USAR Journal Of Education and Literature (USARJEL)
Homepage: https://usarpublisher.com/usarjel/
Volume1,issue 1,July,August,2025 ISSN: XXX-XXX
OPEN ACCESS

Innovative Funding Models: Exploring the Potential of Social Impact Bonds for Financing University Education in Economic Downturns in Northeast Nigeria

BY

[1]MAHMOOD, Mohammed Danjuma, [2]DANZARIA Nuhu Musa, [3]JOHN Ebenezer Oguntokun,[4]ISAAC John Ibanga

[1]Technical Education Department, School of Vocational and Technical Education, Adamawa State College of Education Hong.
[2]Department of Technology Education, Modibbo Adama University, Yola
[3]Department of Technology Education, Modibbo Adama University, Yola
[4]Department of Electrical Technology Education, Modibbo Adama University, Yola

Corresponding author: [4]ISAAC John Ibanga
DOI:

Article History

Received: 12-08-2025

Accepted: 15 -08-2025

Published: 20-08-2025

Abstract

This study examined the impact of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) as an alternative financing model for university education in Northeast Nigeria, particularly during economic downturns. A survey research design was employed. The study was guided by three research questions and two null hypotheses. The study population comprised 4,500 individuals, from which a stratified random sample of 400 respondents was selected. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire with a reliability coefficient of 0.87. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions, while ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses at a 0.05 level of significance. Findings revealed that SIBs are perceived as a viable financing model due to their potential to attract private investment and ensure accountability through performance-based funding. However, key barriers such as weak regulatory frameworks, lack of reliable data, and economic instability were identified as major challenges to implementation. The study further established that SIBs could enhance the financial sustainability of universities by diversifying funding sources, improving efficiency, and fostering public-private partnerships. Significant differences were found among lecturers, administrators, and private sector stakeholders regarding the feasibility and impact of SIBs. The study recommends strengthening legal frameworks, enhancing investor confidence, and piloting SIB programs in selected universities to assess their scalability.

Keywords: *Social Impact Bonds, Higher Education Financing, University Funding, Public-Private Partnerships, Northeast Nigeria.*

Introduction

University education is an important contributor in national development, serving as a driver of economic growth, innovation, and human capital development (World Bank, 2020). Universities are not only centers for knowledge dissemination but also hubs for research, technological advancement, and the development of a skilled workforce that fuels economic progress. A well-funded higher education system enhances productivity, reduces unemployment, and fosters social mobility, contributing to

the overall stability and prosperity of a nation (UNESCO, 2022).

However, funding constraints have remained a significant challenge in many developing countries, particularly in Nigeria. The financial burden of running universities is substantial, requiring investments in infrastructure, faculty development, research, and student support services. Despite the growing demand for higher education, public funding has failed to keep pace with the increasing enrollment rates, leading to overcrowded classrooms, deteriorating facilities, and inadequate learning resources (Olayemi & Adepoju, 2022). This persistent underfunding has weakened the ability of universities to deliver quality education and maintain global competitiveness.

The situation is aggravated during periods of economic downturn when government revenues shrink, and budgetary allocations to education become insufficient to meet the rising demand for university education. Economic recessions often force governments to prioritize urgent social needs such as healthcare and security, further reducing the proportion of national budgets allocated to higher education (Adamu & Hassan, 2021). As a result, public universities increasingly rely on alternative funding sources such as tuition fees, grants, and private-sector partnerships. However, these sources are often inadequate, leading to financial instability, delays in salary payments for academic staff, and disruptions in academic programs.

In Northeast Nigeria, where insurgency and economic instability further strain financial resources, universities face acute funding gaps that threaten the quality and accessibility of higher education (Aliyu & Mohammed, 2022). The prolonged Boko Haram insurgency has led to the destruction of educational infrastructure, displacement of students and faculty, and heightened insecurity, discouraging investment in the sector (Nwankwo, 2021). Many universities in the political zone struggle with deteriorating physical facilities, low staff morale, and insufficient research funding, all of which negatively impact learning outcomes. Additionally, economic instability in the region has reduced household incomes, making it more difficult for students to afford tuition fees and other educational expenses (Yusuf & Bala, 2020). Without sustainable funding mechanisms, universities in Northeast Nigeria risk further decline, exacerbating educational inequality and limiting opportunities for young people to acquire the skills needed for economic and social development.

Given these challenges, there is a growing interest in innovative financing mechanisms to supplement traditional government and donor funding. As public funding for higher education becomes increasingly inadequate, policymakers and educational stakeholders are seeking alternative solutions that ensure financial sustainability while maintaining accessibility and quality (Adamu & Hassan, 2021). Innovative financing mechanisms can provide much-needed capital, introduce performance-based funding models, and encourage multi-sector collaboration to address funding shortfalls in university education (Gustafsson-Wright et al., 2021).

One such model is the Social Impact Bond (SIB), a novel results-based financing mechanism that leverages private investment to fund public services, with repayments contingent on achieving pre-defined outcomes (Mulgan et al., 2021). Unlike traditional government grants or loans, SIBs operate on a pay-for-success principle, where investors provide upfront capital for social programs, and repayments are made only if specific performance benchmarks are met. This structure aligns financial incentives with social impact, ensuring that funds are used efficiently and effectively (Giacomantonio, 2017).

Social Impact Bonds have been successfully applied in various sectors, including education, healthcare, and social welfare, in countries such as the United Kingdom, Australia, and the United States. In education, SIBs have been used to fund early childhood programs, workforce training, and interventions aimed at reducing dropout rates and improving student outcomes (Gustafsson-Wright et al., 2020). For instance, the first education-focused SIB in the United States—launched in Chicago—funded early childhood education programs that demonstrated measurable improvements in kindergarten readiness and long-term academic achievement (Warner, 2019). Similarly, Australia's Newpin Social Impact Bond successfully financed early intervention services to support at-risk children and families, leading to improved educational and

social outcomes (KPMG, 2020).

While the concept remains relatively new in Nigeria, its potential for addressing educational financing gaps has yet to be fully explored. Given the persistent underfunding of higher education and the increasing demand for alternative funding sources, Social Impact Bonds could provide a sustainable solution by attracting private sector investment and ensuring accountability in education spending (Olaniyan & Lawal, 2022). However, the implementation of SIBs in Nigeria would require a supportive regulatory framework, collaboration between government and private investors, and mechanisms to accurately measure educational outcomes. Addressing these challenges could unlock new opportunities for financing university education, particularly in resource-constrained Northeast Nigeria.

Statement of the Problem

Public universities in Nigeria particularly in this Northeast struggle with inadequate infrastructure, outdated teaching resources, and poor staff remuneration, all of which negatively impact the quality of education and students' academic performance (Aliyu & Mohammed, 2022). The situation has been worsened by the Boko Haram insurgency, which has led to the destruction of educational institutions, displacement of students and lecturers, and a decline in private sector investment in higher education (Nwankwo, 2021). Despite efforts by the government and international donors to bridge the funding gap, available resources remain insufficient to meet the growing demands of university education.

The reliance on traditional government and donor funding has proven unsustainable in addressing these financial constraints, necessitating the exploration of alternative funding mechanisms. Social Impact Bonds (SIBs), a results-based financing model that attracts private sector investment into public services, have been successfully implemented in various countries to support education and social programs (Gustafsson-Wright et al., 2020). However, their potential application in financing university education in Nigeria has not been systematically examined. There is limited empirical research on the feasibility, challenges, and impact of SIBs within the Nigerian educational context, particularly in the Northeast region where economic and security challenges persist.

Without innovative financing solutions, universities in Northeast Nigeria risk further decline in quality, accessibility, and overall contribution to national development. This study, therefore, seeks to investigate the viability of Social Impact Bonds as an alternative funding model for university education in Northeast Nigeria. It aims to assess the feasibility of implementing SIBs, identify potential barriers to their adoption, and evaluate their potential impact on higher education sustainability in the region. Addressing these concerns will provide valuable insights for policymakers, educational stakeholders, and private investors interested in improving university funding mechanisms in Nigeria.

Purpose of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to explore the potential of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) as an alternative financing model for university education in Northeast Nigeria, particularly during periods of economic downturn. The study aims to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. Investigate the feasibility of using Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) for university education in Northeast Nigeria.
2. Identify potential barriers to implementing SIBs in university education in Northeast Nigeria.
3. Assess the possible impact of SIBs on the sustainability of university education in Northeast Nigeria.

Research Questions

In this context, the study will be guided by the following research questions:

1. What factors determine the feasibility of using Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) for financing university education in Northeast Nigeria?
2. What are the key barriers to implementing Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) in university education in Northeast Nigeria?
3. How can Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) impact the sustainability of university education in Northeast Nigeria?

Hypotheses

The study will test the following hypotheses:

1. There is no significant difference among the mean response of administrators, lecturers and Private sector on the factors that determine the feasibility of using SIBs for financing university education in Northeast Nigeria.
2. There is no significant difference among the mean response of administrators, lecturers and Private sector on the impact of SIBs on the sustainability of university education in Northeast Nigeria.

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopted a survey research design to explore the feasibility, barriers, and impact of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) as an alternative financing model for university education in Northeast Nigeria. This design was chosen because it allows for the systematic collection of data from a large group of stakeholders, enabling a comprehensive analysis of their perceptions regarding SIBs.

Study Area

The study was conducted in universities across Northeast Nigeria, specifically in Adamawa, Bauchi, Gombe, Taraba, and Yobe States. These states were selected due to their significant challenges in higher education financing, which are exacerbated by economic downturns and insecurity. Universities in these regions struggle with limited government funding, making them ideal for investigating alternative financing models.

Population of the Study

The population consisted of university administrators, lecturers, and private sector stakeholders involved in education financing. These groups were chosen because they directly influence funding decisions, policy formulation, and financial sustainability in higher education institutions. The total population for the study was 4,500 individuals drawn from public universities and relevant stakeholder organizations.

Sample and Sampling Technique

A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure adequate representation of different stakeholder groups by dividing the population into three key strata: lecturers, university administrators, and private sector stakeholders. From each stratum, a proportional random sample was selected, resulting in a total sample size of 400 respondents, comprising 200 lecturers engaged in university teaching and management, 120 university administrators such as vice-chancellors, bursars, and finance officers responsible for financial planning, and 80 private sector stakeholders and policymakers, including investors and government officials involved in education funding. This sampling technique ensured a balanced perspective on the feasibility and challenges of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) in university education.

Instrumentation

Data were collected using a structured questionnaire titled "Social Impact Bonds as a Financing Model for University Education in Northeast Nigeria" (SIB-UN Questionnaire). The instrument was designed on a 5-point Likert scale, with response options ranging from Strongly Agree (5 points) to Strongly Disagree (1 point).

Validity and Reliability of the Instrument

The questionnaire was subjected to expert validation by three specialists in educational finance and policy from the University of Maiduguri. Their feedback ensured the clarity, relevance, and accuracy of the items. To establish reliability, the instrument was pilot-tested on 40 respondents from a university in Northwest Nigeria that was not part of the main study. Using Cronbach's Alpha, a reliability coefficient of 0.87 was obtained, indicating a high level of internal consistency and reliability.

Method of Data Collection

Data collection was carried out through self-administered questionnaires distributed physically. Research assistants were engaged to ensure that all responses were accurately completed and returned. Respondents were given a period of two weeks to complete the survey, after which follow-ups were made to retrieve outstanding questionnaires.

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive and

inferential statistics, where mean and standard deviation were employed to answer the research questions, with a mean score of 3.50 or higher indicating agreement with the feasibility, barriers, or impact of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs), while scores below 3.50 signified disagreement. Additionally, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at a 0.05 level of significance was used to test the hypotheses, allowing for the determination of significant differences in respondents' perceptions across different stakeholder groups.

Results

Research Question 1: What factors determine the feasibility of using Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) for financing university education in Northeast Nigeria?

Table 1: Factors Determining the Feasibility of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) for Financing University Education

Interpretation of Table 1

S/N	Questionnaire Statement	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remark
1	There is a need for alternative financing models for universities in Northeast Nigeria.	4.21	0.78	Agreed
2	SIBs provide a results-based financing approach that can attract private investors.	4.05	0.81	Agreed
3	The presence of social impact investors in Nigeria makes SIBs feasible.	3.89	0.85	Agreed
4	Universities in Northeast Nigeria have the capacity to implement SIB-funded projects.	3.76	0.79	Agreed
5	Government support is essential for the feasibility of SIBs in university education.	4.32	0.74	Agreed
6	SIBs require well-defined educational outcomes to be successful.	4.15	0.80	Agreed
7	There is adequate data to measure educational outcomes for SIBs in Nigeria.	3.42	0.91	Disagreed
8	The private sector is willing to collaborate with universities in financing education through SIBs.	3.84	0.86	Agreed
9	Universities have the necessary governance structures to implement SIBs effectively.	3.68	0.82	Agreed
10	The long-term financial sustainability of SIBs makes them a viable option.	4.00	0.78	Agreed

Table 1 presents the factors determining the feasibility of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) in financing university education. The results indicate that respondents agree on most factors, with mean scores above 3.50, particularly emphasizing the need for alternative financing models ($\bar{x}$ = 4.21) and the importance of government support ($\bar{x}$ = 4.32). However, there is disagreement on whether adequate data is available to measure educational outcomes for SIBs ($\bar{x}$ = 3.42), suggesting a potential challenge in evaluating SIB effectiveness

Research Question 2: What are the key barriers to implementing Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) in university education in Northeast Nigeria?

Table 2: Barriers to Implementing Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) in University Education

S/N	Questionnaire Statement	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remark
1	Limited awareness and understanding of SIBs among university administrators.	3.95	0.85	Agreed
2	Lack of policy framework supporting SIBs in Nigeria.	4.10	0.78	Agreed
3	Difficulty in measuring educational outcomes for SIBs.	3.89	0.83	Agreed
4	Resistance to private sector involvement in education financing.	3.76	0.88	Agreed
5	High initial transaction costs for setting up SIBs.	4.25	0.79	Agreed
6	Uncertainty about investors' willingness to fund university education through SIBs.	3.92	0.84	Agreed
7	Political instability and policy inconsistency affect SIB implementation.	4.30	0.75	Agreed
8	Universities lack technical expertise to manage SIB agreements.	3.68	0.87	Agreed
9	Limited access to reliable data for evaluating SIB-funded projects.	3.55	0.89	Agreed
10	The lengthy negotiation process discourages potential stakeholders.	3.40	0.92	Disagreed

Table 2 outlines the key barriers to implementing Social Impact Bonds in university education. The results show strong agreement on barriers such as policy inconsistency ($\bar{x}$ = 4.30), high transaction costs ($\bar{x}$ = 4.25), and lack of policy framework ($\bar{x}$ = 4.10). However, respondents disagree on whether the lengthy negotiation process is a major challenge ($\bar{x}$ = 3.40), implying that while negotiations may take time, they are not seen as a critical barrier compared to financial and policy-related challenges.

Research Question 3: How can Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) impact the sustainability of university education in Northeast Nigeria?

Table 3: Impact of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) on the Sustainability of University Education

S/N	Questionnaire Statement	$\bar{x}$	SD	Remark
1	SIBs can increase financial sustainability in universities.	4.18	0.76	Agreed
2	SIBs promote accountability and efficiency in fund utilization.	4.12	0.80	Agreed
3	Universities can diversify their funding sources through SIBs.	4.05	0.84	Agreed
4	SIBs encourage long-term investments in education.	4.22	0.77	Agreed
5	The involvement of private investors enhances innovation in university funding.	3.98	0.85	Agreed
6	Universities can improve infrastructure through SIB-financed projects.	3.75	0.89	Agreed
7	SIBs provide financial stability during economic downturns.	3.90	0.82	Agreed
8	SIBs ensure that funding is linked to educational outcomes.	4.00	0.79	Agreed
9	SIBs reduce over-reliance on government subventions.	3.88	0.86	Agreed
10	SIBs can contribute to improving the employability of university graduates.	3.67	0.91	Agreed

Table 3 highlights the potential impact of SIBs on the sustainability of university education in Northeast Nigeria. The highest-rated impact is the promotion of long-term investments in education ($\bar{x}$ = 4.22), followed by increased financial sustainability in universities ($\bar{x}$ = 4.18). Respondents also agreed that SIBs can enhance accountability, fund diversification, and financial stability during economic downturns, with all mean scores above 3.50. This suggests that There is stakeholders recognize the potential of SIBs to create a sustainable higher education financing model in Nigeria.

Hypothesis 1: no significant difference among the mean responses of administrators, lecturers, and private sector stakeholders on the factors that determine the feasibility of using Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) for financing university education in Northeast Nigeria

Table 4: ANOVA Summary of Differences in Mean Responses on Factors Determining the Feasibility of SIBs

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Mean Square (MS)	F-Calculated	F-Critical (0.05)	Decision
Between Groups	12.45	2	6.23	3.89	3.02	Reject Ho
Within Groups	634.72	397	1.60			
Total	647.17	399				

Table 4 present the test of hypothesis one. The ANOVA test shows that the calculated F-value (3.89) is greater than the critical F-value (3.02) at a 0.05 significance level. Since the decision rule states that if F-calculated > F-critical, the null hypothesis should be rejected, we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that there is a significant difference among the mean responses of administrators, lecturers, and private sector stakeholders regarding the feasibility of using Social Impact Bonds for financing university education in Northeast Nigeria.

Post Hoc Test for Hypothesis 1 (Tukey HSD)

Table 5: Tukey HSD Pairwise Comparison of Stakeholder Groups on Feasibility of SIBs

Groups Compared	Mean Difference (MD)	Standard Error (SE)	p-value	Decision (0.05 level)
Administrators vs Lecturers	0.72	0.28	0.014	Significant
Administrators vs Private Sectors	1.15	0.30	0.001	Significant
Lecturers vs Private Sectors	0.43	0.29	0.098	Not Significant

The post hoc Tukey HSD test reveals significant differences in perceptions of Social Impact Bond (SIB) feasibility between administrators and both lecturers and private sector stakeholders, with administrators showing a distinct perspective on implementation challenges. However, no significant difference was found between lecturers and private sector stakeholders, indicating similar views on the feasibility of SIBs. This suggests that administrators, who manage university finances, may have deeper concerns about SIB implementation, while lecturers and private sector stakeholders might view the model more favorably based on its theoretical potential rather than practical constraints.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference among the mean responses of administrators, lecturers, and private sector stakeholders on the impact of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) on the sustainability of university education in Northeast Nigeria.

Table 6: ANOVA Summary of Differences in Mean Responses on the Impact of SIBs on University Sustainability

Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	Degrees of Freedom (df)	Mean Square (MS)	F-Calculated	F-Critical (0.05)	Decision
Between Groups	14.82	2	7.41	4.76	3.02	Reject Ho
Within Groups	617.45	397	1.56			
Total	632.27	399				

Table 6 tested hypothesis 2. The ANOVA test reveals that the calculated F-value (4.76) is greater than the critical F-value (3.02) at a 0.05 significance level. Based on the decision rule, since F-calculated > F-critical, we reject the null hypothesis, concluding that there is a significant difference among the mean responses of administrators, lecturers, and private sector stakeholders on the impact of SIBs on the sustainability of university education in Northeast Nigeria.

Post Hoc Test for Hypothesis 2

Table 7: Tukey HSD Pairwise Comparison of Stakeholder Groups on the Impact of SIBs on Sustainability

Groups Compared	Mean Difference (MD)	Standard Error (SE)	p-value	Decision (0.05 level)
Administrators vs Lecturers	0.68	0.27	0.018	Significant
Administrators vs Private Sector	1.02	0.29	0.002	Significant
Lecturers vs Private Sector	0.34	0.28	0.112	Not Significant

The post hoc Tukey HSD test indicates significant differences in perceptions of the impact of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) on university sustainability between administrators and both lecturers and private sector stakeholders, suggesting that administrators, who manage university finances, may have more reservations about SIB implementation. However, no significant difference was found between lecturers and private sector stakeholders, implying that both groups may have a more favorable or similar perspective on SIBs' potential to enhance university sustainability, likely viewing them as a viable alternative

funding source without being directly involved in financial administration.

Discission of Findings

The study revealed that Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) have the potential to serve as an alternative financing mechanism for university education in Northeast Nigeria. Respondents agreed that SIBs could help bridge funding gaps by leveraging private sector investment while ensuring accountability through performance-based outcomes. This aligns with previous research indicating that SIBs have successfully supported educational projects in various countries by providing sustainable funding models that focus on measurable results (Warner, 2020). However, the feasibility of SIBs depends on factors such as government policy support, investor interest, and the ability to establish clear and achievable performance metrics. Studies suggest that SIBs work best in environments where regulatory frameworks and financial incentives encourage private sector participation in public service funding (Gustafsson-Wright et al., 2021). Additionally, strong institutional governance is critical for ensuring transparency and accountability in the implementation of SIBs (Mulgan et al., 2022). Given the economic and security challenges in Northeast Nigeria, adapting the SIB model to local conditions will require collaboration among universities, policymakers, and financial institutions (Aliyu & Mohammed, 2023).

The study identified several barriers to implementing SIBs in university education, including limited investor confidence, inadequate legal frameworks, and the absence of reliable data for measuring performance outcomes. Previous studies have noted that one of the major challenges of SIB implementation is the reluctance of investors to finance public services in regions with economic instability and governance risks (Albertson et al., 2020). In Northeast Nigeria, persistent security concerns and fluctuating government policies may discourage long-term private sector commitments. Furthermore, effective implementation of SIBs requires a strong legal framework to outline the responsibilities of all stakeholders, including investors, government agencies, and educational institutions (Fraser et al., 2021). Without clear legal guidelines, SIB contracts may face disputes over funding disbursements and outcome evaluations. Additionally, access to reliable data is essential for assessing the impact of SIB-funded initiatives. Studies indicate that the success of SIBs is highly dependent on well-defined and measurable performance indicators (Fitzgerald et al., 2021). In Nigeria, the lack of comprehensive education sector data poses a significant challenge to structuring SIB agreements and ensuring effective monitoring and evaluation (Olayemi & Adepoju, 2021).

The findings suggest that SIBs could significantly enhance the financial sustainability of universities by diversifying funding sources and reducing reliance on government allocations. Similar studies have shown that SIBs encourage efficiency in service delivery by tying funding to specific performance outcomes, ensuring that universities meet agreed-upon educational objectives (Gustafsson-Wright et al., 2020). This model has been effective in other countries, where it has led to improved student retention, infrastructure development, and enhanced learning outcomes. However, for SIBs to contribute effectively to university sustainability, institutions must develop strategic partnerships with investors and establish mechanisms for risk-sharing and financial accountability (Mulgan et al., 2021). Research suggests that well-structured SIB agreements help universities align their financial management practices with long-term development goals (Fraser et al., 2021). In the context of Northeast Nigeria, integrating SIBs with existing educational policies and donor funding programs could enhance their effectiveness in addressing financial constraints and ensuring the long-term stability of university education (Aliyu & Mohammed, 2022).

Conclusion

This study explored the feasibility, challenges, and potential impact of Social Impact Bonds (SIBs) as an innovative financing model for university education in Northeast Nigeria. The findings indicate that SIBs have the potential to address funding gaps by leveraging private sector investment and linking financial support to measurable educational outcomes. However, several challenges, including limited investor confidence, weak legal frameworks, and inadequate data for performance

evaluation, could hinder the effective implementation of SIBs in the region. Despite these challenges, the study highlights that if properly structured, SIBs could enhance the financial sustainability of universities by diversifying funding sources, promoting efficiency, and ensuring accountability in educational service delivery.

Recommendations

.Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Universities should establish dedicated financial management units to oversee SIB implementation and ensure accountability.
2. Universities should actively collaborate with private investors, corporations, and donor agencies to attract funding through SIBs.
3. A phased approach should be adopted by implementing pilot SIB projects in a few universities to assess feasibility and refine the model.

References

Adamu, I., & Hassan, M. (2021). Education financing in Northeast Nigeria: Challenges and opportunities for reform. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Policy, 18(2)*, 45–62.

Albertson, K., Fox, C., & O'Leary, C. (2020). The Role of Social Impact Bonds in Public Service Reform. *Journal of Social Policy, 49*(4), 763-782.

Aliyu, M. S., & Mohammed, B. T. (2023). University funding in crisis: Economic downturn and higher education sustainability in Nigeria. *African Journal of Public Policy, 7(1)*, 33–51.

Aliyu, M., & Mohammed, A. (2022). Economic Challenges and Higher Education Financing in Northeast Nigeria. *African Journal of Education and Development Studies, 10*(2), 112-126.

Fitzgerald, J., Fox, C., & Mason, P. (2021). Measuring Outcomes in Social Impact Bonds: Challenges and Opportunities. *Public Administration Review, 81*(5), 745-759.

Fraser, A., Tan, S., Lagarde, M., & Mays, N. (2021). Evaluating Social Impact Bonds: Evidence from Global Case Studies. *Social Policy & Administration, 55*(3), 435-451.

Giacomantonio, C. (2017). *Understanding social impact bonds: Evidence from international case studies*. Public Administration Review, 77(6), 852–864.

Gustafsson-Wright, E., Boggild-Jones, I., Segell, D., & Durland, J. (2021). Social Impact Bonds: Opportunities and Challenges in Education Financing. *Brookings Institution Report*.

Gustafsson-Wright, E., Gardiner, S., & Putcha, V. (2020). *The potential and limitations of Social Impact Bonds in education: A global perspective*. Brookings Institution.

KPMG. (2020). *Social Impact Bonds in Australia: Lessons from the Newpin program*. KPMG Australia.

Mulgan, G., Reeder, N., Aylott, M., & Bo'sher, L. (2022). Social Impact Investment: The Role of SIBs in Public Sector Innovation. *OECD Social Investment Review, 7*(2), 215-232.

Mulgan, G., Reeder, N., Aylott, M., & Bo'sher, L. (2021). Social Impact Investment: The Role of SIBs in Public Sector Innovation. *OECD Social Investment Review, 7*(2), 215-232.

Nwankwo, C. A. (2021). The impact of insurgency on higher education in Northeast Nigeria: Challenges and policy responses. *African Journal of Educational Development, 9(3)*, 112–130.

Olaniyan, D., & Lawal, O. (2022). The future of higher education financing in Nigeria: Exploring innovative funding models. *African Journal of Education Policy, 10(1)*, 55–73.

Olayemi, T., & Adepoju, K. (2021). Higher education funding in Nigeria: The search for alternative financing mechanisms. *West African Journal of Economics and Education, 15(4)*, 99–116.

Olayemi, T., & Adepoju, K. (2022). Higher education funding in Nigeria: The search for alternative financing mechanisms. *West African Journal of Economics and Education, 15(4)*, 99–116.

UNESCO. (2022). *Education budget trends in developing economies*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

UNESCO. (2022). *Education budget trends in developing economies*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization.

Warner, M. (2019). *Pay for success: Evaluating Social Impact Bonds in education*. Journal of Public Policy and Management, 38(4), 301–318.

Warner, M. E. (2020). Private Investment in Public Services: Assessing the Feasibility of Social Impact Bonds. *Economic Development Quarterly, 34*(3),

187-202.

World Bank. (2020). *The role of higher education in economic development: A global review*. World Bank Publications.

Yusuf, M., & Bala, S. (2020). The socio-economic impact of conflict on university education in Northeast Nigeria. *Journal of African Studies and Development, 12(5)*, 78–95.