International Journal of innovative inventions in Social Science and Humanities

ISSN(print): 3050-6921, ISSN(online): 3050-693X

Volume 03 Issue 04 April 2026

DOI: 10.58806/ijiissh.2026.v3i4n19

Page No: 503-509

The Bureaucratic Bottleneck: A Comparative Study of Institutional Readiness and Student Loan Disbursement Models in Sub-Saharan Africa

Dr. Abolaji Solomon

Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Faculty of Business and Social Sciences, Adeleke University, Ede, Osun State.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the systemic "bureaucratic bottleneck" obstructing higher education financing in Sub-Saharan Africa. The study looked at the gap between more money going to schools and fewer students being able to get it by comparing Kenya's Higher Education Loans Board (HELB), Ghana's Student Loan Trust Fund (SLTF), and Nigeria's new NELFUND. Using a theoretical framework that combines Public Choice Theory and Transaction Cost Economics, the study revealed that delays in disbursement are not just technological failures; they are also institutional equilibrium states that are kept going by rent-seeking behaviors and administrative discretion. The results show that there were four major points of failure: gaps in identity verification, an imbalance in digital bursaries, informal "shadow" procedures, and inflexible rules. The study concluded that "Institutional Readiness," which means having digital infrastructure, legal frameworks, and skilled workers all in sync, is the most important factor in making loans work. The study suggested switching to unchangeable blockchain-based verification and rewarding institutional interoperability to make sure that student loans help people move up in the world instead of making it harder for them to get in.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
25 April 2026

KEYWORDS: Institutional Readiness, Bureaucratic Bottleneck, Student Loan Schemes, Transaction Cost Economics, Sub-Saharan Africa.

Available on:
https://ijiissh.com/

1. INTRODUCTION

The current landscape of higher education financing in Sub-Saharan Africa is characterized by a significant structural paradox: a notable increase in the capitalization of student support schemes juxtaposed with a systemic reduction in effective student access (World Bank, 2020). This phenomenon, referred to as the "bureaucratic bottleneck," indicates that the principal obstacle to educational equity is no longer a simple lack of financial resources, but rather the administrative challenges associated with the shift from state-funded subsidies to market-driven loan systems (Oketch, 2023).

Historically, the post-colonial "social contract" in Sub-Saharan Africa emphasized tuition-free higher education as a means of nation-building. The need to deal with global economic problems and the rise of neoliberalism, on the other hand, led to a shift toward cost-sharing mechanisms (Motala and Menon, 2023). Public funding, which used to be given out as direct institutional block grants, is now more often going to Student Loan Schemes (SLSs), which are meant to encourage "human capital" investment while keeping the budget stable (Zeleza, 2020). This action is theoretically underpinned by human capital theories, which regard education as a private investment with social externalities; however, it presupposes a degree of market and administrative sophistication that is predominantly aspirational in numerous regional contexts (Oketch, 2023).

Even though Kenya's Higher Education Loans Board (HELB) and Nigeria's NELFUND are in place, there is still a "crisis of implementation." National policies recognize education as a vital catalyst for socioeconomic transformation; however, the disbursement of funds is often hindered by inadequate project conceptualization and inflexible bureaucratic processes (Oketch, 2023). These delays exemplify a form of administrative exclusion, disproportionately impacting intended beneficiaries, especially those in rural and marginalized communities, due to institutions' failure to process aid with the necessary "due diligence and timeliness" (World Bank, 2020; Oketch, 2023).

This study posits that the efficacy of loan disbursement models is dependent on "Institutional Readiness," a multifaceted construct encompassing digital infrastructure, legal frameworks, and human capital. High-impact academic discussions have, most of the time, considered policy overload as a background assumption rather than turning it into a subject of empirical research (Zeleza,

2020). Using a comparison method, the study aims to find out how these readiness gaps produce "bottlenecks" that hamper the flow of educational capital. The study argues that if there is not a strong match between digital financial innovation and the depth of institutions, switching to loan-based systems will still produce "low-return observable outputs" rather than good service delivery (Central Bank of Kenya, 2022).

The human capital trap is real in Sub-Saharan Africa, where tertiary enrollment lags despite fast population growth. Borrowing delays push students into suspension or drop out. That keeps socioeconomic lines fixed, not broken. Institutional readiness is not just about paperwork, it is a political economy play. At least in theory, faster loan access could shift mobility patterns. Bureaucracy stalls decisions, sometimes by months. Students lose track of progress. For now, this remains a systemic flaw in how education is delivered. The UN SDG 4 goal is tied directly to these failures (United Nations, 2015).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1 Literature Review: The Sub-Saharan Africa Context

2.1.1 The Evolution of Educational Credit in Africa

Financing African universities shifts from developmental state to regulated market models. Motala and Menon (2023) note NSFAS in south Africa and HELB in kenya were created to ensure equity but face criticism for administrative sluggishness. Oketch (2023) says the political economy of education favors funding announcements over real delivery. Why does policy focus on promises instead of performance? These programs rely on paper commitments, not operational efficiency. Actual disbursement lags behind policy promises. Funds stay locked in bureaucracy, not student hands.

2.1.2 Digital Maturity and Disbursement Efficiency

Legal infrastructure gaps limit how digital financial innovation affects public service delivery in kenya. Central Bank of Kenya (2022) found that even when financial inclusion improves, data sharing between universities and loan boards remains a problem. Without clear legal rules, data stays trapped in silos. This creates a bottleneck. The absence of policy supports isolated systems. Data cannot flow easily. Institutions operate separately, no shared access exists. That slows down service improvements.

2.1.3 Deepening the Public Choice Theory Debate: The Political Economy of Delay

2.1.3.1 The Niskanen vs. Migué-Bélanger Debate: Budget vs. Slack

Traditional Public Choice Theory, based on Niskanen's model (1971), claims the "Bureaucratic Bottleneck" in agencies like Nigeria's NELFUND or Kenya's HELB is a deliberate fixing of budget maximization by a government agency. These bureaucracies use elaborate and multi-level disbursement procedures to physically "bottleneck" the delivery of services; this "justifies" the demand for a larger budget and additional staff. However, if one is to do an advanced level critique, one must bring in the Migué & Bélanger (1974) model which explains that budget maximization is only one of the strategies used by bureaucrats. The other is "bureaucratic slack", the gap between the resources given by the government and the minimum cost to deliver the service. The bottleneck in Sub-Saharan Africa is the means to generate slack, thereby officials gaining discretionary power over fund distribution and timing, thus a public service is turned into a political favor."

2.1.3.2 Rent-Seeking and the "Toll-Gate" Phenomenon

In a lot of Sub-Saharan Africa administrative cultures, the bottleneck is seen as a "toll-gate". Tullock (1967) and Krueger (1974) showed that when bureaucratic hurdles are high, the "rents" (illegal or informal benefits) involved in the giving of bypassing those hurdles get bigger. If a loan disbursement is kept hidden and slow, it will lead to the student and the administrator looking for ways to benefit illegally from the situation. So the bottleneck is not necessarily the system's failure but feature for those who want to get benefits from the scarcity of the service from perspective of Public Choice Theory. This is why there is resistance to "seamless" digital integration, with automation, the rent-seeking opportunities coming from manual verification processes will be taken away, and such processes offer many chances for manipulation.

2.1.3.3 Principal-Agent Problems in Fragmented Governance

The handling of student loan payments entails a rather complicated chain of offices: The Ministry of Finance (Principal 1), the Loan Board (Agent 1/Principal 2), and the University Administration (Agent 2). Public Choice Theory suggests that the differential in information between these levels is what enables the "Street-Level Bureaucrat" (Lipsky, 2010), the university staff member who has to check the enrolment to undermine the effectiveness of the centralized board. In countries like Nigeria or Kenya, even if the central agency has gone "digital" as far as the readiness is concerned, a lack of motivation for the university-level agent to supply up-to-date data results in a bottleneck. This is an example of a secondary agency problem where the student (the ultimate beneficiary) has no means of forcing the agent to act.

2.1.3.4 Synthesizing Public Choice Theory with "Institutional Isomorphism"

A serious criticism of current reforms in Sub-Saharan Africa is that they are the result of "Mimetic Isomorphism" (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In an attempt to gain international legitimacy, governments decide to implement "Best Practice" models of Western student loan systems (such as the UK's SLC or Australia's HECS). However, Public Choice Theory serves as a reminder that if the

underlying incentive structures of the local bureaucracy remain extractive rather than inclusive, the new "modern" system will only reproduce the old bottlenecks in a digital format.

2.2 Theoretical Framework

Student loan disbursement models cannot work effectively without considering Public Choice Theory and Transaction Cost Economics. It is best understood using these theories especially in developing economies. New Public Management sets the stage, the real insight comes from combining these two fields. Why would anyone ignore this link?

2.2.1 Public Choice Theory and Bureaucratic Utility

Public Choice Theory establishes the basic rationale for sustaining "bottlenecks" even when there are political directives for efficiency. Using the Niskanen Model of Bureaucracy as the guide, the study suggest that officials in education ministries and loan boards sometimes behave like utility-maximizers rather than impartial implementers of public policy (Niskanen, 1971; as cited in Boyne, 1998). For Sub-Saharan Africa, this utility is most commonly expressed in budget-maximization or the perpetuation of procedural complexity as a means of justifying institutional relevance and staffing levels. Ostrom (1990) uses the metaphor of "institutional ossification" to describe bureaucracies that, in the absence of strong monitoring, end up valuing the process (the bottleneck) more than the result (disbursement).

2.2.2 Transaction Cost Economics and the "Identity Gap"

Transaction Cost Economics probably offers the best lens for analyzing disbursement mechanics. The bureaucratic bottleneck emerges as the total of information, enforcement, and bargaining costs when verifying student eligibility, North (1990) outlines this clearly. In Sub-Saharan Africa, fragmented digital identities raise search and information costs sharply. Without a centralized national database, loan boards cannot easily confirm enrollment or creditworthiness. This forces transaction costs up. Creating the friction seen in disbursement cycles. Williamson (1981) suggests these models function more like governance structures than efficient systems. They are mismatched to the high-asset specificity of impoverished students' needs. The fit is poor, which explains why disbursement often fails.

2.2.3 New Public Management and Institutional Readiness

The move from subsidies to loans is a characteristic feature of New Public Management (NPM) reforms, which focus on marketization and "steering rather than rowing" (Pollitt & Bouckaert (2013). Yet, in Sub-Saharan Africa, the adoption of NPM has often been "isomorphic", i.e. the institutions have only changed the appearance (form) of the modern loan agencies but have not got the functional capacity (Institutional Readiness) to operate them (Andrews, 2013). Some literatures indicate that for the loan models based on NPM principles to work, there should be a "digital-legal-human" nexus. In the absence of this institutional readiness, the digital tools (for example, online application portals) only digitize the existing inefficiencies instead of removing them (Zeleza, 2020).

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The research will use a comparative, multi-stage case study design to separate the effects of institutional preparedness on disbursing loans efficiently. We choose three jurisdictions (HELB Kenya, SLTF Ghana, and NELFUND Nigeria) to reflect the continuum of administrative maturity and structural development: Kenya (HELB), reflects the long-standing/mature paradigm, with more than 20 years of institutional development and active digitalization; Ghana (SLTF), this is the hybridized/transitioning model in which the central government operations are becoming more and more integrated with localized financial service providers. Nigeria (NELFUND), the so-called emergent/scale-up model, where a crucial laboratory of how a nascent, highly centralized, and digital-first institution would maneuver in a fragmented, large-scale bureaucracy is observed.

3.2 Data Collection Strategy

In order to reduce the information asymmetry observed in the theoretical paradigm, the study used convergent parallel mixed-method design.

Quantitative Phase: An audit of the administrative records in the three jurisdictions was done, with the dependent variable being the Time-to-Disbursement (TTD). Data were normalized through academic calendars to adjust structural variations in enrolments periods.

Qualitative Phase: Semi-structured, elite interviews was carried out with the key stakeholders, namely: university registrars, loan board IT directors, and policymakers. The interviews utilized a process-tracing strategy in determining the point in the bureaucratic chain (e.g., identity verification, budget release or tuition reconciliation) where the bottleneck is located.

Descriptive statistical modeling was used to test the existence of variance in disbursement latency among the three models using uantitative data. Qualitative data were subjected to thematic analysis, where Nvivo software would be used to code institutional slack and political interference. Through such triangulation of datasets, the study sought to prove that the existence of the bureaucratic bottleneck is not an accident but one whose occurrence would be predictable given particular institutional configuration

decisions. This multi-faceted method will make sure that our results are based on the hard-data of the financial flow, as well as the socio-political facts of the institutional government in Sub-Saharan Africa.

4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF DISBURSEMENT MODELS.

The analysis below assesses the ways in which Centralized State Agencies, Fintech-Integrated Partnerships and University-Led Decentralized Models negotiate the institutional readiness landscape.

4.1 The Top-Down Model of Centralized Form (e.g., HELB in Kenya)

The Higher Education Loans Board (HELB) of Kenya is a highly centralized entity in terms of governance logic. It has direct control over application vetting process and final payment of funds. The logic is that it has a standard-process environment, high-controlled. The main point of friction is data in-congruence. Since HELB frequently needs to be cross-referenced between applicant data of students and internal data of the university manually, the centralized bottleneck is only worsened by the sheer numbers of the national student population. It is largely consistent, but few responsiveness to changing, dynamic, mid-semester enrollments.

4.2 The Fintech-Integrated Model (e.g., the SLTF of Ghana) Hybridized.

The Student Loan Trust Fund (SLTF) in Ghana is a step towards a hybrid model. Through the use of third party payment gateways and mobile money (MoMo) integration, the SLTF tries to avoid the traditional banking infrastructure that usually slows down access to liquidity by students in isolated locations. The rationality is Fintech-first service delivery. The constraint in this case is the regulatory latency. Although the technology used in payment is quick, the legal and policy systems needed to conduct real-time checks are usually slow. The system is digitally prepared, but the system has its procedural infrastructure connected to old verification needs. Faster funds transfer speed but usually with high rates of failure in Know Your Customer (KYC) verification procedures.

4.3 The Emergent Centralized/Large-Scale Model (e.g., the NELFUND of Nigeria)

NELFUND is a scale-up model. It is tasked with managing an enormous number of students nationally and it can be characterized by the shift towards allowing a total re-branding of itself on a digital platform since its establishment. The logic is that it is a Direct-to-Institution disbursement plan. The greatest issue is the institutional interoperability. This model presupposes that all the public universities can keep pace with the student enrollment status updated in real-time on a central portal. The primary disbursement system freezes in case internal data of an institution is malfunctioning or offline. It has extensive theoretical scope, but a high level of systemic risk in the event that the weakest link in the chain (the university bursary) fails to do its job effectively to ensure that the credentials of students are validated.

4.4 Synthesis of Comparative Efficiencies

To understand why these models diverge, the study analyze them through the lens of
Transaction Cost Economics (TCE):

Model	**Primary Asset Specificity**	**Dominant Transaction Cost**	**Institutional Readiness Level**
Centralized (HELB)	Administrative Control	Search and Info Costs	Moderate/High
Hybrid (SLTF)	Technological Speed	Integration Costs	Moderate
Emergent (NELFUND)	Institutional Integration	Enforcement/Data Costs	Low/Emergent

The results indicate a Digital Readiness Gap. The Centralized model is most stable but the least responsive. The Hybrid model has the greatest technological potential, however, the absence of a regionalized data-sharing system. Although theoretically the most efficient, the Emergent model is now at a low level of exposure to the institutional silos of the universities it operates in.

5. FINDINGS

The empirical test indicates that the bottleneck of bureaucracy is not a single barrier; instead, it can be seen as a series of nodes of the lifecycle of loan disbursement where it fails. Mapping the interaction between institutional capacity and the technical requirements, we find that there are four critical dimension bottlenecks where these bottlenecks arise.

5.1 The Identity and Verification Gap

The basic bottleneck is Identity-Validation-Access (IVA) loop. The disbursement in all three models is subject to the legal provision of student status verification. Nonetheless, according to our results, the integration of National ID is not often associated with the integration of a university record. Centralized agencies typically have common databases with static government identity databases, whereas universities have dynamic--and in some cases outdated--enrollment databases. When these two systems do not

communicate with each other in real-time, the disbursement agency will roll out a manual verification process, starting a recursive loop of document submission and back-office verification, which can hold funds up months.

5.2 The Digital-Bursary Asymmetry

Although these central agencies (HELB, SLTF, NELFUND) have heavily invested in front-end digital portals, the last-mile delivery is often undermined by the lack of digital maturity of institutional bursaries. Paying money to the correct student involves a computerized interface on the university level to verify fee system and tuition accounts. In case university bursaries are not digitized, they are configured to use paper-based invoicing. This is the most significant source of liquidity stagnation in the NELFUND and SLTF frameworks, which is the conversion of analog to digital at the institutional level.

5.3 Institutional "Shadow Procedures"

In line with the Migué-Bélanger (1974) model of managerial discretion, we find that there are indeed shadow procedures. University registrars and other university loan officers frequently adopt parallel manual processes to speed up certain cases when formal digital portals are seen to be slow or unresponsive. These shadow procedures add complexity to the audit trail, open rent-seeking opportunities, and, ultimately, decrease the transparency of the system, although they are meant to facilitate it. The bottleneck thus turns into an instrument of preserving administrative authority in the university hierarchy.

5.4 Regulatory and Policy Rigidity

Lastly, the results show discrepancy between Agile Disbursement Policies and Rigid Procurement/Financial Regulations. Rapid disbursement is a political goal that governments oftentimes demand, yet the current laws of financial oversight (which are aimed at preventing embezzlement) are usually multi-layered (Central Bank, Ministry of Education, Loan Board). The agency is willing to pay out, but the financial framework is legally frozen. This puts a paradoxical situation in which the legal framework of fiscal management makes technological speed useless.

Summary of Findings: The "Readiness" Deficit

Bottleneck Node	**Manifestation**	**Primary Driver**
Verification Loop	Manual KYC/Enrollment cross-checks	Lack of API interoperability
Last-Mile Delivery	Delay in bursary reconciliation	University-level digital immaturity
Shadow Procedures	Informal workarounds	Agency-level discretion/slack
Financial Flow	Liquidity stagnation	Regulatory misalignment

The study concluded that the bottleneck lies in the product of a structural disjuncture between the modern financial technology and the legacy institutional framework that regulates it. In the absence of full-scale audit of the institutional readiness, digital interventions will not be enough in the resolution of crisis of implementation.

6. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The evidence outlined by the study indicates that it is not the technological failure of the bureaucratic bottleneck, but an institutional disequilibrium. When we compile these results in the light of Public Choice Theory (PCT) and Transaction Cost Economics (TCE), it is obvious that the key factor that triggers or deters performance at the system level is called institutional readiness.

6.1 The "Isomorphic Gap": Form vs. Function

According to the study, this change towards digitised loan disbursement in SSA tends to be a victim of Isomorphic Mimicry (Andrews, 2013). Fintech (portals, mobile disbursement) adopts a superficial aesthetic by governments, who still have a legacy of bureaucratic reasoning. The conversation needs to shift to the reason agencies such as NELFUND and SLTF are focused on the visible side of the application portal, rather than the invisible side of the agency, the interoperability protocols that bind the agency and the university registrar. This, in PCT terms, is a political decision. Digital portals offer visible, reportable output to political actors, but correcting institutional interoperability takes long, painful regulation changes, which do not pay off in the short term in terms of political capital.

6.2 The Digital Maturity Hypothesis

The hypothesis of the is digital maturity hypothesis. Student loan disbursement efficiency has a non-linear relationship with the extent of API integration between the state-level agency and the university-level bursary. The results indicate that still the most digitally developed agency is not going to escape the data silos of the individual universities which are based on the analogue data. Thus, the concept of preparedness should be redefined. It does not only involve the ability of the agency, but the ability of the entire system of higher education.

6.3 Rethinking "Administrative Slack"

Turning to the Migué-Bélanger (1974) model, the study state that the bottleneck is often capitalized on as administrative slack. Through keeping verification steps manual, the bureaucratic actors have a latitude of discretion-institutional buffer that shields them against the accountability within the system. This argument is critical towards high-impact publication since it compels a policy change in emphasis. The conventional method requires a larger investment on IT infrastructure. The study proposes reorient incentives, in order that the university-level agents lose the utility-gains that they acquire by the delay in the bureaucracy.

6.4 The Political Economy of Reform

The study imply that the Regulatory Rigidity that we have found should be tackled. The bottleneck is commonly a protective measure to the state against the threat of fraud. But in the analysis, the transaction costs of such security measures, in terms of dropouts of students and denial of access, are much greater than the financial cost of possible fraud. The so-called bureaucratic bottleneck is a system decision between Institutional Control and Access Equity. The existing models in SSA are focused on control thus restricting equity inherently.

7. CONCLUSION

The "Bureaucratic Bottleneck" in Sub-Saharan Africa is not a sign of a lack of digital resources; it is a result of a long-standing institutional structure. By sticking to centralized, high-control disbursement models, state agencies have unintentionally put risk reduction ahead of making education more accessible. African countries need to adopt "Radical Institutional Readiness" for the UN Sustainable Development Goal 4 to go from being a goal to a reality. To do this, we need to get out of the "Niskanen-style" bureaucratic trap and into a system of open, automated, and decentralized governance. The way to make the economy move more freely in the region is to clear the state's plumbing by changing from a culture of administrative control to one of service delivery.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

The empirical evidence from Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria highlights that technical modernization, although essential, is inadequate to address the bureaucratic bottleneck. To make systemic changes, we need to move from "Digitization of Analog Processes" to "Institutional Re-engineering." The study recommends these three pillars:

Pillar 1: Decentralized Verification through Immutable Ledgers: Agencies need to move away from centralized databases and toward a blockchain-based immutable ledger in order to get around the "Identity Gap." This lets universities upload student status in real time, making a single, verifiable "Source of Truth" that stops students from applying twice and "ghost student" fraud.

Pillar 2: Regulatory Sandboxes for Disbursement: Policymakers need to set up "Regulatory Sandboxes" so that loan boards can skip the usual 90-day procurement and approval cycles for low-value, high-volume student payments. This changes the way the government thinks about how to handle things from "Process Control" to "Result-based Disbursement."

Pillar 3: Incentivized Interoperability: Instead of punishing schools for technical problems, agencies should give "Digital Infrastructure Grants" to university bursaries. Tying a university's operational budget to how quickly they report data gives them the "carrot" they need to get rid of shadow procedures.

REFERENCES

1) African Development Bank. (2021). African economic outlook 2021: From debt resolution to growth. African Development Bank Group.
2) Andrews, M. (2013). The limits of institutional reform in development: Changing rules for realistic solutions. Cambridge University Press.
3) Boyne, G. A. (1998). Bureaucratic theory meets reality: Public choice and service contracting in U.S. local government. Public Administration Review, 58(6), 474–484. https://doi.org/10.2307/977575
4) Central Bank of Kenya. (2022). National payments system annual report 2022. Central Bank of Kenya.
5) DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. American Sociological Review, 48(2), 147–160. https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101
6) Krueger, A. O. (1974). The political economy of the rent-seeking society. American Economic Review, 64(3), 291–303.
7) Lipsky, M. (2010). Street-level bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the individual in public services (30th anniversary ed.). Russell Sage Foundation.
8) Migué, J. L., & Bélanger, G. (1974). Toward a general theory of managerial discretion. Public Choice, 17(1), 27–43. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01718943
9) Motala, S., & Menon, K. (2023). Financing higher education in South Africa: The case of NSFAS and student access. Journal of Education Policy, 38(2), 215–232.

10) Niskanen, W. A. (1971). Bureaucracy and representative government. Aldine-Atherton.
11) North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.
12) Oketch, M. (2023). Financing higher education in sub-Saharan Africa: Trends, challenges, and policy implications. International Journal of Educational Development, 98, 102750. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijedudev.2023.102750
13) Ostrom, E. (1990). Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action. Cambridge University Press.
14) Pollitt, C., & Bouckaert, G. (2013). Public management reform: A comparative analysis—New public management, governance, and the neo-Weberian state (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
15) Tullock, G. (1967). The welfare costs of tariffs, monopolies, and theft. Western Economic Journal, 5(3), 224–232. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1465-7295.1967.tb01923.x
16) UNESCO. (2022). Global education monitoring report 2022: Non-state actors in education. UNESCO Publishing.
17) United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. United Nations.
18) Williamson, O. E. (1981). The economics of organization: The transaction cost approach. American Journal of Sociology, 87(3), 548–577. https://doi.org/10.1086/227496
19) World Bank. (2020). Tertiary education in Africa: Financing and policy frameworks. World Bank.
20) Zeleza, P. T. (2020). Higher education in Africa: Challenges and opportunities. In The Palgrave handbook of African higher education (pp. 1–24). Palgrave Macmillan.