

# AN EXAMINATION OF GOVERNANCE TYPOLOGY IN NIGERIA HIGHER EDUCATION SYSTEM

*Abdulazeez Abioye Lawal*

*Pan Atlantic University, Lagos, Nigeria*

*Waidi Adeniyi Akingbade*

*Lagos State University, Ojo, Lagos, Nigeria*

*Hameed Omotola Ojodu*

*Lagos State Polytechnic, Ikorodu, Lagos, Nigeria*

Received: September 13, 2019 Accepted: November 18, 2019 Online Published: December 18, 2019

## *Abstract*

*Nigeria higher education institutions (NHEIs) are facing a number of challenges that border on corporate governance (CG) practices. CG includes the issues of autonomy and accountability. In developed and developing countries, autonomy is being extended to HEIs for flexibility in fulfilling the mandate of teaching, research and community service. This paper explores CG culture and its challenges in NHEIs. A qualitative survey research method was employed through structured interviews of selected NHEIs key stakeholders and extensive desk-based research. The results of the interviews and content analysis of operational documents of selected high ranking NHEIs revealed the adoption of corporate governance structures and processes. The study also recognised the non-existence of disclosure of CG practice. Challenges such as inadequate funding, excessive interference by government, domineering influence of unions, faulty composition of CG constituents and poor leadership are some factors affecting effective governance in these institutions. Consequently, proper funding, leadership training, empowerment of these institutions and complete and periodic disclosure of application of CG practices are recommended.*

**Key words:** Corporate governance; Nigeria higher education institutions; Stakeholders.

## **1. Introduction**

Sustainable development is increasingly driven by the advancements and application of knowledge through effective higher education and good governance (Mustapha and Nofiu, 2017 and Nazar et al, 2018). In every civilized society, education has been the most important

engine of growth and driving force for socio-economic performance in Organization (Asadullah & Ullah, 2018; Popescu 2011).

Higher education is the organized learning activities at the tertiary level (Jaja, 2013). The National Policy on Education of Nigeria (2004) defined tertiary education to include universities, colleges of education, polytechnics and monotechnics. These institutions were established to blaze the trail in the production of required workforce equipped with a unique education tailored to address Nigeria problems (Ogunraku, 2012). The tripartite mandate of teaching, research and community service of higher institutions were derived from the age long core values characterized by intellectual vitality, academic freedom, ethical caring, diverse community and individual well-being (Okogie, 2013; Pucciaretti & Kaplan, 2016). Tertiary education is generally acknowledged as the citadel of knowledge, education and human resources development. The World Bank maintained that the single most important key to development and poverty alleviation is education (Deboer et al, 2002). Little wonder, why the United Nations Education. Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) recommended that developing nations should invest a minimum of 26% of total budget allocation to education sector (Ahmad, 2015; Ekundayo & Ajayi, 2009).

In developed and developing countries of the world, investment in education is premised on the efficacy of education in solving socio-political, economic and technological problems. In Nigeria, this is far from the reality (Ahmad, 2015). Previous findings on the state of higher education in Nigeria confirmed the degradation of Nigerian education system (Obiyo and Lencee, 2011, Ahmad, 2015). Most of these institutions are characterized by unethical practices, poor quality of graduates, internal politics, bureaucracy, conflicting values, inadequate funding, low motivation, centralization of authority and decision making, global competition and poor CG culture (Lawal 2008; Bamiro 2012; Issa and Mohammed, 2014 and Ahmad and Adepoju, 2017).

Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) are facing dramatic changes. Increasing enrolment, diversification of programs and revenue base, new modes of delivery, diversity in profiles, growing internationalization and emphasis on research and innovation are leveraging on knowledge production of HEI (Hannard and Alexander, 2016). Recently, the strategy of internationalization has become imperative to access large pool of talents and conversely it exposes HEIs to competitors who seek to capture the same resources (Pucciarell and Kaplan, 2016). Internationalization has resulted into international ranking and accountability of HEIs. As rightly remarked "high ranking universities have three connected factors concentration of talents, abundant funding and appropriate governance" (Salmi, 2009).

Accountability is also becoming an important element of governance in HEIs. The trend toward greater transparency and public accountability is evidenced through quality assurance framework, performance related funding, market mechanism and participation of external stakeholders (Crous, 2017 and Hannard and Alexander, 2015).

Nigeria higher education (NHE) has undergone substantial deregulation resulting into participation of private sector. NHE needs to react to competitive environment similar to development in telecommunication and utilities sectors. Despite the deregulation, government and supra agencies are still involved in HEI system through various regulations, policies and recommendations to quality assurance and public resource allocation. NHE cannot succeed within the contemporary competitive environment without good leadership and sound governance (Crous, 2017). In Nigeria, CG is becoming important to the extent that several initiatives, structures and institutions have been established to address governance in various organizations.

Empirical evidence on governance of NHE has received little attention.(Davis, 2005). Extant research focuses on governance of large corporate firms such as banks, multinational corporations and insurance firms on the premise that the findings of these studies can be generalized to other institutions. Thus, NHE governance remains essentially unaddressed.

Higher education in Nigeria is in travail. The system is riddled with crises of various dimensions and magnitudes. A number of multifaceted problems have inhibited goal attainment and are raising questions, doubts and fears on effective and efficient management of these institutions (Ajayi and Haastrup, 2016). Against this backdrop, the successive governments have instituted a number of reforms aimed at improving the level of governance in these institutions. This article seeks to address the foregoing research gap by examining governance in NHE in order to determine how institutional actors are made responsible for the naturally defined mandate of teaching, research and community service.

Our study contributes to literature in two ways. Theoretically, it helps to clarify the concept of governance as applicable to NHE. Second, it adds to and differs from previous studies. While previous studies have addressed effect of governance on organizational determinants (e.g.Blerins et al 2018, Abdulazeez et al 2016), the present study answers the question, “What is the typology of governance system in NHE”? Empirically, our study provides insight into challenges of governance of HEI in a developing economy like Nigeria. It addresses the factors institutional managers need to focus for performance improvement.

## **2. Review of literature and theoretical framework**

### ***2.1. Conceptual framework***

CG has received increased attention because of crises of confidence created by the failure of large corporations due to high-profile scandals involving abuse of corporate power and in some cases alleged criminal activities of corporate officials (Kazmi, 2008). Global disasters such as unethical financial reporting by Enron, World com, Parmalat, and Maxwell in U.K., Dawoo in Korea, Regal Bank in South Africa, Cadbury, Oceanic Bank and Intercontinental Bank in Nigeria, confirmed the growing need for transparency and accountability in corporate management (Uwigbe, 2013).

The concept of corporate governance has been defined differently in literature. Astradian, (2010) defines CG precisely “as the system by which companies are directed and controlled. The Revised Principles of Corporate Governance of OECD expanded this definition by describing it as: “procedures and processes according to which an organization is directed and controlled. The corporate governance structure specifies the distribution of rights and responsibilities among different participants in the organization – such as boards, managers, shareholders and other stakeholders – and lays down the rules and procedures for decision making” (OECD, 2005).

The foregoing perception of CG mainly from agency theory has been criticized as inadequate. Neubauer and Lank (1998) provided a board view of CG by defining the concept as “a system of structures and processes to secure the economic viability as well as the legitimacy of the corporation (.....) economic viability means securing the long-term sustainability to development of the firm.

In summary, CG is devoid by universally acceptable definition. Most definitions are divisible into narrow and board perspectives. A narrow definition focuses on CG structure. The concept is concerned with the structures and systems of control by which managers are held accountable to those who have legitimate stake in an organization (Jacoby, 2005). A broad

perspective is CG as a process. It is considered as the heart of both a market economy and a democratic society (Oyejide and Soyibo, 2001).

Meanwhile, the notion of governance in HEIs is a combination of both the structure and process. It is a structure which strives to preserve the integrity of academic value system. Similarly, CG is a process of positioning universities vis a vis their larger environment to make them receptive and answerable to external messages, demands and expectations (Fried, 2006 p.81). For the purpose of this study, the term governance refers to all the structures, processes and systems involved in planning, organising, directing and controlling of HEIs resources in response to the needs of the society.

## ***2.2. Corporate Governance (CG) of Higher Institutions (HIs) in developed and developing countries***

CG is not only applicable to industrial operations, organizations whether private or public sectors need effective CG. Higher institutions are increasingly being challenged by globalization, diversity of work force and complexity of environment. The problems of internal politics, work ethics, inadequate financing, overconcentration of authority and inability to compete in the global market are manifestations of poor corporate governance culture (Basheka, 2015).

CG in higher institutions according to Basheka, (2015) is the process for distributing authority, power and influence for academic division among various constituencies. The Council, the Senate/Academic Board, Faculty, Department Staff, Students, Administration, Unions, Committees and Subcommittees play significant role in higher institutions CG.

In recognition of the vital role of modern corporations in sustainable development, there has been increasing global initiatives toward the design and implementation of corporate governance principles for effective performance. Most of these initiatives featured prominently in developed countries like United Kingdom, United States of America, and Australia. Developing countries like India, South Africa and Nigeria have also taken bold steps to address the issue of CG (Oyejide and Soyibo, 2001). CG in these countries was initially confined to corporate giants and multinational corporations; however, the trend has been extended to HEIs with the growing need for an educated society (Ogunraku, 2012).

Generally, governance measures were designed and implemented to tackle institutional and managerial dysfunctions. Governance arrangements were instituted to address governance scandals in the post 1992 U.K. university sector scandals, Netherland double students' enrolment, United States students' loan scandal and Australian universities practice of cutting corners to attract foreign students.(Salmi, 2008).

In Australia, the Bosch Reports and Hilmar Reports laid the foundation for promotion of good CG. Australian HEIs are incorporated by statutory legislations that influence the governance. The legislation stipulates the structures and guidelines in relation to the roles of the council and principal officers (Crous, 2017). The Deloitte Report reviewed and aligned governance of Australian HEIs with contemporary governance and management practices. The main features of the reforms include increase in the size of councils, increase in the number of independent council members, promoting the use of Standing Committees with independent members and retaining the power of Senate in governance of academic, research and learning (Deloitte, 2014).

In South Africa, the state supervision model is adopted; Higher Education Act of 801 of 1997 and National Qualification Framework of 2008 amended in 2012 provide guidelines for institutional governance. These Acts empower the Minister of Higher Education to intervene in case of poor performance. These Statutes provide the Ministry of Higher Education assisted by

Council of Higher Education with ultimate responsibility for quality assurance. The Internal Structures of South Africa HEIs include Councils responsible for strategic decision, Academic Board/Senate for academic matters. The Senate/Academic Board comprised of mainly academic employees with representation of non-academic staff and students (Crous, 2017).

There is significant body of literature on shared governance in higher institutions. Most literature concentrates on the concept of agency and trust. To address the concept of shared governance, Olson (2009) explained that shared governance is not a novel topic or unique in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. However, there is a number of misinformation. Shared governance is more complex than committee system and communication is a fundamental requirement for success of shared governance.

American Federation of Teachers (AFT) noted that shared governance is under attack, corporate style of business model that is more interested in physical outcomes rather than academic pursuit and their independent merits are challenging the shared governance. Hoy, Gage, and Tartar (2006) extended discussion on institutional governance to trust conversation by placing the idea in the context of school mindfulness. This concept becomes apparent in contemporary institutional governance. Studies conducted by Keizer and Sam (2014) demonstrated that many faculties consider governance as a luxury but participants disagree with this notion. A strong foundation is the position of resources and funding which are considered as the basis for strengthening boards in institutional governance (Yang, 2015).

### ***2.3 Corporate Governance in Nigeria Higher Institutions***

The history of HEIs in Nigeria is traceable to the early 1930s when Yaba Higher College was established following the Elliot Commission Report. Subsequently, other higher colleges were instituted in Zaria, Enugu and Ibadan in 1940s. In 1948, University College of Ibadan was founded as a campus of University College of London. Subsequently, the Ashibi Commission Report led to the establishment of regional universities in Nsukka, Ife and Zaria in 1962 to provide high level manpower for the emerging public sector. The University of Lagos was also established as a federal university. About the same time, regional Polytechnics or Colleges of Technology were established in Kaduna, Enugu, Ibadan and Benin to produce technical manpower and Colleges of Education in Zaria, Ondo and Owerri for training of secondary school teachers. Later in 1970, the University of Benin came into existence as the fourth regional university. These Universities were regarded as the first generation universities (Ogunraku, 2012).

The evolution of second generation universities started in 1975 when seven federal universities came on board in Ilorin, Port Harcourt, Calabar, Jos, Maiduguri and Sokoto. During this period, many federal and state HEIs were established (Ogunraku, 2012).

The third generations of universities were founded in the early 1980s with the establishment of Universities of Technology and Agriculture in Owerri, Makurdi, Bauchi, Minna and Abeokuta. At the same time, many states like Imo, Ondo, Lagos, Oyo, Cross River established state universities borne out of the political and economic exigencies of the time (Ajayi and Haastrup, 2016). A new development was witnessed in the 1990s with the evolution of private HEIs. In fact, the fourth generations NHEIs were established between 1991 till date (Ogunraku, 2012). The summary of HEIs in Nigeria offering approved and accredited programs are provided in the Table 1.

Governance of University College of Ibadan (now University of Ibadan) naturally tapered from that of its main campus of London (Ogunraku, 2012). Other universities, particularly, the first generation universities adopted the governance structures of the early British Universities

(Ajayi and Haastrup, 2016). These structures were incorporated into the various laws and statutes of various institutions.

The Statutes establishing these institutions such as Federal Universities of Technology Act 1986, The Universities (Miscellaneous Provisions) (Amendment) Act 2003 etc. provide for the external and internal structures of governance. The external structures involve the participation of key stakeholders in institutional decision making of NHEIs. They include the Ministry of Education and agencies like Nigeria Universities Commission (NUC), National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) and the National Council for Colleges of Education (NCCE) charged with the responsibility of monitoring the quality of services rendered by NHEIs. For example, the National University Commission (NUC) Act No 1 of 1974 states that the commission is committed to improve the quality of programmes through the injection of requisite inputs as well as assuring quality process and output. NUC by virtue of Section 10(1) of the Federal Education Act Law of the Federation vested in the body very wide and enormous power with respect to supervision and regulation of university education in Nigeria. (Iruonagbe and Egharvebe, 2015).

These regulatory bodies ensure orderly development and adequate funding of HEIs. Their activities include:

- i. Accreditation of courses
- ii. Approval of courses and programs
- iii. Maintenance of minimum academic standard
- iv. Monitoring of government institutions
- v. Monitoring of private institutions
- vi. Prevention of the establishment of illegal HEIs
- vii. Implementing appropriate sanctions (Ekundayo and Ajayi, 2009)

Quality assurance is the key mandate of these regulatory bodies. Quality assurances in HEIs include internal and external mechanisms put in place by the institutions and accreditations agency respectively. The regulatory bodies employ various variables to determine quality assurance of programmes and institutions. They include minimum academic standard, impact assessment, visitation, carrying capacity and admission quota, accreditation, publications, research assessment, structures, infrastructures and utilities. Evaluation of existing staff strength, capacity building for teaching and non-teaching staff, exchange programmes for teaching personnel and students, institutional ranking and external moderation system (Bannet 1997).

The constituents of internal governance structures are those established by the Statutes of NHEIs. They include the Councils, the Senate/Academic Boards, Congregation, Convocation, and Faculty/School Boards. The Council is the highest decision making authority of NHEIs. The composition of the Council has been reviewed in line with global best practices. For instance, the Universities (Miscellaneous Provision) (Amendment) Act of 2003 adjusted the position of the Governing Councils of Nigerian Universities to have more internal members than external members in order to drive the system effectively and efficiently. The Act also guarantees the autonomy of the University by providing the Councils with full responsibility for good management, growth and development of the institutions.

In summary, the key actors in NHEIs governance can be structured into academic oligarchy; intermediary organization actors and state actors (Hernard and Mitterle, 2015). Academic oligarchy is visible in faculty boards, senates, academic boards and stakeholders on governing boards. The group is otherwise known as “academic elite” and promote in academic council. Stakeholders in HE range from students, academics, government community

representatives, alumni, unions and cultural groups to newly recognized actors like industry representatives. Students as stakeholders in institutional governance occupy marginal roles. However, their advisory capacities and informal structures give their voice a stronger impact (Bergan, 2003).

Intermediary organization actors comprising the governing councils, Vice Chancellors, Rectors, Provost, Chief Executive Officers etc. who are responsible for day to day management. This responsibility entails different administrative tasks. State actors include relevant ministries, departments and government advisory agencies supervising NHEIs. Nigeria HE is characterized by strong state intervention. Supervising NHEIs was seen as a state instrument of financial accountability. Quality assurance agencies like National Universities Commission (NUC), National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) and National Council for Colleges of Education (NCCE) review programs and institutions and their influence varies from auditing and accreditation of programs to system.

#### ***2.4 Theoretical Framework***

The two key divergent theories that underpin perception and approaches to CG are “Agency, Theory”, and Stewardship Theory”. Agency theory suggests that organizations can be viewed as a nexus of a contract between the principal (shareholders) and agents (corporate management). An agency problem exists when the management fails to act in the interest of the owners leading to friction and mistrust (Obasan, 2014). For management to act ethically in the interest of the principal, application of CG principles is inevitable. The main criticism of the theory is the assumption that corporate executives are self-centred and irresponsible (Kazmi, 2009). Thus, agency theory develops primarily to direct and control the business by ensuring that management acts in the best interest of the shareholders. HEIs of course do not have shareholders. Some HEIs might have tendency to see themselves as corporations, however the strong argument is the existence of academic boards which contradicts the analogy.

In stewardship theory, corporate management is considered to be obedient servant managers; they will act in the best interest of the owner/principals. As “stewards” their interests are aligned with those of the owners. (Davis et al 1997). The Stewardship perspective suggests that corporate managers are satisfied and motivated when organisational success is attained. Stewardship theory is more relevant to non-profit sector but falls short of providing a framework for HEIs governance issues. This approach assumes that managers want to do a good job and will act as effective stewards of the company. This is more sympathetic to the position of HEIs staff than agency theory. It nevertheless fails to capture the role of governing bodies, takes no account of legal and constitutional provisions of academic governance and provides a narrow definition of corporate management roles which is appropriate for the academic community.

The agency theory is associated with a less trusting environment and provides for stringent measures using extrinsic rewards. At the other extreme, a stewardship theory is associated with more trusting environment and provides more intrinsic and empowering type of control. HEIs with legally defined objectives as the advancement of learning do not fit comfortably within the foregoing theories (Shattock, 2006).

Rhoades (2005) proposed a shared governance model at the university level that focuses on democratic accountability. While Universities are recognized to have variety of functions, among these are generating revenue for academic institutions, producing knowledge and wealth to boost global competitiveness of corporations.

This trajectory has made HEIs to become increasingly capitalist in nature. Therefore, Rhoades (2005) proposed a shift toward democratic accountability model to include internal and external stakeholders known as shared model. A governance model developed by American Association of Universities Professors provided the foundation for a shared model. The share a model was also proposed by McDaniel (2017), the model provides for inclusion of meaningful stakeholders in all Committees and governing body compositions to secure their trust in governance. As clearly indicated by Hoy, Gage III, and Tartar (2006) trust is a multi-faceted concept with five key components of openness, honesty, competence, predictability and benevolence. Trust becomes a building block for successful institutional climate. The essence of shared model governance is to spread authority over a broader spectrum of stakeholders instead of isolating within the context of university models.

### ***2.5 Corporate Governance and Performance***

The relationships between various aspects of governance and performance have been studied using different theoretical and empirical perspectives. Theoretically, effective governance is essential for long term success. It is a vital ingredient for balancing order and equity of society, ensuring accountability and protection of human rights and freedom (Kwakwa and Nzekwu, 2003). Empirical evidence on the relationship, between corporate governance and performance has been mixed (Adewusi et al, 2013). A first bunch of empirical reports support of positive relationship between CG and some indices of performance such as profitability, stock returns, share price and reduction incidence of corporate failure (Uwigbe, 2013; Blevins et al, 2018; Zagoiched and Gao, 2016, Abdulazeez et al 2016 and Aliya and Robina, 2007). A second stream of studies argues that governance suppresses corporate performance.

Jack and Johl (2009) argued that outside directors with multiple appointments have negative effect on performance. Meanwhile, studies conducted by Adewusi et al (2013) and Arora and Sharman (2016) did not find significant relationship between CG and performance. An important conclusion from the foregoing studies on the combined effects of governance is that empirical evidence is contingent on a number of contextual factors. Studies conducted by Garcia-Meca et al (2015) echoed this position by revealing the moderating effect of regulatory and investors' protection environment on the relationship between board diversity and performance of banks.

From the review of literature, there appears to be some visible gaps. First, most of the literature focused on CG in developed economies. Second, the few empirical reports are corporate based. Therefore, in recognition of the significant role of HEIs in sustainable development, there is need to empirically examine corporate governance of NHEIs.

## **3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

### ***3.1. Research Methods***

Following Clarks (1998) theoretical concepts of HEI governance, the present research focuses on governance of HEIs operating in the dynamic and developing Nigerian environment. Within these contexts, we explore the following two postulates:

- The typology of governance in NHEIs and
- Challenges of institutional governance in NHE

This exploratory study utilized qualitative approach to facilitate in depth and contextual analysis of governance in NHEIs. Qualitative research strategy usually emphasized on words



rather than quantification of data and embodies a view of social reality as a constantly shifting emergent property of individuals' creation (Brynam and Bell, 2011). Crosswell (1994) recommends using qualitative approach to describe experiences. This recommendation is highly relevant to answering research questions of the study. Qualitative research is designed to explore rather than predict a specific phenomenon (Saibah and Xiao, 2014). Moreover, Mustapha and Nofiu (2017) described the state of the art of corporate governance in Nigeria to be at the evolutionary stage, the need for a qualitative research for a more in-depth investigation is essential.

### ***3.2. Data Collection Sources***

Empirical data were gathered by conducting structured interviewed with key institutional stakeholders of NHEIs. The interviews focus on exploring governance practices on one part and challenges of institutional governance on the other part. Majority of the interviews were transcribed verbatim to allow for subsequent analysis. Interviews were conducted with significant governance actors. The interviews lasted for 15-30 minutes. The email enquiry included a request to participate in a short interview. No compensation was offered. Table 2: provides detailed informative in the interviewees.

Respondents were also promised anonymity of name and their respective organizations. The second category of data collection was generated from archival sources. The interviews were complemented by extensive desk-based research (e.g. institutional websites, annual reports, institutional laws and some media releases) to ensure credibility. Content analysis of records has become a popular method for qualitative and quantitative analysis in management and international business research (Ajai and Kumar, 2018). The method was chosen for its ease of extracting data and drawing conclusions from variety of communication tools (Ritchie, 2014).

### ***3.3. Population, Sample Size and Sampling Technique***

HEIs constitute the tertiary education in Nigeria. They include universities, polytechnics and colleges of education (Bamiro, 2012). The population of the study comprises 162 universities, 119 Polytechnics/Monotechnics and 86 Colleges of Education established by Federal, State and Private Investors. A similar studies conducted in South Africa by Crous (2017) also used the list of approved and accredited HEIs. The sampled institutions were 10 high ranking Universities, 10 high ranking Polytechnics and 10 high ranking Colleges of Education. The choice of these institutions was based in availability and accessibility of records on CG and the fact that governance provides explanation for academic excellence in these institutions.

The thirty NHEIs were selected based ranking conducted by regulatory agencies. The ranking assessed quality of staff, capacity building, strategic plan, master plan, students' enrolment, teaching quality, infrastructure and existence of a well-developed entrepreneurship development program to mention just a few. Nine interviews were conducted across these categories. A purposeful sampling approach (Saunders et al 2015) was employed to select participants relevant to the study. Interviewees comprised Chairman Governing Council, Executive Secretary of regulatory agency, Vice Chancellor, Rectors, Registrars, Provosts and Bursars of these institutions who are regarded as accounting officers and drivers of change process.

## 4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

The numerical and non-numerical data were critically analysed using content analysis enriched by tables and figures to provide some insights on corporate governance in NHEIs. The analysis process commenced with transcribing the data from the interview. The transcripts were then summarized. An analysis of secondary information was also conducted to further corroborate the transcribed data. Documents such as conditions of service, enabling laws, annual reports, information available from web sites, vision, mission, strategic planning, organization structure, and organizational manual and so on were contently analysed to ensure rigor in the data collection process.

### *4.1. Application of Corporate Governance (CG) Practices in 30 High Ranking Nigerian Higher Institutions*

Table III shows the application of CG in NHEIs is similar to shared governance structures of the UK. The internal governance structures of shared governance are found virtually in all the institutions. The external governance structures are in forms of state involvement in institutional governance. An important finding is the absence of Annual Report on disclosure of application of CG principles. Shared governance entails stakeholder involvement in decision making and is becoming one of the key principles of CG practices embraced by HEIs worldwide. Examples are found in Europe and developing countries; conversely, the US HEIs institutional governance is diverse in nature. Most U.S. states have unique governance structures governed by strong board of trustees (Crous, 2017).

External governance of HEIs is based on state supervision which is used in developed and developing countries. In South Africa, Europe and United States, there are ministries and agencies responsible for overseeing the HEIs compliance with rules and regulations and formulating educational policies that frame the strategic plan of HEIs (Crous, 2017).

The major internal constituents of governance are usually provided by the statutes establishing NHEIs. They include the Governing Councils (GC), Executive Management, Management Committee, Senate/Academic Boards, Faculty Board, etc. The executive head of NHEIs is known as Vice Chancellor/Rectors/Provosts. The autonomy of NHEIs was expanded by granting the GC and executive heads more power in decision making. The University (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2003 granted the autonomy to Nigerian universities by providing the Council with full responsibility for good management, growth and development. The selection of the executive head is usually by the GC for a single term of 5 years. The size and membership of the Council vary depending ownership structure. Membership also is composed with representation from internal and external stakeholders.

### *4.2. Composition of Governing (GC) Councils in 30 High Ranking Nigerian Higher Education Institutions*

Table IV reveals that sampled NHEIs GC range from ten to twenty-three. While some NHEIs have all DVCs on the GC, others have provision for only one. Senate/ACB representatives on the GC also vary. The federal institutions provide for more representation, states have less and virtually none in private institutions. Some institutions have Alumni representation. One of the Polytechnics allows for the representation of organized private sectors, such as Manufacturers Association of Nigeria (MAN), Lagos State Chambers of Commerce and Industries (LCCI). All the federal and states institutions provide for the representation of Ministry of Education. In addition, federal institutions have representatives of regulatory bodies like NUC, NBTE and NCCE. Some NHEIs have representatives of professional bodies e.g., COREN. Private

institutions have Council members comprising the Board of Trustees of the funding organizations. Committee system is also an essential component of CG in NHEIs. The common standing committees of NHEIs (GCs) are: Financial and General Purposes, Tenders Boards, Development, Audit, Appointments and Promotions Committees. The composition of these Committees depends on the provisions of the Statutes.

Conventionally, stakeholders in HEIs GCs include internal and external members. The newly recognised actors are mainly industry representatives, community authorities, alumni, unions and cultural groups. The influence of these stakeholders ranges from simple funding to supervisory (Lauzzaretti and Tavoletti, 2006). The position and power of these stakeholders differ from one system to another. In strong multi-stakeholders, GCs have representative roles to play. In Hungary, France and Germany strong executive powers are assigned to VCs, Rectors and Provosts (Crous, 2017, Blenche and Kogan, 2017). In Europe and other developed countries students' involvement in governance has been increasing over the years. (Bergan, 2003). NHEIs have no students' representatives in both internal and external governance structures.

Statutes of NHEIs provide for a Senate/Academic Board. The body is academic governance and is accountable to the GC. It has responsibility for academic and research activities. Table V contains the summary of composition of Senate/Academic Boards of sampled NHEIs.

#### ***4.3. Composition of the Senate/Academic Boards of 30 High Ranking Nigerian Higher Education Institution***

From Table V, NHEIs have the Vice Chancellors (VC)/Rectors/Provosts and their respective deputies, Librarians, Deans of Students Affairs, Campus Heads, Academic Directors, Directors of Academic Planning, Heads of Departments and Representatives of Congregation in the composition of the Senate/Academic Boards. NHEIs do not have Staff and Students union's representatives in Senate/Academic Board as practiced in developing countries.

The Senates/Academic Boards of participating institutions also adopt a committee system of governance. Research Grant and Staff Development, Business Committee, Committee of Directors/Deans, Curriculum Committee and Students Disciplinary Committee are common to sampled institutions. Some of these NHEIs also operate a joint committee of the GC and Senate particularly on appointments and promotions of academic staff.

Operation management of the NHEIs is vested with the Principal Officers appointed by the Councils and comprising the VC/ Rector/Provost, DVC/ Deputy Rector/Deputy Provost, Registrar, Bursar and the University/Polytechnic/College Librarian. To achieve organizational wide participation in decision making, an expanded management known as Management Committee is put in place. The Committee is composed of the Principal Officers, Dean Student Affairs, Deans of Faculty/Schools, Directors of Ventures, Director Academic Planning, Director of Works, Director Health Administration, Chief Internal Auditor and Director Public Relations. The committee exists to advise the executive management on the day to day running of the institution.

Apart from the foregoing statutory internal structures, there are Management and Advisory Committees which further enhance participation in decision making. Vice Chancellors, Provosts and Rectors operate a committee system to advice on strategic and non-strategic issues. Examples are Executive Management, Management, Ceremonies, Sports and Games, Students and Staff Discipline, Staff and Students Welfare, Research and Development, External Relations, Congregation, Security and Housing Committees. The adoption of Committee System enhances the beauty of CG in NHEIs. It also facilitates capacity building and participative management.

Management of NHEIs also engage in interactive sessions with all stakeholders including students, teaching and non-teaching staff, Ministries, Departments and Agencies (MDAs) of the governments, royal fathers and the hosting communities. Faculty Boards, School Boards and Academic departments also play important role in CG of NHEIs. They are responsible to the Senate/Academic Board and are expected to report their activities to the Senate/Academic Board for approval. In addition, they provide inputs for academic and management decisions.

Congregation is statutory recognised but has no executive functions, yet is strategic to good governance and order of NHEIs. The Statutes in all cases prescribe that congregation shall comprise all full time academic staff who hold a degree of any HEIs recognised for the purpose of the Statute by the VC/Rectors/Provosts not being honorary degrees. A meeting of the congregation is usually held periodically for the purpose of receiving reports of NHEIs activities. It offers the most convenient forum for disseminating vital information and exchanging views freely on issues affecting stakeholders.

Statutes of NHEIs also provide for Convocation, in Nigerian Universities, it is usually presided by the Chancellor, in his absence, VC and where both are absent, the Deputy VC. The Convocation comprises all officers of HEIs as mentioned in the Schedule of the Statutes and all academic staff and all graduates of HEIs are members of the Convocation. The purpose is to confer degrees, diplomas and fellowships on graduates and members of the society.

Furthermore, the conditions of service and financial guidelines are two basic CG instruments common to NHEIs. The NHIs Conditions of Service regulates appointments of various categories of staff. It addresses issues like compensation package, promotion, staff discipline, retirement, leave, and governance procedure. The Financial Guidelines of NHEIs outline the primary responsibility of the CEOs on financial matters, responsibility of spending officers, bursary, internal audit, budgetary provisions, order of work, tenders, acquisition of assets, payments, income, insurance, etc.

#### ***4.4 Challenges of Corporate Governance in NHEIs***

From the scheduled interviews on design and implementation of governance in NHEIs, the major emerging themes are internal and external challenges. Funding was found to be one of the major internal challenges affecting effective adoption of CG. Majority of the stakeholders argued that inadequate funding from the government and owners of NHEIs did not allow for effective CG practices. This situation is echoed by comments of the following stakeholders:

*“The Polytechnic relies heavily on government subvention to survive. The total monthly personnel costs are over 210 million naira and the monthly subvention from the State Government is 153 million naira which is grossly inadequate. To complement the subvention, part time programs are run to boost internal revenue generation. The operation of part time system affects the quality of education. Moreover, the institution is not in full control. The State that provides the bulk of funds for running the institution usually dictates the programs and projects to channel the funds”.* (Rector)

*“The university still faces numerous challenges, the key of which is inadequate funding. While we deeply appreciate the crucial support of the government, a lot more is required if we have to realize our dream of becoming a world class institution in the not too distance future”* (Vice Chancellor)”.

*“While appreciating the state government for all the past and continued support towards the development of the college, made possible through release of capital grant and increase in subvention, like “Olive Twist”, the Council is requesting for more assistance from the government to supplement internally generated revenue base in order to bring the college into an amiable standard. I come to our aids to improve the infrastructural base of the college (Chairman, Governing Council).*

Inadequate funding and breakdown of infrastructure in NHEIs since the commencement of economic recession in the late 1980s has resulted into employment many staff that have no business in academic environment. Such people have limited understanding of the system; they are products of the prevalent emergency situations. NHEIs also witnessed a lot of bellicose unionistic interventions for redeeming this deplorable situation. In fact, rather than these interventions leading to progression in performance of NHEIs, the system witnessed retrogression (Ajayi and Haastrup, 2016).

As one Executive Secretary observed:

*“Records from the Boards Quality Assurance Department indicate a worrisome level of continued existence of expired programs in most state polytechnics. This is a serious problem that if left unaddressed would greatly affect our standards. This problem is further compounded by the menace of over enrolment driven solely by desire to generate revenue. While there is need to complement government subvention, education remains a social investment that is quality conscious” (Executive Secretary, Regulatory Agency).*

A similar disturbing symptom of poor CG in NHEIs is the historical evolution and changing dynamism of staff unions whose instruments for negotiation is strike. Over the years, these unions had embarked on strikes to press for their demands (Assem, Dima, Sarah, 2007). As rightly noted by a Registrar:

*“Majority of the strikes are caused by financial and other problems of NHEIs and traceable to government who routinely bypass the Management and Governing Council to issue all sorts of instructions and circulars” (Registrar).*

Over the years, Nigeria Higher education system has witnessed a number of crises leading to instability of academic calendar. For NHEIs to achieve effective governance and ultimately succeed, peaceful academic environment is a *sin quo none*. A Rector remarked:

*“The greatest challenge faced by CEO of tertiary institutions in Nigeria is the issue of staff embarking on strike for improvement in working conditions and students protesting a decision or policy of the institution. We have had a crisis-free in the Polytechnic since the inception of the administration in 2015. This indeed is a worthy celebration and contributes to our sound governance” (Rector).*

Another group of stakeholder, Executive Secretary of a regulatory agency agreed with the position of the Rector by commenting:

*“There is also the problem of increasing wave of management and union conflicts threatening the smooth running of academic calendar. There is need for partnership between the Board, Governing Councils, Rectors and other relevant agencies to solve the problem in order to maintain quality in the system.” (Executive Secretary, Regulatory Agency).*

Resulting from reliance on government for funding is the interferences of the State in administration of these institutions which is also a major challenge. Admission of quality candidates and recruitment of qualified manpower to fuel CG practices are problematic considering the frequent requests from civil servants, public officers and politicians. As rightly remarked by a Provost of College of Education:

*“There are criteria for selection of prospective candidates for admissions and recruitment of manpower. Such criteria are compromised to accommodate requests from top government functionaries. This to a large extent would affect the quality of students and staff” (Provost).*

Most NHEIs were established by various Statutes. These laws contain relevant information relating to appointment of key officers. In some cases the laws are violated to satisfy the need of the key stakeholders. For example, a State Government recently filled the vacuum created by the death of a College Provost through selection of a university lecturer in acting capacity without following normal procedure. NHEIs where political considerations and loyalty to the government were the main criteria for the appointment would be governed based on the dictates of the government and politician rather than application of CG principles.

Leadership is another major challenge. Effective implementation of CG in these institutions is contingent on good leadership in both teaching and non-teaching departments. Also good leadership is necessary at the Councils. Leadership in NHEIs requires not only professional competence but administrative acumen to successfully implement CG principles as rightly echoed by a Rector:

*“Some officers have professional skills but majority of these leaders lack administrative experience to stir the affairs of the institutions. The passage of the new Pension Law by the Government created leadership vacuum for my institution. Majority of experienced staff retired to take opportunity of the old pension schemes. The mass retirement of experienced staff left the administration of the institution in the hands of inexperienced staff. In addition, the composition of the present Council constituted an impediment to effective to CG practices. Council comprising members from the geo political zones of the States appointed not on the basis of skills and experience but political affiliations will not provide for robust decision making process” (Rector).*

This sentiment is supported by Executive Secretary of a regulatory agency.

*“The Board observes with dismay, the trending practice of recruitment and promotion of unqualified staff especially in the academics, in clear violation of prescribed rules. Appointment should not be based at the whims and caprices of those in authority but based on laid down rules. Anything contrary will only water*

*down standards and make our products half-baked” (Executive Secretary, Regulatory Agency).*

Meanwhile, the present composition of Federal Universities Councils designed to favour internal members is also a major challenge. While some members are elected to the Council with leadership skills and commitment, a number of these elected officers lack the skills, experience and attitudes to contribute positively to the development of the institutions. They are just squarely politicians pursuing the narrow interest of their sponsors.

Moreover, the domineering influence of unions on election matters has its decreasing impact. A situation in which elective positions are influenced by the unions will create mediocrity and shift of loyalty. A former Registrar commented on the negative effect of this development in his Valedictory Speech delivered in June 2010 as follows:

*“A Council with this composition is obviously not in good position to take an independent view of the affairs of its University; such Council will be more concerned with internal politics” (Registrar).*

In the same vain, appointments of leadership of academic and non-academic units by the VC/Rector/Provost on the basis of personal and principle of giving job to the boys will also affect quality of output negatively.

Higher education is the foundation for sustainable development and its creation must be based on clearly articulated, formulated and implemented educational programs. Establishment of HEIs on political, regional or tribal sentiments will negatively affect effective governance. This external challenge was acknowledged by a union leader:

*“Government establish HE purely on political sentiments and now unable to meet the minimum standard due to poor funding. In fact, most of the infrastructures in the State Polytechnics are Tertiary Education Trust Fund projects” (President, Academic Staff Union).*

## **5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **5.1. Conclusions**

The mandate of higher institutions to develop a whole man mentally, morally and physically is being seriously challenged nationally and internationally. Effective CG is a sine qua non for long term corporate success. (MenihUkpong, 2013). Intellectual capital is the most important resources in knowledge-based organizations. Its importance is increasingly appreciated in the world of business (Bontis, 1996; Bradley, 1997; Keenan and Aggestam, 2001.) CG practices were initially confined to corporate giants and businesses. However, the trend has started to take roots in NHEIs with growing need for an educated society. Governance in NHEIs has been under spotlight for several years due to leadership problem, poor funding, and mismanagement of resources, government interference, organizational politics, and influence of unions and faulty composition of GC to mention just a few. CG addresses the issues of autonomy and accountability. In most developed and developing countries, autonomy is being extended to NHEIs for flexibility in meeting the societal needs. Autonomy of these institutions also implies societal accountability (Pandey, 2004). Various governance models have been documented in recommending best governance practices for quality education. There is no model that fits all

situations. However, an effective model must seek for greater accountability, transparency, competition and fewer regulations.

State involvement in NHEIs is supervisory in nature with Ministry of Education and regulatory agencies playing oversight functions. The internal governing structures of NHEIs are the Council, Senate/ACB and Management. The Council serves as a focal point of governance. It is the highest decision making body for good order and governance. The recent changes in composition of internal governance structures of NHEIs are directed towards empowering the Council and Management effective performance.

### ***5.2. Recommendations***

In view of the foregoing, it is therefore recommended that attempts by the various Nigerian governments in granting autonomy to higher institutions through the various enabling laws should be used as opportunities by NHEIs to take full responsibility for good CG. This system of administration must be accountable, transparent, participatory, ethically caring, motivating, guarantees free flow of information and guarantee fundamental human rights. To sustain public confidence, the GC should include more external members with a focus on strategic direction and little interference in management.

Disclosure of internal government practices which is one of the core aspects of international best practices is virtually non-existent in NHEIs. Hence, commitment of these institutions to CG principles of independence, transparency, accountability and responsibility is in doubt. NHEIs irrespective of nature must be accountable to all stakeholders. While this does not imply uncontrolled interference by the stakeholders, it imposes an obligation on the NHEIs to periodically report and to have their performance examined in transparent manner. Although, Congregation reports delivered by Vice Chancellor/Rectors/Provost provide some account of stewardship. Without disclosure of application of CG principles by the Councils and Management, the stakeholders will find it difficult to hold the constituents of governance accountable. Usually, CG Reports must be prepared, published and submitted to the government through the Ministry of Education. Such reports will list the contribution of NHEIs to the society and can be used for the purpose of benchmarking. In addition, a National Database that will guarantee access of these documents for public use should be established.

### ***5.3. Contribution to Knowledge***

Meanwhile, the study makes important contributions to theory and practice. First we expand the existing small number of studies on CG in NHEIs. This study clearly describes the internal and external governance structures of NHEIs and the importance of CG in the performance of these institutions in light of developments in the global environment. Second, the study highlights some challenges faced by NHEIs in achieving good governance. Third, we demonstrate the absence of disclosure of application of CG in institutional reports which needs adequate attention.

### ***5.4. Suggestions of future research***

Nevertheless, the findings of this exploratory study must be interpreted with care. It has some limitations. Hence, suggestions for future studies deserve some comments. The study focused mainly on few NHEIs and generating data from only key stakeholders. A more comprehensive study on NHEIs incorporating both academic and non-teaching staff would be desirable in order to enlarge the sample size and increase the possibility of generalizing the findings for future studies.



Finally, a study of this nature is expected to improve performance and subsequently ranking of NHEIs in the global environment. Consequently, it is suggested that future study should analyse institutional governance practices and performance.

## References

1. Abdulazeez, D.A; Ndibe, L. and Mercy, A. (2011). Corporate governance and financial performance of listed money banks in Nigeria, *Journal of Accounting and Marketing*, 5, 1, 2-16
2. Ahmad, S. (2013). Availability of funds and utilization in Federal University of Technology in North-East Zone of Nigeria, *Multidisciplinary Journal of Science, Technology and Vocational Education*, 2,1, 80-90.
3. Ahmad, S. And Adepoju, O.A. (2013). Meeting the challenges of funding university in Nigeria, in P.K. Ojedelu, M.O. Arikewuyo, and A.C. Njoku (Eds), *Challenges of education in Nigeria*,708-724.
4. Ahmad, S. (2015). Public-private higher education financing in Nigeria, *European Scientific Journal*, 11, 7, 92-109.
5. Arora, A. and Sharma, A. (2016). Corporate governance and firm performance in developing countries; Evidence from India, *Corporate Governance*, 16, 2, 420-436.
6. Asadullah, M.A. & Ullah, A.Z. (2018). Socio-economic contributions of vocational education and training: An evidence from OECD countries, *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 50, 4, 172-174.
7. Astrachen, J.H. (2010) Strategy family business: Toward a multidimensional research agenda: *Journal of Family Business Strategy*, 1, 6-14.
8. Basheka, B. C (2015). *Best practices on corporate governance of higher education institutions*.
9. Bergan, S. (2003). *Students participation in higher education governance*. Council of Europe, [www.cve.int/t/dg4/highereducationgovernance](http://www.cve.int/t/dg4/highereducationgovernance)
10. Bernett, R. (1997). *Higher education: a critical business*. Buckingham, The society for research university press.
11. Blenche, I. and Kogan, K. (2007). Organization and governance in universities Portal. [Unesco.org/education/eu/files](http://Unesco.org/education/eu/files).
12. Blevins, P.D., Eckart, R. and Ragozzino, R. (2018). An investigation of link between governance and performance in non-profit organizations, *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 1, 1-9.
13. Bolden, R.G., Petror, G. and Gosling, J. (2008). *Developing collective leadership in higher education*. London leadership foundation for Higher Education. <http://www/thea.c.research>.
14. Bontis, N. and Sevenko, A (2007). The moderating role of human capital management practices on employees capabilities. *Journal of Knowledge management* 11, 3, 31-51.
15. Bryman, A.E. and Bell, E. (2011). *Business research methods*. United Kingdom Oxford University Press.
16. Brandley, K (1997). Intellectual capital and the new wealth of nations. *Business Strategy Review*, 8, 1, 53-62.
17. Clark, B. (1998). *Creating entrepreneurial universities: organisational pathway of University Paris and Oxford*. International Association of Universities, Elsevier Press.
18. Clark, B.R. (1983). *Higher education system? Academic organisations in crossnational perspective*. University of California Press Barkie.

19. Council of European Unions (2014). Conclusions on efficient and innovative education and training. Retrieved from <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/>
20. Creswell, J. (1994) *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
21. Crous, T. (2017). *Corporate governance in south Africa higher education institutions*. Ph.d thesis, School of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Management, University of Freetown, South Africa.
22. Dabiri W. B (2012). Corporate accountability *ADNEWS Monthly* pp 28-32.
23. Davis, G. F (2005). New dimension in corporate governance. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 31, 1, 143-162.
24. Davis, J, H; Schoorman, F. D and Donaldson, L (1997). Towards a stewardship theory of management. *American Management Review*, 22, 1, 20-47.
25. De Boer, H, Hisman, J., Klemper, A. Vander Menten, B., Neavo, G., Theiseins, H Vandev
26. Wender (2002). *Academia in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. An analysis of trends and perspective in higher education and research*, AWT.Achtergrond 28. The Hagu: Advier and voor het. Wetenschags-en.
27. Deloitte (2014). *The 2014 Global Report*.
28. Ekundayo, H.J. and Ajayi, A. (2009). Towards effective management of university education in Nigeria, *International N.G.O. Journal*, 4, 8, 342-347.
29. Fried, J. (2006). Higher education governance in Europe: Anotomy, ownership, and accountability: A review of literature in J. Kohler and J. Haber (eds) *Higher education governance between democratic culture, academic opportunity and market forces*, Council of European, Strasburg, 179-133.
30. Garcia-Meca, E., Garcia-Sanchez, A. and Martinez-Ferrew, J. (2015). Board diversity on its effect on bank's performance: An international analysis, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 53, 202-214.
31. Hanard, F. and Alexander, M. (2015). *Governance and quality guidelines in higher education: A review on governance arrangements and quality assurance guidelines*. United Kingdom OECD Paris.
32. Hoy, W. K., Gage, C. Q., III, & Tarter, C. J. (2006). School Mindfulness and Faculty Trust: Necessary Conditions for Each Other? *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 42(2), 236-255.
33. Iruonagbe, C. and Egharveba, M. (2015). Higher Education in Nigeria and the emergence of private universities. *International journal of Education and Research*. 3(2).
34. Issa, A and Muhammad, A (2014). Corporate governance in Nigeria higher education: Issues and challenges. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 16, 2, 221.
35. Jackling, B. and Johl, S. (2009). Board and firm performance: Evidence from India's top companies. *Corporate Governance. An International Review*, 17, 4, 492-509.
36. Jacoby, J. (2005). Maximizing shareholder value: a new ideology for corporate governance. *Corporate Governance and Society Challenge*. 48 (4).
37. Jaja, M. J (2013). Higher education in Nigeria: Its gain, its burden. *Global Journal of Human Social Science, Linguistics and Education*, 13, 4.
38. Johnson, G; Scholes, K and Whittington, R (2008). *Exploring corporate strategy: Text and Cases*. U.S. Prentice Hall.
39. Johnson, E.A. (2013). *Recommendation for good governance in Denmark Committee for University Boards in Demarks*, Copertnaugen.
40. Kazmi, A (2008). *Strategic management and business policy*. Tata McGraw Hill Publishing Company.

41. Keenan, J and Aggestan, M (2001). Corporate governance and intellectual capital: Some /Conceptualizations. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 9, 4, 259-275.
42. Kezar, A., & Sam, C. (2012). Governance as a Catalyst for Policy Change: Creating a Contingent Faculty Friendly Academy. *Educational Policy*, 28(3), 425-462.
43. Khan, H (2011). A literature review of corporate governance. International conference on E-business. *Management and Economics*, 25, 1-5.
44. Lawal, A. A (2008). Ethics and integrity: Imperators for economic reforms. *Nigerian Academy of Management* 2, 1, 123-137.
45. Lauzzaretti, L. and Tavoletti, E. (2006). Governance shifts in higher education: A cross national comparison, *European Educational Research Journal*, 5, 1, 18-26
46. Mustapha, Y. and Nofiu, A. (2017). The relationship between board structure variable and performance of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria, *International Journal of Economic Behavior*, 7, 1, 131-147.
47. Momoh, O. A and Ukpong, M. S (2013). Corporate governance and its effect on the Nigerian Insurance Industry, *European Journal of Globalization and Development Research*, 8, 1,1-12
48. Middlehust, R. (2004). Changing internal governance: A discussia of leadership, roles and management structures in U.K. universities, *Higher Education, Quarterly*, 58, 4, 258-279.
49. National Policy on Education (2004). Federal Ministry of Education. National Educational Research Development Council.
50. Nazar, R. Chandhry, I.S. and Faheem, M. (2018). Role of quality education for sustainable development goals, *International Journal of Social Science*, 4, 2, 486-501.
51. Naubauer, F. And Lank, A. (1998). *The Family business: its governance for sustainability*. Macmillan Press Ltd Houndmills, 105-67
52. Obasan, K, A (2014). Impact of Corporate governance on organizational profitability. *Fountain Journal of Management and Social Science*, 3, 2, 11-22.
53. Obiyo, O, C and Lencee, L (2011). Corporate governance and firm performance in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management*, 1, 4, 1-12.
54. Ogunruku, O.O. (2012). *University administration in the 21<sup>st</sup> century: a new direction*. Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University press.
55. Olson, G. A. (2009, July 23). *Exactly What Is 'Shared Governance'?* Retrieved February 27,2016, from <http://chronicle.com/article/Exactly-What-Is-Shared/47065/>
56. Oso, L and Semiu, B (2012). The concept and practice of corporate governance in Nigeria. The need for public relations and effective corporate communication, *Journal of communication*, 3, 1, 1-16.
57. Oyejide, T.A. and Soyibo, A. (2001). Corporate governance in Nigeria. A paper presented at the *Conference on Corporate Governance*, Accra, Ghana, 29-30, Jan.
58. Pandey, I.M. (2004). Governance of higher education, *Vikalpa*, 29, 2, 79-85
59. Pucciarelli, F. and Kaplan, A. (2016). Competition and strategy in higher education: managing complexity and uncertainty, *Business Horizon*, 1-10.
60. Popescu, M. (2011) The attitudes importance for the Students education, *International Journal of Economic Behavior* 1, 1, 53-61.
61. Ritchie, J., Lewis, J., Nicholls, C. & Ormston, R. (2014). *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers*. United Kingdom Natcen National Center for Social Research.
62. Rhoades, G. (2005). Capitalism, Academic Style, and Shared Governance. *Academe*, 91(3), 38.doi:10.2307/40252785

63. Salmi, J. (2009). *The challenge of establishing world class universities*. World Bank Washington D.C.
64. Salmi and A.M. Verspoor (eds) *Revitalising higher education*, Pergamon, Oxford
65. Salami, S.O. (2009). Emotional intelligence, self-efficacy, psychological well-being and students' attitudes: implication for quality education. *European Journal of Education Studies*.12 (3).
66. Sanda, A; Mukailu, A and Garba, T (2005). Corporate governance mechanisms and firm financial performance in Nigeria Financial Report. *Presented at the Biennial Research Workshop of AERC Nairobi, Kenya* pp 22-29.
67. Saunders, M, Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2015). *Research methods for business students*. (12<sup>th</sup>Ed). New York: Pearson Publisher.
68. Shattock, M. (2006). *Good governance in higher education*. United Kingdom: Open University Press Mc Graw Hill
69. Sarbah, A and Xiao, W. (2015) Good Corporate governance Structures” A must for family businesses, *Journal of Business and Management* 3, 40-57.
70. UIS/OECD (2003). *Financing education investment and return: Analysis of the World of Educational indicators 2002 Edition Paris UNESCO/OECD*.
71. Uwigbe, O. R (2013). Corporate governance and share price index: Evidence from listed firms in Nigeria. *Africa Research Review*, 7, 2, 129-143.
72. Wrapper, L and Loot, I (2003). Corporate governance, investor protection and performance in emerging markets. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 19, 5, 1-26.
73. Villain, M.L., Normand, A. Gibson, E. Hazelkorn, E. Pankowska, P. (2014). *Governance and adaptation on innovation modes*. <http://www.he.gov>.
74. Vught, F. A. (2009). Autonomy and accountability in government university relationship in J. Yang, C. (2015). *The Effects of Higher Education's Institutional Organizational Climate on Performance Satisfaction: Perceptions of University Faculty in Taiwan*. *IBR International Business Research*, 8(8).
75. Yin, R. (2003). *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage Publications Incorporation.
76. Zagorchev, A. and Gal, L. (2016). Corporate governance and performance of financial institutions, *Journal of Economics and Business*, 82, 17-41.

## Appendix

Table 1 – Higher Institutions Offering Approved and Accredited Programs in Nigeria

S/N	INSTITUTION TYPE	FEDERAL	STATE	PRIVATE	TOTAL
1	Colleges of Education <sup>a</sup>	22	47	17	86
2	Polytechnics/Monotechnics <sup>b</sup>	28	43	48	119
3	Universities <sup>c</sup>	41	47	74	162
	Total	91	137	139	367

Source: (a) National Council for Colleges of Education (NCCE) Website 2018

(b) National Board for Technical Education (NBTE) Website 2018

(c) National Universities Commission (NUC) Websites 2018

Table 2 – Interviewees and Interviewed Schedule Details

S/N	ORGANISATION	TYPE	POSITION	RANK	N/V	QUALIFICATION	EXPERIENCE IN CG
1.	University	Federal	Vice Chancellor	TMT	V	B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.	8years
2.	Polytechnic	State	Registrar	TMT	V	B.Sc MPA	5years
3.	University	Federal	Registrar	TMT	N	B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.	8years
4.	Polytechnic	Federal	Rector	TMT	V	B.Sc., MSC, Ph.D.	8years
5.	Polytechnic	State	Rector	TMT	N	B.Sc., MSC,	4years
6.	Polytechnic	Private	Rector	TMT	N	B.Sc., M.Sc.	8years
7.	Regulatory Agency	Federal	Executive Secretary	TMT	V	B.Sc., M.Sc., Ph.D.	8years
8.	College of Education	State	Chairman, Governing Council	TMT	N	B.A, MA, MPA	4years
9.	Polytechnic	Federal	Union President	MM	N	HND	5years

Key:

TMT/MM: Top Management/Middle Management

V/N: Voice/Recording/Note taking

Table 3 – Application of Corporate Governance Practices in Best 30 Higher Institutions in Nigeria

S/N	Institution	Year of Establishment	Statute	Constituents of Internal Governance	Constituents of External Governance	Disclosure of CG Practices	Principal Officers
1	University of Ibadan (UI)	1948	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 3 DVCs, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
2	Covenant University, Ota (CU)	2002	Incorporated Trustees	Board of Regents, Senate, Faculty Board, Department	NUC, Board of Trustees, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, DVC, Registrar, Director Financial Services, Director Centre for Learning Resources, Director Physical Planning and Resources, University Chaplain
3	University of Nigeria, Nsukka (UNN)	1960	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 3 DVCs, Provost College of Medicine, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
4	Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife (OAU)	1962	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 2 DVCs, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
5	Federal University of Technology, Minna (FUTM)	1983	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 2 DVCs, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
6	University of Lagos (ULG)	1962	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 3 DVCs, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
7	Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria (ABU)	1962	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 2 DVCs, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
8	Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta (FUAB)	1988	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 2 DVCs, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
9	University of Ilorin (ULR)	1975	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 3 DVCs, Provost College of Health Services, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian

10	Federal University of Technology Akure (FUTA)	1981	University miscellaneous provision 1993, amendment 2003	Councils, Management, Senate, Faculty Board, Departments	NUC, Federal Ministry of Education	None	VC, 2 DVCs, Registrar, Bursar, University Librarian
11	Federal Polytechnic Nekede, Imo State (FPN)	1978	Federal Polytechnics Acts 2004 Amendment 2017	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
12	Federal Polytechnic Ilaro, Ogun State (FPI)	1979	Federal Polytechnics Acts 2004 Amendment 2017	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
13	Kaduna Polytechnic Kaduna (KPK)	1956	Federal Polytechnics Acts 2004 Amendment 2017	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
4	The Polytechnic Ibadan (TPI)	1970	Ibadan Poly edict 1970	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, State Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
15	Federal Polytechnic Bida (FPB)	1977	Federal Polytechnics Acts 2004 Amendment 2017	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
16	Auchi Polytechnic Auchi (APA)	1963	Federal Polytechnics Acts 2004 Amendment 2017	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
17	Institute of Management and Technology Enugu (IMT)	1973	IMT edit No.10 of 1973	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, State Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian and Director of Works
18	Federal Polytechnic Offa (FPO)	1992	Federal Polytechnics Acts 2004 Amendment 2017	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
19	Rufus Giwa Polytechnic Owo (RGP)	1979	Rufus Giwa Poly edict of 1979	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian and Chairman committee of Deans
20	Yaba College of Technology Yaba (YCT)	1947	Federal Polytechnics Acts 2004 Amendment 2017	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NBTE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Rector, 2 DRCs, Registrar, Bursar, Polytechnic Librarian
21	Adeyemi College of Education, Ondo (ACE)	1964	Federal College of Education Acts 1986	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian

22	Federal College of Education Zaria (FCZ)	1962	Federal College of Education Acts 1986	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian
23	Niger State College of Education, Minna (NCM)	1975	Niger State edict N.S.L.N Number 3 of 1983	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, State Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian
24	Federal College of Education (Special) Oyo (FCO)	1977	Federal College of Education Acts 1986	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian
25	Federal College of Education, Kano (FCK)	1965	Federal College of Education Acts 1986	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian
26	Federal College of Education, Abeokuta (FCA)	1976	Federal College of Education Acts 1986	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, Federal Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian
27	College of Education Warri (CEW)	1979	College of Education 1995 amended edict.	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, State Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 1 Deputy Provost, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian, Director of Works and Maintenance
28	Emmanuel Alayande College of Education Oyo (ECO)	1976	Edit No.16 Vol 30, 2005	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, State Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian, Director of Works.
29	College of Education, Agbor (CEA)	1979	College of Education 1995 amended edict.	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, State Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian
30	College of Education IkereEkiti (CEI)	1977	College Law No.3 of 1999	Councils, Management, Academic Board, Board of School, Departments	NCCE, State Ministry of Education	None	Provost, 2 Deputy Provosts, Registrar, Bursar, College Librarian

Source: Compiled by the Authors



Table 4 – Composition of Governing Councils According to the Statutes of Best 10 Nigeria Universities, Polytechnics, and Colleges of Education

Composition of Governing Councils According to the Statutes of Best 10 Nigeria Universities											
S/N	MEMBERSHIP	UI	CU	UNN	OAU	FUM	UNLG	ABU	FUAB	LRN	FUTA
1	Non-Executive Chairman	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Executive Chairman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	VC/Rector	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	DVC/Dep. Rector/Dep. Provost	3	2	3	2	2	3	2	2	3	2
5	Rep Senate/ACB	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
6	Rep Congregation	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
7	Rep Ministry of Education	1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	Rep Convocation	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9	Rep Students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Rep Geo Political Zones	9	-	9	9	9	9	9	9	9	9
11	Rep of Regulatory	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
12	Rep Professional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	Rep Industrial Ass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	Rep Alumni	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Rep BOT	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Rep of University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Rep National Council for Women	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	21	15	21	20	20	21	20	20	21	20
Composition of Governing Councils According to the Statutes of Best 10 Nigeria Polytechnics											
S/N	MEMBERSHIP	FPN	FPI	KPK	TPI	FPB	APA	IMT	FPO	RGP	YCT
1	Non-Executive Chairman	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Executive Chairman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Rector	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	Dep. Rector	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
5	Rep ACB	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
6	Rep Congregation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
7	Rep Ministry of Education	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	Rep Convocation	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	-	3
9	Rep Students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Rep Geo Political Zones	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
11	Rep of Regulatory	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	Rep Professional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	Rep Industrial Ass	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	Rep Alumni	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	Rep BOT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Rep of University	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
17	Rep National Council for Women	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	TOTAL	21	15	21	20	20	21	20	20	21	20

(continuing)

(following)

Composition of Governing Councils According to the Statutes of Best 10 Nigeria Colleges of Education											
S/N	MEMBERSHIP	ACE	FCZ	NCM	FCO	FCK	FCA	CEW	ECO	CEA	CEI
1	Non-Executive Chairman	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2	Executive Chairman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
3	Provost	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
4	Dep. Provost	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
5	Rep ACB	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2
6	Rep Congregation	3	3	3	3	3	3	1	3	3	3
7	Rep Ministry of Education	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
8	Rep Convocation	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
9	Rep Students	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10	Rep Geo Political Zones		5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
11	Rep of Regulatory	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	Rep Professional	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
13	Rep Industrial Ass	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
14	Rep Alumni	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	Rep BOT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Rep of University	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1
17	Rep Ministry of Finance	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
	TOTAL	21	20	21	20	20	21	18	22	21	20

Source: Compiled by the Authors

Table 5 – Senate Composition of Best 10 Nigerian Universities, Polytechnics, and Colleges of Education According to the Statutes

Academic Board Composition of Best 10 Nigerian Universities According to the Statutes											
S/N	COMPOSITION	UI	CU	UNN	OAU	FTM	ULG	ABU	FUA	ULR	FTA
1	VC/Rector/Provost	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
2	DVC/Dep. Rector/Dep. Provost	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
3	Registrar	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
4	Campus Heads/Directors	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
5	Deans	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
6	Dean Students Affairs	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
7	Director ICT	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8	Director Academic Planning	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
9	Heads of Departments	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
10	Professors/Chief Lecturers	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
11	Librarian	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	Senate Representative	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
13	Representative of Congregation	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
14	Representative of Unions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Students Union Representative	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Rep of Council	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(continuing)

(following)

Academic Board Composition of Best 10 Nigerian Polytechnic According to the Statutes											
S/N	COMPOSITION	UI	CU	UNN	OAU	FTM	ULG	ABU	FUA	ULR	FTA
1	Rector	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
2	Dep. Rector	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
3	Registrar	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
4	Campus Heads/Directors	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
5	Deans	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
6	Dean Students Affairs	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
7	Director ICT	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8	Director Academic Planning	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
9	Heads of Departments	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
10	Professors/Chief Lecturers	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
11	Librarian	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	Senate Representative	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
13	Representative of Congregation	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
14	Representative of Unions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Students Union Representative	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Rep of Council	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Academic Board Composition of Best 10 Nigerian Colleges of Education According to the Statutes											
S/N	COMPOSITION	ACE	FCZ	NCM	FCO	FCK	FCA	CEW	ECO	CEA	CEI
1	Provost	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
2	Dep. Provost	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
3	Registrar	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
4	Campus Heads/Directors	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
5	Deans	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
6	Dean Students Affairs	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
7	Director ICT	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8	Director Academic Planning	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
9	Heads of Departments	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
10	Professors/Chief Lecturers	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
11	Librarian	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
12	Senate Representative	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
13	Representative of Congregation	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
14	Representative of Unions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15	Students Union Representative	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
16	Rep of Council	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Source: Compiled by the Authors