

# Exploring Sustainable Funding Management Practices for Facilitating Security Architectures in Public Universities in Cross River State, Nigeria

<sup>1</sup>Uzoigwe, Michael Chukwudi Ph.D, <sup>2</sup>Luke Abraham Adams Ph.D, <sup>3</sup>Chikezie Michael CHIMA

<sup>1&2</sup>Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Educational Foundation Studies, University of Calabar, Cross River State, Nigeria, <sup>3</sup>Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Nigeria, Nsukka,

**Abstract:** This study explored sustainable funding management practices for facilitating the security architectures of public Universities in Cross River State. Descriptive survey research design was adopted. A total of 172 (10%) respondents was sampled from a population of 1,720 through cluster sampling. A 20-item validated instrument with a Split-half reliability index of .84 and .86, titled: Sustainable Fund Management Practices and Security Facilitation Survey (SFMPFS) was employed for data collection. Mean and standard deviation and independent t-test were used for data analysis. Findings revealed that items 1 to 10 occur within the range of 3.1-4.0 (Always) which indicate that these items are significant barriers to securing adequate funding for security architectures in public universities in Cross River State. Some of the items include limited budgets, poor prioritization of security funding, cost of security measures, resistance to change, lack of security expertise and community opposition, poor security budget planning and forecasting, failure in diversifying security funding sources, rejecting collaboration with security personnel and loathing security technology adoption in facilitating school security architectures. The result also showed that with the t-test value of 1.87 less than the t-crit. value of 1.960, there is no significant difference in the mean responses on the extent to which Federal and State Universities are facing funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures. It was equally found that items 11 to 20 occur within the range of 2.1-4.0 (Accepted), suggesting that the acceptable strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices in facilitating security architectures include collaboration, partnerships with private sectors, community support and advocacy roles among others. It was concluded that the administrators have not adopted sustainable funding practices for facilitating security architectures in the study area. It is recommended amongst others that the administrators should improve security funding via collaboration and advocacy efforts in order to create a safe school environment for students, staff and the public.

**Keywords:** Sustainability, Funding, Management, Facilitation, Security, University.

## INTRODUCTION

Over the years, public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria are facing significant security challenges, ranging from theft, vandalism, cyber-attacks and violent crimes. These security threats pose a significant risk to the safety and well-being of students, staff and Departments. According to Olufemi and Adeyemo (2018), this problem is already having negative impacts on the enrollment rates and the reputation of the institutions. While security architectures can help mitigate these

risks, the funding required to implement and maintain effective security measures is a significant challenge. Recent studies showed that the problem of inadequate funding for security architectures in public universities in Cross River State is a complex issue that requires sustainable funding management practices (Oladipo & Adeyemi, 2018; Okoro & Nwankwo, 2018; Umaru & Suleiman, 2020). This means that these practices can help ensure that resources are used efficiently and effectively to enhance security architectures, without

compromising other important areas of the institutions' operations. This research aims to explore sustainable funding management practices for facilitating security architectures in public universities in the study area. By exploring the current funding management practices and identifying best practices from other institutions, this research seeks to provide recommendations for improving the effectiveness and sustainability of funding for security architectures. Ultimately, this research aims to contribute to the development of a safe and secure learning environment for all stakeholders in public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria.

Security architecture is conceived as the design and implementation of a comprehensive security strategy for an organization (Ogunleye & Adetunji, 2019). It involves creating a framework for identifying, assessing, and mitigating security risks, as well as establishing policies, procedures, and technical measures to protect against potential threats and vulnerabilities (Odo & Ugwu, 2020). In addition, security architecture typically involves a combination of physical, technical, and administrative controls, such as access control, surveillance, encryption, firewalls, intrusion detection and prevention systems, security information and event management systems and incident response plans (Njeru & Orodho, 2020). The architecture also considers the organization's business objectives, regulatory requirements, and risk tolerance. Supporting this fact, Kiguru and Waweru (2021) opined that the goal of security architecture is to provide a holistic and integrated approach to security that aligns with the organization's overall strategy and supports its mission and goals. Gitonga and Mbugua (2021) explained that the architectures ensures that security measures are effective, efficient, and sustainable over time, and that they can adapt to changing threats and technologies. In educational institutions, security architecture is an essential component of comprehensive security management which requires careful planning, implementation, and ongoing evaluation and refinement to ensure that it meets the school organization's needs and objectives (Fashiku & Sulaiman, 2019).

Unfortunately, the researchers have observed that the security architectures in most Universities in Nigeria generally and Cross River State in particular has not reached an appreciable level. There are frequent reports of physical security risks such as theft, vandalism and violence among students and staff on campus (Daramola & Ojo 2019). Most scammers invade sensitive information of the University, including student records, financial data and employees' records (Bello & Ibrahim, 2018). The heights of cyber security risks facing public Universities in Cross River in terms of data breaches, ransomware attacks and phishing scams are quite surprising. Babalola and Adeyemi (2018) found that there are social engineering attackers (school charges racketeers) who

target unsuspecting individuals rather than computer systems, and seek to manipulate people into divulging sensitive information or performing actions that compromise security on campus. Anunobi and Amos (2021) lamented that these attacks include phishing emails, pretexting and baiting. These are just a few examples of the security risks that the Universities are facing among which the administrators have not conducted regular risk assessments to develop comprehensive security plans and address these risks in order to protect their staff and students.

According to Alhassan and Aremu (2019) security management is essential in the school system for several reasons among which is protecting students and staff. This is because the safety and security of students and staff is paramount in the school system. Administrators therefore are responsible for providing a safe and secure learning environment, and security management helps to mitigate risks and threats that could endanger the well-being of students and staff (Alabi & Adeniji, 2019). More so, protecting school property and valuable assets such as buildings, equipment, and technology from theft, vandalism, and damage helps the school to comply with various laws, regulations, and standards related to security and safety. Akinyele (2019) stipulated that effective security management helps schools to meet these requirements and mitigate the risk of legal and regulatory violations. Additionally, security incidents can damage the reputation of a school, which can have long-term consequences for enrollment, funding, and community support. Effective security management helps to prevent incidents and minimize the impact of any incidents that do occur.

Many studies have revealed that one of the most essential strategies in facilitating security architectures in the school system is through sustainable funding management practices (Adetunji, & Adeleke, 2018; Adegoke, 2019). These refers to the act of managing school financial resources in a way that ensures long-term financial stability and sustainability. This involves the administrative process of balancing the short-term needs of the University system with the long-term goals and objectives, while also considering the impact of financial decisions on the environment, society, and the economy. Sustainable funding management typically involves the following practices including financial planning. This entails developing a comprehensive financial plan that outlines the short-term and long-term financial goals and objectives of the school, as well as the strategies for achieving those goals. It also involves developing a budget that aligns with the financial plan and ensures that resources are allocated efficiently and effectively to support the schools' activities and priorities.

Another dimension of sustainable funding management practice is revenue generation. This involves identifying and pursuing opportunities to generate revenue,

such as fundraising, grants, and partnerships, to support the school financial sustainability and security needs (Umaru, & Suleiman 2020). It equally entails managing costs and expenses to ensure that they are aligned with the schools' financial goals and objectives, while also ensuring that resources are used efficiently and effectively. Oladipo and Adeyemi (2018) averred that risk management by way of identifying and managing financial risks, such as market risks, credit risks, and operational and security risks in order to ensure that the school financial sustainability is not compromised by unexpected events is another aspect of sustainable funding management. Above all, it is essential for schools to achieve their long-term goals and objectives, while also ensuring that their financial decisions are responsible and sustainable over time (Okoro & Nwankwo, 2018).

Furthermore, sustainable funding management practices can ensure that adequate resources are allocated to security management, including the hiring of security personnel, the installation of security systems, and the development and implementation of security policies and procedures (Ogunleye. & Adetunji, 2019). All-inclusive risk assessment can be enhanced through sustainable funding management and regular assessment of security risks by identifying appropriate measures to mitigate those risks. This includes identifying the resources needed to implement those measures, such as additional security personnel or security equipment (Odo & Ugwu, 2020). It can also support the provision of training and awareness programs for staff and students on security protocols and procedures. This can include training on emergency response procedures, cybersecurity best practices, and physical security measures (Njeru & Orodho, 2020). The regular maintenance and upgrades of security systems and equipment to ensure that they are functioning effectively and are up-to-date with current security standards and requirements are the fundamental focus of sustainable funding management practices in the school system (Kiguru & Waweru, 2021).

In study carried out by Gitonga and Mbugua (2021) on sustainable funding management practices and school security maintenance in public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya, the study found that developing a comprehensive security plan that includes a budget for security architectures, outlining the required funding and potential sources of funding are the prerequisite for sustainable funding management practices. Similarly, Odo and Ugwu (2020) found that creating a task force or committee responsible for overseeing the allocation of funds for security architectures, ensuring that resources are used efficiently and effectively for sustainable security culture. They also found that establishing partnerships with government agencies, private organizations, and other institutions to leverage resources and funding opportunities are

ideal for security management. Njeru and Orodho (2020) found that conduct regular risk assessments to identify potential threats and security vulnerabilities which can inform funding decisions and priorities are expedient for sustainable security management. They also found that implementing cost-saving measures, such as energy-efficient lighting and building materials, to reduce long-term operating costs and freeing up resources for security architectures are the requirements for sustainable security management.

Contrarily, Anunobi and Amos (2021) found that the funding management practices did not significantly influence school security maintenance. The study revealed that schools without sustainable funding management practices were not able to allocate resources towards security infrastructure, equipment and personnel, resulting in better security outcomes. Likewise, Kiguru and Waweru (2021) found that sustainable funding management practices did not significantly influence school security maintenance. The study revealed that schools without sustainable funding management practices were unable to allocate resources towards security infrastructure, equipment, and personnel, resulting in better security outcomes. One of the key findings across these studies is that schools with sustainable funding management practices tend to have better security outcomes compared to those with poor funding management practices. This is because sustainable funding management practices enable schools to allocate resources towards security infrastructure, equipment, and personnel, which are essential for maintaining a safe and secure learning environment.

On the other hand, Njeru and Orodho (2020) highlighted some funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures in the Universities including limited budgets, poor prioritization of security funding, cost of security measures, resistance to change, lack of security expertise and community opposition among others. Anunobi and Amos (2021) emphasized that the barriers to security funding comprise poor security budget planning and forecasting, failure in diversifying security funding sources, neglecting security investments, ignoring security asset loans and detesting security cost-saving measures, rejecting collaboration with security personnel and loathing security technology adoption in facilitating school security architectures. Buttressing this fact, Anunobi and Amos (2021) alluded that some sustainable funding management practices for improving school security are collaboration, grants and funding opportunities, partnerships with private sectors, community support and advocacy roles among others.

Additionally, some studies have highlighted the importance of involving all stakeholders in the funding management process to ensure transparency and accountability. For instance, Njeru and Orodho (2020) strongly recommended

that effective school administrators involve parents, teachers, and students in the decision-making process regarding the allocation of funds for security purposes. This helps to build trust and promote accountability, which are essential for sustainable funding management practices. Furthermore, some of the studies emphasized the need for schools to prioritize security as a core function and allocate sufficient resources towards it. Anunobi and Amos (2021), for example, recommended that schools should allocate at least 10% of their budget towards security to ensure that they have adequate resources to maintain a safe and secure learning environment. It is logical to state that sustainable funding management practices play a critical role in ensuring school security maintenance. By allocating resources towards security infrastructure, equipment, and personnel, schools can create a safe and secure learning environment for students and promote their academic success.

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The security of public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria is a growing concern, with reports of theft, vandalism, cyber-attacks, and violent crimes. While security architectures can help mitigate these risks, the funding required to implement and maintain effective security measures is a significant challenge. The problem is the lack of sustainable funding management practices to facilitate security architectures in public universities in the study area, leading to inadequate security measures, increased risks, and negative impacts on the safety and well-being of students, staff, and the community where the schools are situated. Therefore, there is a need to explore sustainable funding management practices that can enhance security architectures in public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria, to ensure a safe and secure learning environment for all stakeholders.

## PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to explore sustainable funding management practices for facilitating security architectures in public Universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to:

- 1) Find out the funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures in Universities
- 2) Ascertain the strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices in facilitating security architectures in Universities

## RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study answered the following research questions

- 1) What are the funding management challenges and barriers in facilitating security in Universities?
- 2) What are the strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices in facilitating security architectures in Universities?

## RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

There is no significant mean difference between funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures in the University of Calabar and University of Cross River State.

## METHODOLOGY

Descriptive survey design and quantitative approach were adopted in conducting the study. Data were collected from security personnel in the two public universities in Cross River State: University of Calabar (UNICAL) and Cross River State University (CRSU). The population of the study comprised 172 (10%) respondents out of a population of 1,720 through cluster sampling technique. In this figure, 109 were from University of Calabar while 63 were from Cross River State University. This strategy was utilized because security personnel run shift-work schedule and it was difficult to get them to administer the questionnaire. A validated questionnaire titled: Sustainable Fund Management Practices and Security Facilitation Survey (SFMPFS) was employed for data collection. The instrument was tested for reliability using Cronbach Alpha. The reliability index was 0.87 which was adjudged good for data collection. The questionnaire had 20 items and comprised three parts (Section A, B and C) based on the objective of the study. Section A was on demographic data, while section B (10 items) focused on the funding management challenges in facilitating security architecture in Universities. They were rated as follows: Always (A) =3.1-4.0; Sometimes (S) =2.1-3.0; Rarely (R) =1.1-2.0 and Never (N) =0.1-1.0. Section C (10 items) focused on strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices in facilitating security architectures in Universities which were rated thus: Accepted (R) =2.1-4.0; Rejected (A) =0.1-2.0.

## RESULTS

### Research Question one

What are the funding management challenges in facilitating security architecture in Universities?

**Table 1:** Results on the mean and standard deviation scores of funding management challenges in facilitating security architecture in Universities

Items on the funding challenges and barriers in facilitating security	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D	Remarks
My university often has limited budgets and cannot allocate enough funds for security	172	2.01	1.07	Sometimes
My university has many competing academic priorities such that security is not a top priority in the face of other pressing needs	172	4.12	2.15	Always
My university do not prioritize security funding because they perceive the risk of a security incident to be low.	172	2.34	1.33	Sometimes
My university leaders do not view security as a priority so they cannot be convinced to secure funding for security initiatives	172	4.56	2.51	Always
The cost of security technology/equipment is high, making it difficult for my university to implement the latest security measures	172	2.78	1.70	Sometimes
My university cannot allocate resources due to inadequate security assessment	172	3.90	2.91	Always
My university failed to comply with security regulations which require significant financial resources to implement	172	2.02	1.02	Sometimes
The threat landscape is constantly evolving and my university needs to be prepared to adapt to new threats which require additional funding	172	4.14	2.24	Always
My university finds it difficult to collaborate on an inclusive security strategy because various Departments have different security needs	172	4.26	2.46	Always
My university has aging security infrastructure that requires replacement and upgrading which are very expensive.	172	4.48	2.68	Always
Criterion mean core		2.50		Accepted

*Source: Authours' computation, 2023*

Table 1 demonstrated that the results presented on the mean and standard deviation scores of funding management challenges in facilitating security are informative and well-analyzed. The use of descriptive statistical measures provides a clear understanding of the magnitude and variability of the challenges and barriers faced in funding management for security purposes in public universities in Cross River State. Table1 showed that exceptions of items 1, 3, 5 and 7, other items occur within the range of 3.1-4.0 (Always), hence the mean score for the funding management challenges indicates that these items are significant barriers to securing adequate

funding for security architectures in public universities in Cross River State. The high mean scores suggest that the administrators in the institutions are yet to address the funding management challenges effectively in order to enhance security architectures across the institutions.

### Research Question two

What are the strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices in facilitating security architectures in Universities?

Items on the strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices for facilitating security	N	$\bar{X}$	S.D	Remarks
Develop a comprehensive security plan that includes a budget for security architectures, outlining the required funding and potential sources of funding	172	2.01	1.00	Accepted
Create a task force or committee responsible for overseeing the allocation of funds for security architectures, ensuring that resources are used efficiently and effectively.	172	3.23	2.18	Accepted
Establish partnerships with government agencies, private organizations, and other institutions to leverage resources and funding opportunities	172	3.45	1.36	Accepted

Conduct regular risk assessments to identify potential threats and security vulnerabilities, which can inform funding decisions and priorities	172	2.17	1.54	Accepted
Implement cost-saving measures, such as energy-efficient lighting and building materials, to reduce long-term operating costs and free up resources for security architectures	172	3.49	1.72	Accepted
Develop a fundraising strategy that targets alumni, donors, and other stakeholders to increase funding for security architectures	172	3.52	1.99	Accepted
Use data analytics and performance metrics to track the effectiveness of security architectures and make informed decisions about future funding allocations	172	2.24	2.27	Accepted
Consider alternative funding sources, such as grants and corporate partnerships, to supplement traditional funding streams	172	2.56	1.45	Accepted
Engage in advocacy efforts to increase public awareness of the importance of security architectures and the need for sustainable funding management practices	172	3.68	1.63	Accepted
Develop a contingency plan for emergency funding that outlines procedures for accessing additional resources in the event of a security crisis	172	2.70	2.81	Accepted
Criterion mean score		2.50		Accepted

*Source: Authours' computation, 2023*

Table 2 indicated the mean and standard deviation scores on the strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices in facilitating security architectures in public Universities in Cross River State. Table 2 showed that items 1 to 10 occur within the range of 2.1-4.0 (Accepted), hence based on the mean response of the participants, they suggest that if and when the cost-saving measures are effectively implemented, it is clear that they can meritoriously contribute in reducing long-term operating costs and freeing up resources

for enhancing security architectures in the public universities studied.

### Hypothesis one

There is no significant mean difference between funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures in the University of Calabar and University of Cross River State.

**Table 3:** Independent t-test results on the significant difference in the mean scores of Federal and State University towards funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures

S/N	Variables	No of cases	X	S.D	Df	t-cal	t-crit	Decision	Significance
1	Federal University	109	2.22	1.19	416	0.25	1.96	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)
	State University	63	2.18	1.09					
2	Federal University	109	1.74	0.91	416	8.49	1.96	Reject H0	Significant (S)
	State University	63	2.60	0.85					
3	Federal University	109	1.71	0.84	416	1.30	1.96	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)
	State University	63	1.84	0.93					
4	Federal University	109	1.82	0.89	416	1.24	1.96	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)
	State University	63	1.70	0.78					
5	Federal University	109	1.89	0.97	416	0.44	1.96	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)
	State University	63	1.84	0.85					
6	Federal University	109	1.66	0.97	416	0.18	1.96	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)
	State University	63	1.64	0.96					
7	Federal University	109	1.65	0.79	416	2.67	1.96	Reject H0	Significant (S)

	State University	63	1.92	0.97					
8	Federal University	109	2.16	1.03	416	1.36	1.96	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)
	State University	63	2.01	0.91					
9	Federal University	109	1.86	0.92	416	2.76	1.96	Reject H0	Significant (S)
	State University	63	1.58	0.77					
10	Federal University	109	1.45	0.72	416	0.00	1.96	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)
	State University	63	1.45	0.71					
	Overall t-test value					1.87	1.960	Accept H0	Not Significant (NS)

*Source: Authours' computation, 2023*

From the results in Table 3, the t-test value of 1.87 is less than the t-crit. value of 1.960; therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is no significant difference in the mean responses on the extent to which Federal and State Universities are facing funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures in Cross River of Nigeria. Based on the mean and standard deviation scores of the funding management challenges, it is clear that there is a need to improve the effectiveness and ensure that procedures are in place to access additional resources in the event of a security crisis or unexpected security expenses in both institutions.

## DISCUSSION OF THE RESULTS

The first research question aimed at exploring the funding management challenges in facilitating security architecture in Universities. The results as shown in Table one indicated that the items are significant barriers to securing adequate funding for enhancing security architectures in public universities in Cross River State. The high mean scores suggest that the administrators in the institutions are yet to address the funding management challenges effectively in order to achieve the expected results across the institutions. This finding corroborates that of Njeru and Orodho (2020) who found some funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures in the Universities including limited budgets, poor prioritization of security funding, cost of security measures, resistance to change, lack of security expertise and community opposition among others. It is in agreement with that of Anunobi and Amos (2021) who lamented that the barriers to security funding comprise poor security budget planning and forecasting, failure in diversifying security funding sources, neglecting security investments, ignoring security asset loans and detesting security cost-saving measures, rejecting collaboration with security personnel and loathing security technology adoption in facilitating school security architectures. The implication of this finding is that the lack of funding for security architectures can increase the risks of

security threats such as theft, vandalism, cyber-attacks, and violent crimes. This can create an environment of fear and uncertainty, affecting the safety and well-being of students, staff, and faculty.

The answer to the second research question also indicated the acceptable strategies for ensuring sustainable funding management practices in facilitating security architectures in public Universities in Cross River State. This finding is in consonant with that of Gitonga and Mbugua (2021) who found that developing a comprehensive security plan that includes a budget for security architectures, outlining the required funding and potential sources of funding are the prerequisite for sustainable funding management practices. Similarly, the finding supports that of Odo and Ugwu (2020) who found that creating a task force or committee responsible for overseeing the allocation of funds for security architectures, ensuring that resources are used efficiently and effectively for sustainable security culture. They also found that establishing partnerships with government agencies, private organizations, and other institutions to leverage resources and funding opportunities are ideal for security management. The implication of this finding is that without adequate funding for security architectures, universities may not have the necessary resources to implement and maintain effective security measures. This can leave the university vulnerable to various security threats and make it difficult to manage and mitigate insecurities.

Meanwhile, the result of the hypothesis indicated that there is no significant difference in the mean responses on the extent to which Federal and State Universities are facing funding management challenges in facilitating security architectures in Cross River of Nigeria. The implication of this findings is that insecurities on campus can have a negative impact on enrollment and the university's reputation. This can lead to reduced funding from other sources, further exacerbating the problem of inadequate security funding.

## CONCLUSIONS

Sustainable funding management practices are needed to enhance security architectures in public universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. This involves identifying and pursuing essential opportunities to generate revenue, such as fundraising, grants, and partnerships, to support the school financial sustainability and security needs. It was concluded that the administrators are yet to adopt sustainable funding practices to facilitate security architectures in the study area.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

Premised on the findings, it is recommended that:

1. Universities in Cross River State should develop a comprehensive security plan that includes a budget for security architectures and identifies potential sources of funding. The plan should be regularly reviewed and updated to ensure that it reflects the evolving security needs of the institution.

2. Universities in Cross River State should explore partnerships with government agencies, private organizations, and other institutions to leverage external resources and funding opportunities. This can include seeking grants, establishing corporate partnerships, and engaging in advocacy efforts to increase public awareness of the importance of security architectures.
3. Universities in Cross River State should use data analytics and performance metrics to track the effectiveness of security architectures and make informed decisions about future funding allocations. This can include collecting data on the number and type of security incidents, the cost of security architectures, and the effectiveness of different security measures. By using data to inform funding decisions, universities can ensure that resources are used efficiently and effectively to enhance security architectures.

## REFERENCES

1. Adegoke, B. A. (2019). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(5), 1-8.
2. Adetunji, A. A. & Adeleke, A. O. (2018). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 10(2), 8-16.
3. Akinyele, S. T. (2019). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Lagos State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 11(1), 12-20.
4. Alabi, A. T. & Adeniji, A. O. (2019). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Osun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 11(2), 10-18.
5. Alhassan, A. I. & Aremu, A. O. (2019). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(8), 1-8.
6. Anunobi, C. V. & Amos, S. O. (2021). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Lagos State, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 12(2), 1-10.
7. Babalola, Y. A. & Adeyemi, T. O. (2018). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 6(1), 1-10.
8. Bello, A. A. & Ibrahim, A. (2018). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Kano State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(14), 135-143.
9. Dada, A. O. & Adeyemi, T. O. (2018). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 6(6), 15-24.
10. Daramola, A. O. & Ojo, S. O. (2019). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Osun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 10(16), 18-26.
11. Fashiku, C. A. & Sulaiman, A. A. (2019). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Kwara State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 11(1), 1-9.
12. Gitonga, E. M. & Mbugua, Z. K. (2021). Sustainable funding management practices and school security maintenance in public secondary schools in Nairobi County, Kenya. *Journal of Educational Research and Practice*, 12(1), 1-10.
13. Kiguru, R. G. & Waweru, J. M. (2021). Sustainable funding management practices and school security maintenance in public secondary schools in Kiambu County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 12(15), 1-10.
14. Njeru, P. N. & Orodho, J. A. (2020). The influence of sustainable funding management practices on



- school security maintenance in public secondary schools in Nakuru County, Kenya. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 11(17), 1-10.
15. Odo, J. O. & Ugwu, J. I. (2020). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in secondary schools in Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(1), 18-26.
  16. Ogunleye, A. O. & Adetunji, A. A. (2019). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 11(2), 1-9.
  17. Okoro, E. O. & Nwankwo, C. C. (2018). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Enugu State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(19), 87-93.
  18. Oladipo, S. O. & Adeyemi, T. O. (2018). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Osun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 6(2), 1-10.
  19. Olufemi, A. O. & Adeyemo, A. O. (2018). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Ondo State, Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 9(7), 1-9.
  20. Umaru, H. A. & Suleiman, A. S. (2020). Sustainable funding management practices and school security in public secondary schools in Kogi State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Educational Administration and Policy Studies*, 12(1), 1-10.