UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.18 (1);
July-December, 2024 https://unijerps.org
2023 Impact Factor: **6.834;** 2022 ***Impact Factor***: 5.156; ***2021 Impact Factor: 5.641;***
tor: 5.355. *Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363*

UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT AND STAKEHOLDERS' PARTICIPATION IN THE FUNDING OF RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT AND STAFF WELFARE OF STATE OWNED UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH-SOUTH NIGERIA

Jim-Dorgu Godson
Department of Educational Foundations,
Faculty of Education, Niger Delta University,
Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State
gjimdorgu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to ascertain the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff on stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare, research and development in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. The research design utilized in this study was that of analytical descriptive survey design. The target population of this study was made up of 506 management staff from six selected state owned public Universities in South-South, Nigeria during the 2022/2023 academic session. A sample size of 430 management staff (representing 85%) of the total population was selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique from the two strata of principal officer and non-principal officer management staff of state owned public Universities in South-South, Nigeria. A structured questionnaire titled "University Management Perception of Stakeholders' Participation in the Funding of State Owned Universities Questionnaire (UMPSPFSOUQ) was developed by the investigator of this study. Two experts and the investigator's supervisor checked the validity of the instrument. The instrument was administered to 40 management staff of University of Africa, Toru-Orua in Bayelsa State that were not part of the main population of the study. The internal consistency of the test was determined using scores collected from a single administration of the item. Through the use of Cronbach Alpha analysis, we were able to ascertain the reliability coefficient values for each variable inside the instrument. For every component of the complex tool, the dependability coefficient was determined. The values obtained were stakeholders' participation in funding research and development (0.80), stakeholders' participation in funding staff welfare (0.85), and the overall instrument (0.82). The dependability coefficients for different sectors were derived from the overall condition of the instrument. The investigator and two trained research assistants administered the instrument to ensure that copies of the questionnaire were distributed and retrieved efficiently. This study used descriptive and inferential statistics to examine its data. The inferential statistical tool of interest applicable in the study for data analysis was ANOVA analysis. All hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. Findings indicated that management staff status does influence management staff significantly on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities. Among others, it was recommended that university management staff should be

appreciative of their management status; sine it can motivate their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities.

Keywords: University Management; Stakeholders; Participation; Funding; Research, Development; Staff Welfare

Introduction

Education is considered a catalyst for enhancing the social, political, and cultural progress of a nation. The significance of being a game changer cannot be exaggerated, as it plays a crucial role in both personal transformation and national progress. Nigeria's educational system is divided into three tiers: primary, secondary, and tertiary. According to Ada, Ofem, and Ameh (2019), the university represents the pinnacle of higher education in this hierarchical structure. University education is the most advanced kind of higher education, dedicated to equipping individuals with the necessary skills and knowledge to excel globally and bring about significant changes in society.

University education includes the educational programs offered by universities, colleges of Education, Polytechnics, Monotechnics, and institutions providing correspondence courses. It is undertaken following the completion of secondary schooling. According to Ayo-Sobowale (2011), post-secondary education refers to the educational stage that comes after secondary education. It encompasses traditional universities that offer courses in sciences and humanities, as well as specialized universities that focus on sciences, agriculture, and engineering. University education holds a central position in higher education in Nigeria. According to Emenalo (2013), university education is considered to be the primary source of accredited information and the most significant gathering of qualified specialists in many disciplines of study. These experts play a crucial role in the advancement and progress of society. It provides skilled personnel at a higher level to contribute to the socio-political and economic progress of a nation. According to Subair (2008), a University is considered a community of intellectuals that prioritize the power of the mind over physical objects and emphasize the importance of subordinating material things to intellectual pursuits.

Nigerian tertiary institutions encompass universities, colleges of education, polytechnics, institutes of technology, and other professional institutions that operate under several ministries. These institutions can be classified into federal and state entities. Higher institutions can be classified as private institutions that are formed or owned by religious organizations, individuals, or other private entities. Public institutions are entities that are owned or founded by the government at either the state or federal level. In Nigeria, there are two types of universities: federal universities and state-owned universities. Each of these higher education institutions necessitates the

presence of infrastructure, equipment, resources, and manpower.

The funding of state-owned universities mostly relies on government money, which typically constitutes less than 10% of the national budget at the federal level. This amount falls below both the African average and UNESCO's minimum requirement of 15% (Bamiro & Adedeji, 2010). State universities were granted licenses as a consequence of the states fulfilling the requirement of creating universities, one of which is providing finance. The institutions are subject to state control and funding, particularly with regards to ongoing expenses, and the State Governor serves as the Visitor (Tolutope & Dang 2019). Mogaji (2019) observes that state universities are created by individual states within the nation and are answerable to the Ministry of Education of the respective state. State universities frequently lack sufficient funding in comparison to federal universities, as their funding is contingent upon education budget allocations that vary among different states. The absence of funding adversely impacts the calibre of their facilities and the overall student experience. The expenditure associated with operating the state university system is substantial. The majority of funding for the system is derived from the state allotment. The primary sources of university revenues are as follows: the state government contributes 84% of the funds, income production activities account for 7%, and various student fees make up the remaining 9% of the revenues. The current pattern of escalating monetary backing for the system is like to persist as inadequate in the next years. Ekundayo and Ajayi (2019) assert that the State Government has significantly reduced the financial resources allocated to the Universities, providing a funding level that is 51.8% below the recommendation set by UNESCO. He elaborated that despite the University's demands aligning with the criteria set by the National Universities Commission (NUC), the disparity between the requested amount and the granted amount varied from 25% to 54% during a span of five years.

A study by Akpan and Umor (2019) emphasizes the need for universities to actively engage with stakeholders, cultivate relationships, and establish avenues for donations and sponsorships. University management and stakeholders' financial contributions can provide assistance in infrastructure development, scholarships, and research grants, ensuring the financial sustainability of state-owned universities. Stakeholder engagement plays a pivotal role in supporting funding for universities. By fostering collaborative relationships with various stakeholders, higher education institutions can enhance their financial resources and sustainability

Research, development, and staff welfare are critical components of state-owned universities' functions in South-South Nigeria. Research drives innovation, addresses regional challenges, and contributes to socio-economic development. Development initiatives encompass infrastructure projects, technology upgrades, and capacity-building efforts aimed at enhancing teaching, learning, and research

capabilities. According to Adams and Campbell (2019), investing in R&D in higher education institutions is essential for fostering innovation and maintaining competitiveness. State-owned universities face various challenges in promoting R&D, including limited funding, resource constraints, and increasing competition. For instance, universities can allocate funding for state-of-the-art laboratories, research equipment, and technology platforms to facilitate cutting-edge research (Brown & Smith, 2020).

Staff welfare is another critical aspect of state-owned universities, as the well-being of faculty and staff directly impacts institutional performance and morale. Brown and Smith (2020) highlight the importance of enhancing staff welfare in universities to attract and retain talent, improve job satisfaction, and foster a supportive work environment. Addressing work-life balance, providing professional development opportunities, ensuring fair compensation and benefits, and creating inclusive work environments are essential strategies for enhancing staff welfare (Chen & Huang, 2018). Staff welfare initiatives are essential for attracting and retaining qualified personnel, fostering a conducive work environment, and promoting job satisfaction and productivity. State-owned universities rely on a mix of funding sources including government allocations, tuition fees, research grants, philanthropic donations, and partnerships with the private sector and international organizations. Effective management of these financial resources and stakeholder involvement in funding decisions are crucial for sustaining research, development, and staff welfare initiatives amidst budgetary constraints and competing priorities.

Research Questions

1. What is the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria?
2. What is the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria?

Research Hypotheses

1. There is no substantial difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.
2. There is no substantial difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Literature Review

Empirical Literature

Dayu (2014) investigated the effect of funding on the administration of Nigerian public secondary schools by surveying relevant parties. The objective was to

pinpoint and rectify any deficiencies in the financing of secondary education in Nigeria. Nine research questions were formulated, each with a corresponding set of nine hypotheses. The field of secondary school financing and management was the focus of a comprehensive literature review. A total of 270,650 educators, 7,065 representatives from the Ministry of Education, and 18,238 principals were surveyed for the study. This equates to an aggregate sum of 295,944 participants. The implementation of random sampling guaranteed that each state and responder had an equitable chance of being chosen. The poll encompassed a grand total of 1,105 participants, comprising 65 education officials, 13,360 Principals, and 910 instructors. The population's sample size was established using the 10% Krejcie and Morgans (2004) Table. A systematic questionnaire was used. The findings revealed that the funding supplied to secondary schools is inadequate in all crucial components of administration. Key proposals include allocating 26% of the budget to education and encouraging principals to efficiently utilise other financing sources.

Oladipo and Adewale (2018) conducted a study to examine the correlation between welfare services and students' satisfaction with their school life. The study focused on the University of Lagos, Nigeria, as a specific case. A correlational research strategy was employed in the study. A total of 6,124 graduating seniors from the university made up the population, and 400 students from 10 different departments were chosen at random using a standard random sampling approach. Researchers used a self-administered questionnaire with 20 questions to compile their data. A significance level of 0.05 was used to analyze the gathered data using the PPMC technique. The findings point to a strong, positive, and statistically significant relationship between the satisfaction of students with their hostel housing and their overall school experience. Additionally, there is a moderate, positive, and statistically significant association between the provision of security services and students' pleasure with their school life. The study determined that students' welfare services make a significant contribution to overall satisfaction with school life, ultimately improving institutional management and enhancing students' learning outcomes. The study suggests that the current policy on student accommodation should be reevaluated in order to enhance the supply of enhanced and superior facilities. In order to achieve the objectives of sustainable educational development, it is imperative that the security services are equipped to meet the demands of the 21st century.

Okafor and Amini-Philips (2020) looked at how people in Rivers State who care about achieving the sustainable development goals of UBE (Universal Basic Education) via learning more and being better at what they do were involved. The research method used was a descriptive survey. Significantly more than thirty-nine thousand people from Rivers State's junior secondary schools (UBE) made up the study's population. From this pool, 3,122 stakeholders were chosen at random. They used a stratified sampling

method. Data was collected using the 10-item "Stakeholders Participation in Sensitization and Capacity Building for the Attainment of Sustainable Development Goals Questionnaire" (SPSCBASGQ). In terms of raising awareness and improving skill development, the results indicated that stakeholders were not very active. Research in Rivers State has shown that stakeholders are not doing enough to help achieve UBE's sustainable development goals. In order to attain sustainable development, it was proposed that all parties concerned be informed through the media about the significance of fully participating in the implementation of UBE. Furthermore, it was proposed that parents and persons who are sincerely interested in each community should pool their resources and make financial contributions to improve the skills and capabilities of instructors. The government should guarantee the supply of adequate infrastructure and appropriately motivate teachers to ensure their consistent dedication to their responsibilities.

Research Method

Research Design: The research design utilized in this study was that of analytical descriptive survey design. Nwankwo (2016), note that descriptive survey design supports a researcher to effectively compare the opinion of different demographic details of the study population using hypotheses. In this study, the demographic detail of interest was that of management staff status which was applied to compare their opinion on the subject matter under investigation. Another important attribute that supported the utilization of this design was that, it does not permit a researcher to manipulate the independent variable in the study as obtainable in the case of true experimental design.

Population of the Study: The target population of this study was made up of 506 management staff from six selected state owned public Universities in South-South, Nigeria during the 2022/2023 academic session (Office of the Establishment Officer of Universities, 2023). This was distributed as 60, 81, 69, 112, 77 and 107 for Akwa Ibom State University of Technology (AKUTECH); Ambrose Ali University(AAU), Ekpoma; Cross River State University of Science and Technology (CRUTECH), Calabar; Niger Delta University (NDU); Rivers State University (RSU), Port-Harcourt and Delta State University (DELSU), Abraka respectively. Similarly, the population was further distributed as 36 and 470 principal officers and non-principal officers respectively.

Sample and Sampling Technique: A sample size of 430 management staff (representing 85%) of the total population was selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique from the two strata of principal officer and non-principal officer management staff of state owned public Universities in South-South, Nigeria, during the 2022/2023 academic session. This was distributed as 51, 69, 59, 95, 65 and 91 for Akwa Ibom State University of Technology (AKUTECH); Ambrose Ali University (AAU), Ekpoma; Cross River State University of Science and Technology (CRUTECH), Calabar; Niger Delta

University (NDU); Rivers State University (RSU), Port-Harcourt and Delta State University (DELSU), Abraka respectively. Similarly, the sample was further distributed as 30 and 400principal officers and non-principal officers' management staff respectively. Table 3.1 indicates the sample frame and distribution of sample into the six (6) selected state owned Universities.

Instrumentation of the Study: A structured questionnaire titled "University Management Perception of Stakeholders' Participation in the Funding of State Owned Universities Questionnaire (UMPSPFSOUQ) was developed by the investigator of this study. The questionnaire is divided into section A and B. containing seven (7) items each. The measurement of all items was conducted using a 4-point rating scale of `Strongly Agree (SA) 4-points; Agree (A) 3-points, Disagree (D) 2-points and Strongly Disagree (SD) 1-point

Validation of the Instrument: Two experts and the investigator's supervisor checked the validity of the instrument. Located at Wilberforce Island, Bayelsa State, Niger Delta University's Department of Educational Foundations was home to two experts: one in educational administration and planning and the other in measurement and assessment. Simply by gauging its perceived worth, the supervisor validated the procedure for ascertaining the instrument's validity. The expert from educational management and planning carried out the validity process of the instrument on the content aspect and also ensured the appropriateness of each item statement in respect of the variables in the study. In the contrary, the expert from measurement and evaluation carefully implemented the validity of the instrument on the construct value. All the comments, suggestions and observations were sincerely utilized in arriving at the final draft of the instrument.

Reliability of the Instrument: The instrument was administered to 40 management staff of University of Africa, Toru-Orua in Bayelsa State that were not part of the main population of the study. The internal consistency of the test was determined using scores collected from a single administration of the item. Through the use of Cronbach's Alpha analysis, we were able to ascertain the reliability coefficient values for each variable inside the instrument. For every component of the complex tool, the dependability coefficient was determined. The values obtained were stakeholders' participation in funding research and development (0.80), stakeholders' participation in funding staff welfare (0.85), and the overall instrument (0.82). The dependability coefficients for different sectors were derived from the overall condition of the instrument.

Administration of the Instrument: The investigator and two trained research assistants administered the instrument to ensure that copies of the questionnaire were distributed and retrieved efficiently. The primary goal of employing research assistants with the necessary skills was to guarantee a high rate of return for all of the disseminated questionnaires. A total of 450

copies of the instrument were distributed, however, 430 (96%) copies of the instrument were completely administered by the respondents and alternatively, 20 (4%) copies were not properly administered as a result these copies were not utilized for the purpose of analysis in the study. The duration of period for distribution and retrieval of copies of the instrument for data collection lasted for seven (7) weeks.

Method of Data Analysis: This study used descriptive and inferential statistics to examine its data. Study participants' demographic information was analyzed and research issues were addressed using the descriptive statistics techniques of standard deviation, simple percentage, and mean. The inferential statistical tool of interest applicable in the study for data analysis was ANOVA analysis. All hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance. In addition, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25 was the central point of utilization for all the analyses in the study.

Presentation of Results

Research Question 1: What is the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria?

Table 1: Summary of mean and standard deviation scores of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities

S/N	Stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development	Principal Officer		Non-Principal Officer		Total		Decision
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
1	Stakeholders are involved in the development of research centers	2.50	1.04	2.45	1.09	2.46	1.09	Rejected
2	Stakeholders are involved in the funding of innovative activities	3.17	0.75	2.55	1.05	2.59	1.04	Accepted
3	Stakeholders are involved in the funding of research grants	3.20	0.85	2.84	0.97	2.86	0.97	Accepted
4	Stakeholders are involved in the funding of research equipment	3.17	1.05	2.55	1.12	2.60	1.13	Accepted
5	Stakeholders are involved in the funding of travel grants	2.93	0.94	2.54	1.01	2.57	1.01	Accepted
6	Stakeholders are involved in the funding of conferences	2.53	1.17	2.11	0.98	2.14	1.00	Rejected
7	Stakeholders are involved in providing travelling expenses during research work	2.77	0.86	2.35	1.05	2.38	1.04	Rejected
	Grand Mean/SD	**2.90**	**0.46**	**2.48**	**0.58**	**2.51**	**0.54**	**Accepted**

Cut-off mean = **2.50**; Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **30**; Non-Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **400** and Total = **430**

The data represented in Table 1 reveals that, the mean rating scores of principal officer management staff in all items were equal to and greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 2.50, 3.17, 3.20, 3.17, 2.93, 2.53 and 2.77 respectively. This implies all items were accepted by the principal officer management staff. Alternatively, the non-principal officer management staff mean rating scores for all items were also greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except items 15, 20 and 21 with mean scores of 2.45, 2.55, 2.84, 2.55, 2.54, 2.11 and 2.35 respectively. This implies that all items were accepted except items 15, 20 and 21 by the non-principal officer management staff. Table 4.6 also indicates that, on the whole the total mean rating scores for all items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except items 15, 20 and 21 with mean scores of 2.46, 2.59, 2.86, 2.60, 2.57, 2.14 and 2.38respectively. This implies that all items were accepted except items 15, 20 and 21. The grand mean rating score of non-principal officer management staff (2.48) was less than that of the principal officer management staff (2.90) with a total grand rating mean score of (2.51) being greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This simply means that, principal officer management staff mean rating score was better than that of the non-principal officer management staff on their rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities. Consequent upon the observed difference the mean rating scores were further subjected to ANOVA analysis in order to ascertain if the difference observed is substantial or not.

Research Question 2: What is the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria?

Table 2: Summary of mean and standard deviation scores of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities

S/N	Stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare	Principal Officers		Non-Principal Officers		Total		Decision
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
8	Stakeholders support in the funding of staff allowances	3.13	0.82	2.73	0.98	2.76	0.97	Accepted
9	Stakeholders support in the funding of staff accommodation,	2.70	1.09	2.43	1.01	2.45	1.02	Rejected
10	Stakeholders support in the funding of health services	2.27	1.08	2.16	1.03	2.17	1.03	Rejected
11	Stakeholders support in the funding of retirement benefits	2.90	1.00	2.42	1.08	2.45	1.08	Rejected
12	Stakeholders support in the funding of recreational facilities	2.63	0.85	2.67	0.95	2.66	0.95	Accepted

13	Stakeholders support in the funding of leave bonuses	2.20	1.13	2.06	1.01	2.07	1.02	Rejected
14	Stakeholders support in the funding of death benefits	3.00	1.08	2.60	1.09	2.63	1.09	Accepted
	Grand Mean/SD	**2.69**	**0.51**	**2.44**	**0.52**	**2.46**	**0.52**	**Rejected**

Cut-off mean = **2.50**; Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **30**; Non-Principal Officer Mgt. Staff = **400** and Total = **430**

The data represented in Table 2 indicates that, the mean rating scores of principal officer management staff in all items were greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except items 24 and 27 with mean scores of 3.13, 2.70, 2.27, 2.90, 2.63, 2.20 and 3.00 respectively. This implies all items were accepted except items 24 and 27 by the principal officer management staff. Similarly, the non-principal officer management staff mean rating scores for all items were also greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except items 23, 24, 25 and 27 with mean scores of 2.73, 2.43, 2.16, 2.42, 2.67, 2.06 and 2.60 respectively. This implies that three items were accepted and items 23, 24, 25 and 27 were rejected by the non-principal officer management staff. Table 4.7 still reveals that, on the whole the total mean rating scores for all items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50 except items 23, 24, 25 and 27 with mean scores of 2.76, 2.45, 2.17, 2.45, 2.66, 2.07 and 2.63 respectively. This implies that all items were not accepted as indicated in the mean scores of items 23, 24, 25 and 27 respectively. The grand mean rating score of non-principal officer management staff (2.44) was less than that of the principal officer management staff (2.69) with a total grand rating mean score of (2.46) being less than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This simply means that, principal officer management staff mean rating score was better than that of the non-principal officer management staff on their rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities. Consequent upon the observed difference the mean rating scores were further subjected to ANOVA analysis in order to confirm if the difference observed is substantial or not.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Table 3: ANOVA analyses of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Principal officer management staff	Between Groups	10.161	3	3.387	3.136	.025
Non-principal officer management staff	Within Groups	460.046	426	1.080		
	Total	470.207	429			

Source: Authors computation

The data in Table 4.12 indicates that the ANOVA analysis is statistically significant at a significance level of 0.05. This is because the probability (Sig.) associated with the ANOVA result which is 0.025 is less than the alpha value of 0.05 considering 429 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis, which asserts that there is no significant difference between the mean rating of stakeholder participation in research and development funding among principal and non-principal officers in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria, may be refuted. Thus, the alternative hypothesis, which asserts that there is a notable disparity in the mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development between principal and non-principal officers' management staff in State-owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria, is supported.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Table 4: ANOVA analyses of the difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Principal officer management staff	Between Groups	8.417	3	2.806	2.849	.037
Non-principal officer management staff	Within Groups	419.481	426	.985		
	Total	427.898	429			

Source: Author's computation

The data in Table 4.13 shows that the ANOVA analysis is statistically significant at a significance level of 0.05. This is because the probability (Sig.) associated with the ANOVA result which is 0.037 is less than the alpha value of 0.05 considering

429 degrees of freedom. Therefore, the null hypothesis not accepted. Thus, the alternative hypothesis, which asserts that there is a significant difference in the mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare between principal and non-principal officers' management staff in State owned Universities in South-South, Nigeria, is accepted.

Discussion of Findings

The data in Table 1 shows that the average score for principal officer management staff (2.90) was higher than that of non-principal officer management staff (2.48) in terms of their assessment of stakeholder involvement in funding research and development in State owned Universities. The statistical analysis in Table 1 reveals a notable disparity in the average evaluation of stakeholder participation in research and development financing between principal and non-principal officers in State owned Universities.

The findings suggest that the status of management personnel positively influences the mean rating of stakeholders' participation in funding research and development at State-owned Universities. The findings demonstrate that senior officer management staff in State owned Universities ranked higher than non-principal officer management staff in terms of stakeholders' involvement in funding research and development. The assessment of the senior officer management staff is anticipated and unsurprising due to their extensive experience with financial concerns inside the university system. The results of this study are consistent with the findings of Jas and Jonathan (2013) that there is a notable disparity in the average rating of stakeholder participation in research and development funding between principal and non-principal officers in management staff of State owned Universities. In contrast, the results of this study contradict the findings of Mansuri (2004), which stated that there is no notable distinction between the average rating of stakeholders' involvement in funding research and development in State owned Universities for principal and non-principal officers' management staff.

The result presented in Table 2 shows that, the mean score of principal officer management staff (2.69) was greater than that of non-principal officer management staff (2.44) on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities. Statistical analysis in Table 4 indicates that, there is a significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities.

The result implies that, management staff status does contribute to management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities. The result also indicates that principal officer management staff rated higher on the stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities than that of their non-principal officer management staff in the study. The rating of the principal officer management staff is expected and not surprising, as a

result of their interest in the overall welfare of staff in the university system. The finding of this study is in line with the findings of Asiyai (2015) that, there is a significant difference between principal and non-principal officers' management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities. On the other hand, the results of this study contradict those of Peretamode (2006), who found that management staff members who are not principals did not significantly differ from one another when it came to rating the level of involvement of stakeholders in funding staff welfare at state-owned universities.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusion was provided. The study concludes that, management staff status does influence management staff significantly on their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities. Management staff status has significant influence on management staff mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities.

Recommendations

The following recommendations were formulated in the study.

1. University management staff should be appreciative of their management status; sine it can motivate their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of research and development in State owned Universities.
2. University management staff should not overlook their management status, since it can influence their mean rating of stakeholders' participation in the funding of staff welfare in State owned Universities.

REFERENCES

Ada, M. J., Ofem, W &Ameh, E. (2019). Funding patterns in public universities and cost-sharing in Nigeria for global competitiveness: empirical evidence from University of Calabar. *Journal of Advances in Education and Philosophy*.

Adams, O. A & Campbell, Y. O. (2019). Alternative sources of funding vocational and technical education in Nigeria. Continental. *Journal education research; 8(1): 1-10*

Akpan T. H & Umor, I. A. (2019). Towards effective management of university education in Nigeria. *International NGO Journal Vol. 4 (8), 342-347.*

Ayo-S, M. (2011). Funding strategies for quality university education in Nigeria: the principle of fiscal justice. *Journal of Studies in Education*, 1(1).

Brown, L. O & Smith, M. I. (2020). Exploration of Pragmatic Funding Sources in Funding Higher Education in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4 (14).

Dayu, S. B. (2014). Perceptions of stakeholders on the impact of funding on the management of public secondary schools in Nigeria. A dissertation submitted to the school of post graduate studies in

partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Doctor of Philosophy in Educational Administration and Planning, Department of Educational Foundations and Curriculum, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.

Ekundayo, T. H & I. A. Ajayi. (2009). Towards effective management of university education in Nigeria. *International NGO Journal Vol. 4 (8), 342-347.*

Mogaji, E. (2019). Types and location of Nigerian universities. Research Agenda Working Papers. 9 (7) 92-103.

Subair, S. T. (2008). Infrastructure, welfare services and students' perceived motivation to learning in universities in South-West Nigeria. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis. University of Lagos.

Tolutope, I. O, & Dang, P. L. (2019). Funding tertiary education for national development in Nigeria: a historical perspective. KIU Journal of Social Sciences, Kampala International University; 5(2): 59-67.