POLITICS AND SCARCITY: UNPACKING RESOURCE ALLOCATION DYNAMICS IN NIGERIAN HIGHER EDUCATION

Ogbomida, A. O., Obano, E. J. and Emmanuel, O. O.

Department of Vocational and Technical Education Faculty of Education, University of Benin, Benin City
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8239632

Abstract: Resource allocation in Nigerian higher education institutions has long been a pressing issue, with inadequate funding being a major concern. Despite the UNESCO recommendation of allocating a minimum of 26% of annual budget to education, Nigeria allocates only 6% to 7% for higher education. This study delves into the complex and politically charged landscape of resource allocation in Nigerian universities, where meager resources are distributed among various units, departments, and individuals. The allocation of resources is not only a managerial challenge but also a subject of intense research.

The allocation of a mere 0.76% of Gross National Product (GNP) to the education sector in Nigeria pales in comparison to Sub-Saharan African and OECD countries. As a result, resource allocation becomes a multifaceted issue intertwined with political and sentimental considerations. Various specialized boards, committees, and ad-hoc committees are employed by universities to allocate resources efficiently. However, the decisions made by these committees have often been influenced by organizational politics, leading to issues of inequity, tribalism, and bias.

Nigerian universities heavily rely on committees for decision-making across a wide range of activities including policy formulation, resource management, staff recruitment, and research implementation. While these committees are intended to promote efficiency and transparency, they are sometimes plagued by corruption, power struggles, and bias, ultimately affecting the fair distribution of resources.

This study aims to explore the impact of organizational politics on resource allocation decisions within Nigerian universities. The scarcity of resources within the institutions creates a power struggle where political factors such as ethnicity, religion, and partisan considerations come into play. These dynamics often lead to preferences and discriminations in resource distribution, influencing who benefits and who loses. The study seeks to shed light on the intricate relationship between organizational politics and resource allocation decisions and provide insights into the strategies employed by university stakeholders to influence resource distribution.

Keywords: Resource allocation, Nigerian universities, higher education, organizational politics, decision-making, committees, efficiency, transparency, equity, bias.

Introduction

For a very long time now Nigeria, the issue of inadequate resource allocation to both federal and state universities has been a burning one. Infact, Akpakwu and Okwo (2014) consider that despite the UNESCO requirement for a minimum 26% of annual allocation for education to member countries, the amount set aside for higher education in Nigeria still dangles between 6% – 7% generally, in view of their budgets to education. This has made the issue of sharing critical resources in Nigerian tertiary institutions a big challenge to management and a big subject matter for serious research.

The overall, 0.76 percent of Gross National Product (GNP) allocated to education sector in Nigeria is lower than the average of 4.5 percent of GDP allocated to education sector in Sub-Saharan African countries and lower when compared with the average of 6 percent of GDP allocated to education sector by OECD countries. Consequently this makes equitable allocation of resources within the system not just a complex matter but also political and sentimental (Abidogun, as cited in Edame and Eturoma, 2014). In the opinions of Agboola and Adeyemi (2012), although in Nigeria, education sector has received increased budgetary allocation every fiscal year, the allocation falls below the 26% as stipulated by the UNESCO. Consequently, for the purpose of efficient and effective management of available meager resources, many universities in Nigeria use various specialized boards, committees and ad-hoc committees for the allocation of their critical resources to staff, students, departments, faculties and various units in the system. This makes the bulk of a universities business to be left in the hands of committees set up by either Councils, Senate or Vice-Chancellor, Deans or Directors or even heads of departments.

Nigerian universities use various committees to make critical decisions that promote development within the university system and act as catalysts that fast-track the physical and intellectual growth of the system in competitive terms with other ivory towers in the world (Ogbomida, Obano, Emmanuel, 2013). Nigerian universities can hardly take decisions without boards, committees and adhoc committees in various activities such policy making, adequate planning and resources management, staff recruitment, students" admission, teaching, research, decision making, assessment of needs and implementations of projcts among others. For example, as at (2004), Mgbekem remarked that the University of Benin, for instance, has about fifty committees to facilitate the work of Council, Senate and Vice-Chancellor. This happens in almost all the public universities in Nigeria. However, there are some committees that appear to be of special interest to the generality of the university staff. These committees include those of housing loans, appointment and promotion, staff housing allocation, car refurbishing loan, research grant, furniture loan; and study/sabbatical leave. The roles which these committees play in the allocation of these scare resources appears engineer different class of staff in the universities have special interest in them because many of them have different benefits to staff. This makes these committees which are supposed to be instrument for enhancing efficiency, effectiveness, fairness and transparency in the discharge of their responsibilities to be negatively associated with tribalism, unionism, and religious bigotry, to mention a few (Osha, 2000).

In the words of Charas (2015), universities and other public organizations adopt the use of committee system as a strategy for enhancing efficiency, effectiveness, fairness and transparency in the discharge of their responsibilities. In spite of such beautiful accolades, several leaders, indeed some vice-chancellors in the system appear to throw away some, if not all of them, owing to greed and personal aggrandizement. Furthermore, Charas (2005) remark that most of the Nigerian university Chancellors, Vice-Chancellors, Senate members and members

of resources allocation committees seem to be overtaken by corruption, political power drunkenness, and tribalism in the discharge of their duties. Similarly, Imhabekhai and Tonwe (2001) noted that abuse of power has led to rampant crises in the system, resulting in strikes by academic and non-academic staff, dearth of equipment and facilities, indiscipline among staff and students. In the view of Lenshie (2013), politicization of the education sector and partisan politics in education based on primordial identities such as ethnicity, religion and godfatherism are rather responsible for the deploring condition of the education system in Nigeria, which has multiplier effect on national transformation.

The universities resources are often limited which often result to serious inter-play of power and politics within the system. Therefore, there is usually a serious decisional problem to university administrators on how to fairly allocate critical resources to various interest groups in the system. Scarcity of available resources often leave the administrators" and members of resource allocation committees with choices and decisions that could be influenced by many political factors from within or outside the institutions in the allocation of resources. But whether from within or from outside, these administrators and members of resource allocation committees are usually faced with decision making that could to some extent discriminate against others alternatives. Such discrimination or preference may be borne out of political considerations and political factors such as ethnicity, partisan political consideration, sectionalism, tribalism, religious sentiments, favouritism, catchment area, and quota system. The above situations often lead to situations of scrambling. On the other hand, when some members and groups within the university community are unable to get the resources which they have applied, they resort to hidden political strategies to ensure that such scarce university resources are distributed in a way that would favour them, their friends or ethnic group members. Simply put, Nigerian university workers tend to use politics to influence organizational decisions on allocation of certain resources. Consequently, politics can be said to play important part in who gets what within the Nigerian public university system. However, how organizational politics affect decision on the allocation of various scarce resources in Nigerian universities has remained unclear. This difficulty naturally raises a major research problem in terms of how politics influences decisions on allocation of resources in Nigerian universities. To this end, the concern of this study was to investigate the role which organizational politics tends to play in the relative advantage some units and members in Nigeria universities have over others in the allocation of vital resources.

Statement of the Problem

Individual university in Nigeria has objective laid down rules and regulations on how resources such as grants, loans, office space, staff quarters, and instructional facilities could be allocated to its component units and members. However, because these resources are usually in limited or inadequate, the attempt to base their allocation on laid down objective criteria has usually proved difficult which often result to serious inter-play of power and politics within the system. In fact one area of administration that appears to pose serious decisional problem to university administrators is how to allocate resources among members in view of the inter-play of power and politics within the system. Presented more accurately, many Nigerian university workers tend to use politics to influence organizational decisions on allocation of certain resources in their favour. Consequently, politics can be said to play important part in who gets what within the university system. However, how organizational politics affect decision on the allocation of various scarce resources in Nigerian universities has remained unclear. This difficulty naturally raises a major research problem in terms of how politics influences decisions on allocation of resources in Nigerian universities. To this end, the concern of this study was to

investigate the role which organizational politics plays in the relative advantage some units and members in Nigeria universities have over others in the allocation of vital resources.

Theoretical Framework – Resource Dependency Theory

The theoretical framework adopted for this study is the Resource Dependency Theory. The theory of resource dependency was propounded by Pfeffer and Salancik (1978). Resource dependency theory is an organizational theory that explains how different behaviors are exhibited within organizations due to external resource inputs. It states that external resources of organizations such as the universities affect the behaviors of the organization. According to the theory, resources are keys to organizational growth and success and that access and control over resources is a basis of power within an organization. Resource dependency theory further explains that an organization or a faculty‟s ability to gather, alter and exploit external resources faster than competitors or contemporaries can determine its progress or success. Consequently, an organization, faculty, unit or individual employee lacking in essential resources would seek to establish relationships with others in order to obtain needed resources. Again, resources dependency theory maintains that organizations themselves can be seen as coalitions of groups of interest, which are managed by individuals influencing the organization‟s behaviour (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). According to Nienhüser (2008), the resource dependency theory also assumes that each actor in the environment wants to reduce his/her dependence or increase his/her power upon others within the system.

EKPENYONG, L.E. & OJEAGA IBHADE JOY. (Mrs)

Resource dependence theory affects non-profit making sectors such as the university because it is one of the main reasons non-profit organizations have become more commercialized and aggressive in the use of internally generated revenues in recent times (Nienhüser, 2008). Inadequate funding and resource allocation from funding authorities has led to aggressive utilization of marketization techniques previously used mainly in the private and industrial sectors by Nigerian universities to compete for resources for internally generated revenues (IGR) to keep their universities running. However, Nienhüser warned that scholars have argued that the marketization of the non-profit sector would lead to a decrease of quality of services provided by non-profit organizations such as universities.

The basic assumptions of resource dependence theory are as follows:

- Organizations depend on resources from its external environment.
- These resources ultimately flow in from an organization's environment.
- The environment, to a considerable extent, contains other organizations.
- The resources one organization needs are thus often in the hand of other organizations.
- Resources are bases of power.
- Legally independent organizations can therefore depend on each other.
- Power and resource dependence are directly linked in such a way that organization A's power over organization B is equal to organization B's dependence on organization A's resources.
- Power is thus relational, situational and potentially mutual.

Resource dependence theory has several implications regarding politics, power, funding and resource allocation within an organization including universities. Thus, the resources a university, as an organization needs, are thus often in the hand of other organizations or sources and in the case of Nigerian universities, it is the founders. The university itself contains so many faculties, departments, programmes, units, staff and students with limited

resources from the founder. The limited available resources from the founders of these universities thus, become a base of power and control within the universities. To be able to plan and manage these resources equitably, universities commonly use committees with members who are presumed to be credible and transparent. However, in recent times this presumption seems to have been seriously perverted. Allocation of resources in the universities appears now more or less based organizational politics issues such as unionism, gangsterism, ethnicity, religion and godfatherism among others. This could lead to a decrease in the quality and quantity of process and products of the universities.

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of organizational politics on resource allocation in Nigeria universities. Specifically, this study investigated:

1.   How often various categories of staff play politics on chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment

2.   Usual considerations which often influence university Boards/Resource Allocation Committees" decisions on the dispense of the resources under their control

3.   Factors which best or least guide board/committee"s decision on who to grant the universities facilities/resources

4.   Extraneous considerations which influence university Boards/Resource Allocation Committees on the dispense of scarce university resources under their control

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1.   How often do various categories of staff approach committee chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment?

2.   What resources have the most or least influence in federal and state universities?

3.   What factors best or least guide board/committee"s decision on who to grant the universities facilities/resources?

4.   What extraneous considerations often influence university Boards/Resource Allocation Committees on the dispense of scarce university resources under their control?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses were tested in the course of this study

1.   There will be no significant difference in the amount of influence possessed by faculties and departments in Federal and State universities to attract university resources to themselves.

2.   The frequency with which various categories of staff approach the chairmen or members of Resources Allocation Committees for preferential treatment in federal and state universities is not significantly different.

Methodology

This study adopted tne descriptive survey design. The population for the study included all the senior academic staff, past and present Deans, Directors and H.O.Ds, Professors and Associate Professors and principal officers of all the State and Federal universities located in six universities in three-geopolitical regions of Nigeria. A sample of 299 was drawn from the population using stratified random sampling. The study used a structured instrument titled: Influence of Organizational Politics on Resource Allocation in Nigerian Universities

(IPRANU). The instrument was validated by three experts in business education and business management. The reliability coefficient of the instrument was established through Cronbach Alpha method on a pilot group of thirty senior academic and nonacademic staff of University of Benin. Data collected were analyzed using Cronbach Alpha test and reliability co-efficient of 0.75 was obtained. Administration of instrument was conducted through trained research assistants who were recruited from the target institutions. Analysis of data collected was done using mean (x) scores and Standard Deviation (SD) for the research questions. Hypothesis one was tested using Wilcoxon test while hypothesis two was tested using z-test. All the hypotheses were analyzed at 0.05 level of significance. A null hypothesis was upheld when the probability (p) value was greater than or equal to the level of significance of 0.05 and a null hypothesis was rejected when the probability (p) was less than the 0.05 level of significance.

Results

Research Question 1: How often do various categories of academic staff approach chairman and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment?

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation Analysis of how often the various categories of staff approached the chairman and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment

s/n	Items	Mean	SD	Decision	Rank
1	How often do the following categories of academic staff approach you for preferential treatment in relation to a scarce resource under your control?				
(a)	Senior Academic Colleagues?	3.04	1.09	Sometimes	1st
(b)	Your close friends?	2.81	1.21	Sometimes	3rd
(c)	Junior Colleagues?	2.88	1.14	Sometimes	2nd
(d)	Applicant''s friends who are friendly with you?	2.65	1.06	Sometimes	4th
(e)	Vice Chancellor''s representatives?	2.45	1.11	Rarely	9th
(f)	Principle officers of the university?	2.49	1.04	Rarely	8th
2	How often do such contacts influence your Board''s decision in favour of the applicant?	2.43	0.99	Rarely	10th
3	How often do you as chairman/member able to influence the committee''s decision in favour of the applicant you sponsor?	2.55	1.03	Sometimes	7th
4	How often do you as a chairman/member approve the decisions taken by your Board/Committee	3.60	1.17	Sometimes	5th
5	How often does the chairman delegate the authority of the board/committee to members?	2.50	1.28	Sometimes	6th

☐ Federal = 128   State = 101   **Total = 229**

Table 1 shows the finding on how often various categories of staff approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment in federal and state universities generally. The result of the table indicates that senior colleagues, close friends, junior colleagues, and applicants" friends who are friendly with them sometimes approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment with a mean scores of 3.04, 2.81, 2.88 and 2.65 with standard deviation scores of 1.09, 1.21, 1.14 and 1.06 generally at both federal and state universities. The result also shows that the chairmen sometimes use their influence to personally control resources allocation for personal interest with a mean score of 2.55 and standard deviation of 1.03. The finding further shows that the respondents agreed that in their various universities, chairmen sometimes approve decisions taken by their boards/committee to allocate resources and/or delegate the authority of the board/committee to members to act on their behalf with mean scores of 3.60, 2.50 and standard deviation scores of 1.17, 1.28 respectively. The respondents disagreed with all the other items on the table.

Research Question 2. What resources have the most or least influence in federal and state universities?

Table 2: Ranking on resources that have the most or least influence in federal and state universities

S/n	Items	Mean Rank	SD	Rank
1	Budget	4.82	2.69	4th
2	Housing Loan	4.72	2.21	1st
3	Car Refurbishing Loan	5.00	2.22	6th
4	Furniture Loan	5.32	2.08	7th
5	Staff Housing Allocation	5.45	2.28	8th
6	Research Grant	4.79	2.51	3rd
7	Study/sabbatical leave	4.85	2.69	5th
8	Appointment and Staff Promotion	4.74	3.02	2nd
9	Nomination/appointment into boards/committees	4.85	2.85	5th

☐ Federal = 128   State = 101   **Total = 229**

Table 2 shows the resources that have the most or least influence in federal and state universities generally. Housing Loan has the highest influence with a mean score of 4.72 and standard deviation of 2.21. Staff housing allocation has the lowest among the resources that are highly politicized in universities with a mean value of 5.45 and standard deviation of 2.28. Appointment and staff promotion and research grant ranked 2nd and 3rd with mean values of 4.74, 4.79 and standard deviations of 3.02 and 2.51 respectively.

Research Question 3. What factors best or least guide board/committee's decision on who to grant the universities facilities/resources Table 3: Ranking of factors which best or least guide board/committee's decision on who to grant the facilities listed in Table 2

S/n	Items	Mean	SD	Decision
1	Rank of applicant	3.62	1.96	4th
2	Departmental Quota	4.19	1.48	6th
3	Length of service of applicant	3.31	1.05	3rd
4	Quantity/amount of resource available	3.01	1.97	1st
5	First-come first-served	5.29	2.01	7th
6	Priority list	3.24	1.81	2nd
7	Faculty Quota	3.83	1.57	5th

☐ Federal = 128   State = 101   **Total = 229**

Table 3 shows the results of the factors which best or least guide board/committee's decision on how and who to allocate resources within the universities generally. As the table shows, item 4 which is quantity/amount of resource available has the highest rank with a mean value of 3.01
standard deviation of 1.97 while First-come first-served has the lowest mean value of 5.29 with standard deviation of 2.01.

Research Question 4 What extraneous considerations often influence university Boards/Resources Allocation Committees' decision on the allocation of the resources under their control?

Table 4: Ranking of extraneous considerations which often influence universities Boards/Resources Allocation Committees' decision on the dispense of the resources under their control

S/N	Items	Mean Rank	SD	Decision
1	Compassion on applicant	4.46	2.02	5th
2	Pressure from applicant	4.59	2.08	6th
3	Directive from the top	2.77	2.00	1st
4	Pressure from interest groups within the university	3.90	1.73	3rd
5	Pressure from chairman	3.65	1.84	2nd
6	Pressures from member	4.13	1.82	4th
7	Token from applicant	6.49	2.03	7th

☐ . Federal = 128   State = 101   **Total = 229**

Table 4 shows extraneous considerations which often influence university Boards/Resource Allocation Committees on the dispense of resource under their control in universities generally. The results on the table show that directives from the top has the highest rank with a mean score of 2.77 and standard deviation of 2.00 while token from applicants has the lowest rank with a mean value of 6.49 and standard deviation of 2.03.

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One: There will be no significant difference in the amount of influence possessed by academic faculties in Federal and State universities to attract university resources to themselves

Table 5: Summary of Wilcoxon test analysis on why some academic faculties in Federal and State universities are more capable of attracting more resources to themselves than others.

Institution type	No.	No of Ranking	Mean	SD	Z	p	Level of Significance	Decision
Federal	196	51	63.92	3260.00				Not significant
State	115	62	51.31	3181.00	.113	.910	0.05	
Ties		2						
Total	311	115						

Data on Table 5 show that the mean of negative and positive ranks between federal and state universities on influence on resource allocation are 63.92 and 51.31 respectively. The p-value of .910 is greater than the stated level of significance of 0.05 indicating acceptance of the null hypothesis. This means that there is no significant difference in the amount of influence possessed by academic faculties in Federal and State universities to attract university resources to themselves. Therefore, the hypothesis which stated that there will be no significant difference in the amount of influence possessed by academic faculties in federal and State universities to attract university resources to themselves was upheld.

Hypothesis Two: The frequency with which various categories of staff approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment between federal and state universities will not differ significantly.

Table 6: z-test analysis on how often the various categories of staff approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment

Institution type	N	Mean	SD	df	Z	p	Level of Significance	Decision
Federal	128	2.50	0.68					
State	101	3.01	0.67	227	-5.60	.000	0.05	Sig

Data on Table 6 show that at 227 degree of freedom, the p-value of .000 is lesser than the 0.05 level of significance indicating a rejection of the null hypothesis. This means that there is a significant difference in the frequency with which various categories of staff in federal and state universities approach the chairmen and members of resource allocation committees for preferential treatment. The finding showed that the state universities with a mean score of 3.01 and standard deviation of 0.67 utilize more organizational politics and preferential treatment as strategies for resource acquisition than their counterparts in federal universities. Therefore, the hypothesis which stated that the frequency with which various categories of staff approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment between federal and state universities will not differ significantly was rejected.

Discussion of Findings

The finding on research question 1 show why some academic faculties in federal and state universities are more able to attract scarce university resources to themselves than others. The result shows that the funds brought to the university and amount of revenue generated internally ranked highest while the peculiar needs of a faculty

ranked lowest. The finding show that irrespective of the outstanding contributions of a faculty to the university, number of programmes/consultancies, support a faculty enjoys with the vice-chancellor, the bargaining skill of the faculty and age of the faculty, it is funds brought to the university through budgetary allocation and internally generated revenue that determine the resources a faculty gets in the university. This finding is in line with the views of Agboola and Adeyemi (2012) that several factors such as teacher characteristics (qualification, number, and experience), class-size, teaching periods; student-teacher ratio; facilities and equipment attribute to be the cause of differences in resources allocation within institutions.

The finding on research question 3 show how often various categories of staff approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment. The result indicates that senior colleagues, junior colleagues and close friends sometimes approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment at both federal and state universities generally. TThis finding shows that there is high level of organizational politics in Nigerian universities especially in the state universities. This finding is highly revealing as it has shown that almost all categories of staff are caught in the web of organizational politics. This is detrimental to quality that the ivory tower stands for and could erode the confidence that the nation has on the university to produce high-level manpower needed for sustainable social and economic development of the nation. This finding supports the view of Lenshie (2013) which contended that politicization of the education sector and partisan politics in education based on primordial identities such as ethnicity, religion and godfatherism are rather responsible for the deploring condition of the education system in Nigeria, which has multiplier effect on national transformation. Also, Imhabekhai and Tonwe (2001) noted that this state of affairs has led to rampant crises in the system resulting in strikes by academic and non-academic staff, dearth of equipment and facilities, indiscipline among staff and students and upsurge in the activities of secret cults among others.

To find answer to research question 4, the study first of all identified the resources that are more or least political in universities. Housing loan ranked highest among the resources that are highly political in the universities while Staff housing allocation maintain the least politicized resource in the universities generally. On individual university basis, housing loan ranked highest among the resources that are highly politicized in federal universities with while staff housing allocation is least politicized. However, study/sabbatical leave ranked highest among the resources highly politicized in state universities while furniture loan maintain the least politicized resource. On the factors which best or least guide board/committee‟s decision on how and who to allocate resources within the universities, the finding revealed that quantity/amount of resource available has the highest rank for both federal and state universities while first-come-first-served has the least rank for both universities. The finding, therefore, revealed that because resources are generally scare to satisfy various needs in the universities, chairmen of boards and members of resources allocation committees use various factors such as rank of applicant, departmental quota, length of service and amount of resources available to mention a few in resources allocation. The finding, however, shows that these factors could be influenced by many political factors that may place some staff and faculties at disadvantage and discriminate against laid down procedures. This finding is in line with the views of Akpakwu and Okwo (2014) which stated that as resources are generally scarce to satisfy the competing needs of their institutions and various interests, university managers are bound to make choices from available alternatives. Their choices could however be influenced by many political factors from within or outside the institutions but whether from within or from outside, managers of these universities and chairmen/members of resources allocation committees take decisions that discriminate against laid down procedures.

The finding on research question 5 shows extraneous considerations which often influence university Boards/Resource Allocation Committees on the dispense of resource under their control. The finding shows that generally directive from the top has the highest rank for both federal and state universities while token from applicants has the lowest rank for both federal and state universities. This finding on individual university level revealed that corruption which has eaten deep into the Nigerian society has crept into the ivory tower hence, chairmen of boards and members of resource allocation committees depend on directives from the top to allocate university critical resources. This is detrimental to quality that the ivory tower stands for and could erode the confidence that the nation has on the university to produce high-level manpower needed for sustainable social and economic development of the nation. This finding supports the view of Lenshie (2013) which contended that politicization of the education sector and partisan politics in education based on primordial identities such as ethnicity, religion and godfatherism are rather responsible for the deploring condition of the education system in Nigeria, which has multiplier effect on national transformation.

Test of hypothesis one at 0.05 level of significance show that there is no significant difference in the amount of influence possessed by academic faculties in federal and state universities to attract university resources to themselves. The implication of this finding is that resources are inadequate at both federal and state universities in Nigeria. This result also show that to some extent organizational politics is entrenched as the order of the day at both federal and state universities.

Test of hypothesis two at 0.05 level of significance show that there is a significant difference in the frequency with which various categories of staff in federal and state universities approach chairmen and members of resources allocation committees for preferential treatment. The finding showed that the state universities with mean scores of 3.01 and standard deviation of 0.67 utilize more organizational politics and preferential treatment as strategies for resource acquisition than their counterparts in federal universities. This may be attributable to the fact that there is high proliferation of tertiary institutions in many states in Nigeria making it extremely difficult for the various state governments to adequately fund these institutions. Hence, staff and faculties have to resort to hidden strategies to get their own share of university critical resources. According to Onukwugha, Ochoga and Okeke (2018), many states in Nigeria today are in a race to a championship over who will own the highest number of universities. Besides, that the state bears much responsibility for governance and financing of public higher institutions in Nigeria (Akpakwu & Okwo, 2014) making it extremely difficult for them to provide adequate resources.

Conclusion

The findings of this study have shown that the resources for management of both federal and staff universities in Nigeria are grossly inadequate. This often results in the aggressive use of committees and boards for allocation of resources in both federal and state universities in Nigeria for equitable allocation of resources. However, the findings of this study showed that despite the various committees and boards for allocation of resources, individual university has various considerations in the allocation of resources within their institution such as size of the resource, peculiar needs of the faculty, outstanding contributions to the university, funds brought to the university, programme and consultancy, funds generated for the university through external agencies and foundations, the support the faculty enjoys with the vice-chancellor, the support the faculty gets from some powerful members of relevant resource allocation board or committees amongst others. This makes it extremely difficult for universities" resources to be allocated to staff, students, departments and faculties equitably.

Consequently, applicants result to the use of tokens to chairmen and members of resources allocation committees staff also use undue pressure on the chairmen and members of resources allocation committees to get their needs meet. This opens the door for partisan politics, sentiments, tribalism and favouritism in scrambling for resources among staff, students, departments and faculties who have feelings of marginalization and neglect in the systems. It could therefore, be concluded that organizational politics is highly entrenched in both federal and state universities in Nigeria.

Recommendations

1.   Although the federal universities are expected to generate a minimum of 10% of their total annual resources from internally, both federal and state universities could strive to improve their internally generated revenues (IGR) to a higher such as 15% or 20% by investing in profitable ventures both within and outside their universities.

2.   Resources of the universities should be allocated based on laid down rules and regulations.

References

Abdallah, N. M. (2018). Nigeria: Govt, States Spend 8% of Budgets on Education. Daily Trust. Retrieved from http://allafrica.com/stories/201606030204.html

Ahmed, S. (2015). Public and private higher education financing in Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(7), 92 -109.

Agboola, B. M. & Adeyemi, J.K. (2012). Analysis of private cost of education in a selected Nigerian university. *JORIND 10* (3), 281 -292

Akpakwu, O. S. & Okwo, F. A. (2014). Politics and the appointment of council members, vice chancellors and other principal officers in federal and state universities in the North Central states of Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice 5(33)*, 12-20.

Ogbomida, A. O., Obano, E. J. &, Emmanuel, O. O. (2013). Utilization of committee system in the administration of Nigerian universities. *Academic Research International. 4(4),* 392-399.

Anaekwe, M.C. (2007). *Basic research methods and statistics in education and social sciences*. Onitsha, Sofie Publicity and Printing Limited.

Babalola, A. A. (2017). Funding of universities in Nigeria: Attitude of Nigerians to giving. Retrieved from http://www.abuad.edu.ng/funding-of-universities-in-nigeria-attitude-of-nigerians-to-giving/

Charas, M. T. (2015). The role of committees in decision making in University of Maiduguri. *Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS), 20(9),* VI, 34-42

Edame, G. E. & Eturoma, A. D. (2014).The determinants of public expenditure on educational infrastructural facilities and economic growth in Nigeria. *E3 Journal of Business Management and Economics. 5(6)*,152-161.

Imhabekhai, C. I. and Tonwe, D. A. (2001). *Funding Higher education in Nigeria.* Ibadan: Powerhouse Publishers.

Lenshie, N. E. (2013). Politicisation of Education in Nigeria: Implications for National Transformation. *Global Journal of Human Social Science Political Science*. 13(5) 1.0

Matthew, I. A. (2016). Financial allocation to education in Nigeria, trends, issues and way forward in Nigeria. *Journal Plus Education, 1, 227 - 242.*

Mgbekem, S. J. A. (2004). Management of university educatio.n in Nigeria. Calabar: UNICAL Press.

Nienhüser, W. (2008). Resource Dependence Theory-How well does it Explain Behavior of Organizations? *Management Revue, 19*(1+2), 9-32.

Onukwugha, A., Ochoga, P. & Okeke, V. (2018). High proliferation of state universities have impacted negatively on the quality of education sector in Nigeria. Retrieved from https://leadership.ng/2018/01/12/proliferation-state-universities-impacted-negatively-educationsector-nigeria/

Osha, S. (2000). Violence and decay within the Nigerian university system: Notes from Ladoke Akintola University of Technology, Ogbomoso. Institut français de recherche en Afrique. *Journal of Higher Education. 36*, 43-66.

Pfeffer, J. and G. R. Salancik (1978). The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective. New York, NY, Harper and Row. Reynaldo, J. & Santos, A. (1999). Cronbach‟s alpha: A tool for assessing the reliability of scales. *Journal of Extension*, 37(2), 34 – 36.

Udoh, G. (2008). Alternative sources of funding university education in Nigeria. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal*, *2 (3)*, 98-110.