the Fund, and its impact on the sustainable development of infrastructure in selected tertiary institutions in Anambra state.

Research Questions

In pursuit of the objectives of this paper, this investigation is poised to provide answers to the following questions:

1. Have tertiary institutions in Anambra state achieved significant level of infrastructural development?
2. Has TETFund significantly intervened in the renovation and maintenance of infrastructures in Anambra state tertiary institutions?
3. Has TETFund significantly assisted tertiary institutions in Anambra state to construct new infrastructures in Anambra state?

2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS

This paper adopts descriptive survey design as method of data gathering, wherein researcher's designed questionnaire was used to generate information from respondents in three randomly selected tertiary institutions in Anambra state i.e. Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Federal Polytechnic Oko, and Nwafor Orizu College of Education Nsugbe. The basic idea behind the survey methodology is to measure subsisting variables i.e. TETFund intervention and Infrastructural development by asking questions and then examining the relationships among the variables based on the participants' responses. The entire population of the three institutions constitutes the population of study, however, the executives of primary organs of the institutions i.e. the Academic Staff Union (ASU), Non-Academic Staff Union (NASU), Students' Union Government (SUG), and the Works Department, forms the study sample. Eleven (11) core executive positions were identified in each case thereby making $44 \times 3 = 132$ the study sample.

A 14 items self-designed questionnaire titled "Infrastructural Development and Quality Assurance Questionnaire" was used for data gathering. The relevance of the contents of the questionnaire was assessed to ensure its validity using Pearson Product Moment Correlation statistic while its test-re-test method carried out within an interval of two weeks in two tertiary institutions in Enugu State showed an acceptable reliability of more than 0.81. In distributing the questionnaires, the Secretary-General of SUG of the various institutions were approached to assist in the distribution of the questionnaire with the instruction to send soft copy of the questionnaire to any of the participants that could not be reached physically. A 14-day period was set to distribute and collect back the questionnaires. In all 125 questionnaires, representing 94.7%, were retrieved for analysis. In addition, secondary data was also generated from relevant published and accessible materials found in public and private libraries and the internet to complement the primary data.

The data collected from fieldwork was analysed with the aid of descriptive and measures of central tendency/variance tools in the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0. However, the demographic data of the respondents and other data generated were analysed using frequency tables and percentages for purposes of inference.

Theoretical Framework

The paper considered the public goods theory proposed by Samuelson (1994; 2004) appropriate for this study. The theory holds that large public expenditure in education is essential and such can only be provided by government effectively sue to externalities associated with it. The theory has two basic assumptions as follows:

- a. When a product is produced for some consumers, additional consumer can also consume such product without extra cost.
- b. People cannot be excluded from consuming the product, once it has been produced.

In most cases, such products are produced mainly by government and are generally made available for the benefit of its citizens. The theory emphasises the importance and inevitability of public purpose, public ownership, and public control of such products. In all its ramifications, tertiary education is therefore a public good in Nigeria.

The theory, therefore, enables this paper to examine the level of TETFund interventions in the provision of infrastructures in Anambra state tertiary education as a public good. As a public good, it demands large budgetary allocations and a significant level of TETFund involvement in the management of such infrastructures.

3.0 DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

The socio-demographic data of the respondents are presented in table iii as follows:

Table 3: Respondents' Socio-Demographic Data

| s/n | Institution | Respondents | Gender | | Age | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| | | | Male | Female | 18-34yrs | 35-50 yrs | 51-64 yrs | 65 & above |
| 1 | Nnamdi Azikiwe University | 40 | 16 | 24 | 15 | 18 | 6 | 1 |
| 2 | Federal Polytechnic Oko | 42 | 20 | 22 | 18 | 14 | 8 | nil |
| 3 | Nawfor Orizu College of Education | 43 | 19 | 24 | 19 | 18 | 6 | nil |
| | Total | 125 | 55 (44%) | 70 (56%) | 52 (41.6%) | 50 (40%) | 20 (16%) | 1 (0.85) |

Source: Fieldwork, 2022

An analysis of table iii above reveals that 55 respondents representing 44% are male while 70 respondents i.e. 56% are female. Further, the table reveals that 52 respondents i.e. 41.6% fall within 18 - 34 years of age, 50 i.e. 40% of the respondents fall within the age bracket of 35 - 50 years, 20 i.e. 16% fall within 51 - 64 years, while 1 respondents representing 0.8% is 65 years and above. A review of these statistics shows that the research is gender sensitive and all the respondents are matured to respond objectively to the questions.

Research Question 1: Have tertiary institutions in Anambra state achieved significant level of infrastructural development?

Table 4: Results of SPSS Analysis of Responses to Questions

| Sn | Research questions | Grand Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | Tests of Between-Subjects Effects | Sig. | Pairwise Comparisons |
|----|---|------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|------|---|
| 1 | Your institution has adequate classrooms and well equipped laboratories | 2.09 | .345 | .058 | 189.002 | .000 | @ 95% confidence interval with no adjustments |
| 2 | Your institution has a well equipped e-library with current books and journals | 2.58 | 1.390 | .304 | 334.006 | .001 | @ 95% confidence Interval with no adjustments |
| 3 | Your institution has adequate ICT facilities, administrative and lecturer's offices | 1.02 | .239 | .241 | 240.296 | .003 | @ 95% confidence Interval with no adjustments |
| 4 | Your institution has adequate accommodation with reliable power and water supply for staff and students | 2.58 | 1.390 | .304 | 334.006 | .001 | @ 95% confidence Interval with no adjustments |

Source: SPSS Analysis of Responses to Questions

In table iv above, analysis of responses to questions 1, which sought to find out if tertiary institutions in Anambra state have adequate classrooms and well-equipped laboratories reveals a total grand mean of 2.09 with standard deviation of .345 and standard error of .058. The Tests of Between-Subjects Effects reveals a significant mean difference of .000, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to level of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the ground mean of 2.09, which represents 'Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted and implies that tertiary institutions in Anambra state do not have adequate classrooms and well equipped laboratories.

Equally, analysis of the responses to question 2 that sought to find out if tertiary institutions in Anambra state have well equipped e-libraries with current books and journals reveals a grand mean of 2.58 with a standard deviation of 1.390 with a standard error of .304. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects shows a significant mean difference of .001, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .001 levels of difference reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 2.58, which represents 'Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted and implies that institutions in Anambra state do not have well equipped e-libraries with current books and journals.

Similar analysis of the responses to the question 3 that sought to find out if tertiary institutions in Anambra state have adequate ICT facilities, administrative and lecturer's offices reveals a grand mean of 1.02 with a standard deviation of .239 with a standard error of .241. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to find out the level of difference in their responses reveals a significant difference of .003, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .006 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 1.02, which represents 'Strongly Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted and implies that tertiary institutions in Anambra state do not have adequate ICT facilities, administrative and lecturer's offices.

Further analysis of responses to question 4, which sought to find out if tertiary institutions in Anambra state have adequate accommodation with reliable power and water supply for staff

and students reveals a grand mean of 2.58 with a standard deviation of 1.390 with a standard error of .304. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects shows a significant mean difference of .001, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .001 levels of difference reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 2.58, which represents 'Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted and implies that institutions in Anambra state do not have adequate accommodation with reliable power and water supply for staff and students.

Research Question 2: Has TETFund significantly intervened in the renovation and maintenance of infrastructures in Anambra state tertiary institutions?

Table 5: Results of SPSS Analysis of Responses to Questions

| S/n | Research questions | Grand Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | Tests of Between-Subjects Effects | Sig. | Pairwise Comparisons |
|-----|--|------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|---|
| 5 | Request for maintaining and/or replacing obsolete and mal-functioning teaching equipment sent to TETFund received positive attention | 1.02 | .239 | .241 | 240.296 | .003 | @ 95% confidence Interval with no adjustments |
| 6 | TETFund monitors the state of transport, energy, and water facilities and assists your institution in their maintenance | 1.02 | .239 | .241 | 240.296 | .003 | @ 95% confidence Interval with no adjustments |
| 7 | TETFund assists your institution to renovate lab infrastructures and replace damaged and/or used laboratory equipment | 2.09 | .345 | .058 | 189.002 | .000 | @ 95% confidence Interval, no adjustments |
| 8 | TETFund assists your institution to refurbish or renovate dilapidated buildings | 2.58 | 1.390 | .304 | 334.006 | .001 & .012 | @ 95% confidence Interval, no adjustments |

Source: SPSS Analysis of Responses to Questions

According to table 'v' above, analysis of responses to questions 5 that interrogated whether request for maintaining and/or replacing obsolete and mal-functioning teaching equipment sent to TETFund received positive attention reveals a total grand mean of 1.02 with standard deviation of .239 with a standard error of .241. According to the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects, the mean differences of the responses show a significant difference of .003, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .006 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 1.02 which represents 'Strongly Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted, and implies that TETFund did not respond positively to request for maintaining and/or replacing obsolete and mal-functioning teaching equipment sent by tertiary institutions in Anambra state.

Further, analysis of the responses to the question 6 that sought to find out if TETFund monitors the state of transport, energy, and water facilities and assists tertiary institution in Anambra state to maintain them reveals a grand mean of 1.02 with a standard deviation of .239 and standard error of .241. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to find out the level of difference in their responses reveals a significant difference of .003, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .003 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of

1.02, which represents 'Strongly Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted, and implies that TETFund does not monitors the state of transport, energy, and water facilities, nor assists tertiary institutions in Anambra state to maintain them.

Similar analysis of the responses to question 7 that sought to find out if TETFund assists tertiary institutions in Anambra state to renovate lab infrastructures and replace damaged and/or used laboratory equipment reveals a grand mean of 2.09 with a standard deviation of .345 and standard error of .058. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to find out the level of difference in their responses reveals a significant difference of .000, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .000 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 2.09, which represents 'Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted, and implies that TETFund does not assists tertiary institutions in Anambra state to renovate lab infrastructures and replace damaged and/or used laboratory equipment.

In addition, analysis of responses to question 8, which sought to find if TETFund assists tertiary institutions in Anambra state to refurnish or renovate dilapidated buildings reveals a ground mean of 2.58 with a standard deviation of 1.390 whose level of significance differences is .001 & .012 with no adjustments required. Thus, the grand means of 2.58, which represents 'Disagree' in our likert scale measures is accepted, and implies TETFund does not assist tertiary institutions in Anambra state to refurnish or renovate dilapidated buildings.

Research Question 3: Has TETFund Significantly Assisted Tertiary Institutions in Anambra State to Construct New Infrastructures in Anambra State?

Table 6: Results of SPSS Analysis of Responses to Questions

| S/n | Research questions | Grand Mean | Standard Deviation | Standard Error | Tests of Between-Subjects Effects | Sig. | Pairwise Comparisons |
|-----|--|------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|------|---|
| 9 | TETFund engage in the construction and equipment of lecture halls and lecturer's offices in your institution | 4.47 | .505 | .123 | 192.330 | .006 | @ 95% confidence Interval with no adjustments |
| 10 | TETFund engage in the provision of work tools and equipment for practical lessons in institution's laboratories | 1.02 | .239 | .241 | 240.296 | .003 | @ 95% confidence Interval with no adjustments |
| 11 | TETFund assists in the provision of modern information and communication technology facilities and transport equipment | 2.09 | .345 | .058 | 189.002 | .000 | @ 95% confidence Interval, no adjustments |
| 12 | TETFund assists your institution to provide up-to-date quality textbooks and library materials | 4.14 | .918 | .056 | 226.652 | .000 | @ 95% confidence Interval, no adjustments |
| 13 | TETFund assists your institution to provide seats, tables and other office equipment for effective teaching and learning | 2.09 | .345 | .058 | 189.002 | .000 | @ 95% confidence Interval, no adjustments |
| 14 | TETFund assists your institution in the construction of relevant infrastructures like library, office complex, hostels and provision of alternative source of energy | 4.43 | 0.239 | .100 | 362.003 | .000 | @ 95% confidence interval with no adjustments |

Source: SPSS Analysis of Responses to Questions

Analysis of responses to questions 9 in table 'vi' that interrogated if TETFund engage in the construction and equipment of lecture halls and lecturer's offices in your institution reveals a total grand mean of 4.47 with standard deviation of .505 with a standard error of .123. According to the Tests of Between-Subjects Effects, the mean differences of the responses show a significant difference of .006, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. Pairwise Comparison carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .006 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the ground means of 4.47, which represents 'Agree' in our likert scale measure is accepted, and implies that TETFund engages in the construction and equipment of lecture halls and lecturer's offices in tertiary institutions in Anambra state.

Further, analysis of the responses to the question 10 that sought to find out if TETFund engages in the provision of work tools and equipment for practical lessons in institution's laboratories reveals a grand mean of 1.02 with a standard deviation of .239 and standard error of .241. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to find out the level of difference in their responses reveals a significant difference of .003, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparison carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .003 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 1.02, which represents 'Strongly

'Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted, and implies that TETFund does not engage in the provision of work tools and equipment for practical lessons in tertiary institution's laboratories in Anmbra state.

Similar analysis of the responses to question 11 that sought to find out if TETFund assists in the provision of modern information and communication technology facilities and transport equipment reveals a grand mean of 2.09 with a standard deviation of .345 and standard error of .058. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to find out the level of difference in their responses reveals a significant difference of .000, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .000 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 2.09, which represents 'Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted, and implies that TETFund does not assist in the provision of modern information and communication technology facilities and transport equipment.

In addition, analysis of responses to question 12, which sought to find if TETFund assists tertiary institutions in the state to provide up-to-date quality textbooks and library materials reveals a ground mean of 4.14 with a standard deviation of .918 whose level of significance differences is .000 with no adjustments required. Thus, the grand means of 4.14, which represents 'Agree' in our likert scale measures is accepted, and implies TETFund provides assistance up-to-dating quality textbooks and library materials.

In addition, analysis of responses to question 13, which sought to find if TETFund assists institution to provide seats, tables and other office equipment for effective teaching and learning reveals a grand mean of 2.09 with a standard deviation of .345 and standard error of .058. A Tests of Between-Subjects Effects to find out the level of difference in their responses reveals a significant difference of .000, whereas the mean difference should be significant at .05 levels. The Pairwise Comparism carried out to determine the level of adjustment due to .000 levels of significances reveals no adjustment. Thus, the grand means of 2.09, which represents 'Disagree' in our likert scale measure is accepted, and implies that TETFund does not assist institutions to provide seats, tables and other office equipment for effective teaching and learning.

Finally, analysis of responses to question 14, which sought to find if TETFund assists tertiary institutions in the construction of relevant infrastructures like library, office complex, hostels and provision of alternative source of energy reveals a ground mean of 4.43 with a standard deviation of 0.239 whose level of significance differences is .000 with no adjustments required. Thus, the grand means of 4.43, which represents 'Agree' in our likert scale measures is accepted, and implies TETFund provides assistance TETFund provides assistance to tertiary institutions in the construction of relevant infrastructures like library, office complex, hostels and provision of alternative source of energy.

Discussion

From results of analyses to questions 1 – 4, this paper observes that tertiary institutions in Anambra state are still facing the challenges of poor infrastructure in spite of the establishment and interventions of TETFund. This finding collaborates earlier report by Okeke-ezeanyanwu & Okpala (2021), Tayo et al. (2012) among others to the effect that infrastructural decay still persist in Nigeria tertiary institutions. Some publications such as Nwangwu (2005), Muogbo (2013), NUC (2004), Mgbekem (2004) and Nwede (2009) blame inadequate human resources, mismanagement of fund, corruption, and inadequate funds for this scenario. However, this paper observes that TETFund does not intervene in the maintenance of existing infrastructures.

This, which other research have failed to observe can explain why the Fund's interventions have failed to change the scenario.

In addition, the paper equally observes that TETFund interventions concentrated only in the area of providing new up-to-date quality textbooks and library materials, and construction of new infrastructures like library, office complex, hostels, and provision of alternative source of energy needs of the institutions to the neglect of others. Although this finding was supported by scholars such as (2011, 2008), Nwagwu (2004), and Osagie (2003), we contend that annual allocations to tertiary institutions in Anambra state are highly inadequate for the replacement of decaying infrastructures and the construct of new ones. The finding that TETFund intervenes in constructing new infrastructures aligns with observations made by many scholars such as Fejoh & Adesanwo (2021), Idowu (2020) and Nagbi & Micah (2019), but essentially this paper observes that these interventions are narrowly and minutely focused on building construction alone. This equally contributed to the low significant impact being recorded by the interventions.

4.0 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research offers the following recommendations:

- i. TETFund should extend its interventions in Anambra state tertiary institutions to include the renovation of existing infrastructures.
- ii. TETFund should create counter-part funding programme to assist tertiary institutions in Anambra state engage in self-help projects.
- iii. TETFund should diversify its interventions to include other infrastructures like provision of equipment for laboratories, staff offices, and the libraries.
- iv. TETFUND intervention activities, progress report, and benefiting tertiary institutions should be made public either through monthly, or biannual, or annual report. This will build public trust and accountability.

REFERENCES

- Adedipe, N.O. (2007). University quality assurance: Finding strategy and task allocation. Being paper presented at the workshop on tertiary education financing at the University of Lagos on April 23 – 24
- Adeyemi, T. (September 2011). Financing of Education in Nigeria: an Analytical Review. *Proceedings in Education*. DOI:10.5251/AJSMS.2011.2.3.295.303
- Agabi, C.O. & Ogah, J.I. (2010). Education and Human Resource Planning in Nigeria: The Case of National Manpower Board. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 3(3), 152 – 165.
- Agha, N.C. (2014). Funding university education in Nigeria: Implications on institutional performance. *International Journal of scientific research and Management*, 2(8), 1145-1153
- Balkie, A. (2002). *Recurrent Issues in Nigeria Education*. Zaria: Tanaza Publishing
- Ekundayo, H.T. & Ajayi, I. A. (2009). Towards Effective Management of University Education in Nigeria. *International NGO Journal*, 4, 342-347. Retrieved November 2, 2022 from <http://www.academicjournals.org/INGOJ>
- Ezeali, B. & Esiagu, L. (2009). *Public Personnel Management: Human Capital Management Strategy in the 21st Century*. Onitsha: Chambers Books Ltd.
- Ezeali, B.O. (2017). Impact of TETFUND Intervention on Human Resources Development in Government Owned Tertiary Institutions in South Eastern Nigeria (2011-2016). *International Journal of Finance and Management in Practice*, 5(2), 68-80.
- Fejoh, J. & Adesanwo, E. (2021). Impact of Tertiary Education Trust Fund (Tetfund) Interventions on Industrial Peace in Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye, Ogun State. *Izvestiya Journal of Varna University of Economics*, 65 (1), 120 - 135. DOI: 10.36997/IJUEV2021.65.1.120
- Ibrahim, Shuaibu (2017). Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund), Research and Development and Nigeria's higher education. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 3(7), 799 - 814. doi: 10.5281/zenodo.844096
- Idowu, S.A. (2020). Tertiary Education Trust Fund (Tetfund), Infrastructural And Sustainable Development Of Nigerian Higher Institutions (2010-2019). Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference, The Federal Polytechnic, Ilaro, 10th – 11th November.
- 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, April-June. Retrieved November 2, 2022 from www.seahipaj.org
- NUC (2004). Report on the performance of the federal university system in 2002. Presented at the special meeting convened by the Honourable Minister of Education on Thursday, December 12
- Okebukola, P. (2005). *The State of University Education in Nigeria*. Abuja, Nigeria: National Universities Commission

- Okeke-ezeanyanwu, J.A. & Okpala, C.E. (2021) Business Educators' Perception of the Contribution of TETFund in the Development of Business Education Programme for Sustainable Development in Anambra State of Nigeria. *International Journal of Education Humanities and Social Science*. 4(02), 78 – 88. Retrieved October 17, 2022 from <http://ijehss.com/>
- Subair, S.O. (2011). Infrastructure and students' perceived motivation to learning in universities in South-Western Nigeria. In Alani, A. & Oni, S. (Eds.). *Trends and Issues in Education in Nigeria*. Ibadan: Triumph- Providential Publishers
- Suleiman E.B (2019). TETFUND and the development of Tertiary Education in Nigeria: Strategies, Performance and Challenges. Paper presented at the Institute for Security Studies Bwari, F.C.T Abuja, Nigeria, on 17th May.
- Tayo, S.S., Okotoni, C.A., Adebakin, I. & Azeez, B.1. (2012) Problems of infrastructure in tertiary institutions. *Makerere Journal of Higher Education*, 4(1), 111–124. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/majohe.v4i1.9>
- Ugwoke, R.O. (2013). Education tax law and administration in Nigeria. Retrieved October 17, 2022 from <https://www.semanticscholar.org>. Corpus ID: 157260365

License

Copyright (c) 2024 Obi, Yves Mary Virginia, PhD, Emenike Ekene, Okoye Sunday Nonso, Achinike, Daniel Chimaobim



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).
Authors retain copyright and grant the journal right of first publication with the work simultaneously licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution \(CC-BY\) 4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) that allows others to share the work with an acknowledgment of the work's authorship and initial publication in this journal.