



Global Advanced Research Journal of Educational Research and Review (ISSN: 2315-5132) Vol. 2(11) pp. 203-210, November, 2013
Available online <http://garj.org/garjerr/index.htm>
Copyright © 2013 Global Advanced Research Journals

Full Length Research Paper

Value creation and Nigerian universities: a specification of leadership style and collaborative areas for national development

¹Meenyinikor JND, ²Meenyinikor KND, ³Nwokoye P, ¹Blessing ASOR

¹Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education, University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria

²Institute of Education, Uniport, Rivers State

³Library Department, University Park, Choba

⁴EDM, University of Port Harcourt

Accepted 22 November, 2013

This study seeks to specify leadership style(s) and collaborative areas of value creation for National Development. It used literature review document analysis, 3 research questions, 2 hypothesis and validated self-constructed questionnaire that was liability –tested. The 100 Nigerian conventional universities, Jamb 2012 was the population and 10, 10% sampled to cover the 6 geo-political Zone and Abuja. It discovered Democratic Leadership style and 13 collaborative areas of value creation for National Development. It concludes that the identification of acceptable leadership style and collaboration areas are vital for individual, society and national development hence recommends democratic leadership principles and special training programmes for collaboration be intensified and included in Nigeria university curricula.

Keywords: Value Creation, Leadership Styles, Collaboration Areas, National Development.

INTRODUCTION

Development is one of the desired needs of countries the world over. According to Pearson Education Ltd (2005) and Horby (2005), development in a process of position increase or growth (Physically, mentally and emotionally) in sign, amount and degree thus becoming bigger, better, stronger or more advanced. The implication of this understanding is that development could be for an individual, a group, a society or an institution. Thus, for nations, national development would cover so many areas including politically, economical social and technological ramifications. Educational and

management experts including Sheldrake (2000), Obi (2003), (Gaset (2009) and Osokoya (2010) are in agreement of the view that national development requires the effective and efficient management of available human and material resources. To the said view Economic and administration experts including Lipsey (1989) Igwe (2000), (Gbosi (2003) and Ebong (2006) also added that such involve prudent allocation and utilization of these resources that are very scarce to priority identified areas. The above points clearly to the fact that managerial leadership style and areas for collaboration are definitely needed and required to be specified in the value creation inculcated and developed individuals from universities during the process of education.

*Corresponding author Email: jndaccountability@yahoo.com

Statement of the Problem

Countries the world over require a lot of coordinated efforts by individuals, groups and organizations in the allocation and utilization of its available resources for development. In the case of Nigeria, she is well known as the most populated country in Africa with a lot of human and natural resources. The implication of the above is that Nigeria has a lot of individuals, groups and human with their leaders, values standards and technique that use the abundant human and national resources to achieve their goals and objectives. However, it is not very uncommon to read in the various media and hear in different form and newscast that there are problems of national development in Nigeria. Moreover, the numerous institutions that is available in Nigeria for natural developing including education institutions. Particularly, one of the main goals of university education is to develop and inculcate proper values for the survival of the individual and society.

Apparently, this aspect value creation as it concern national development, seems not very well addressed.

Purpose of the Study

This study therefore, shall focus mainly on value creation and Nigerian universities specification of leadership styles and possible-collaborative areas for national development.

Objective of the Study

The specific objectives of this study shall include to:

1. Identify the style(s) of leadership that will enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria.
2. Determine the level of acceptability of the identified style(s) of leadership that will enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria by the number of Nigerian universities staff.
3. Find out the possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhanced for national development in Nigeria.

Research Questions

The research questions of this study include

1. What style(s) of leadership will enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria?
2. What is the level of acceptability of the identified style(s) of leadership that will enhance the value creation for national development in Nigeria by the number of staff of Nigeria?

3. What are the possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhanced for national development in Nigeria?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses shall be tested by this study

1. There is no significant difference in opinion between the teaching and non-teaching members of staff who accepted the identified style(s) of leadership that will enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria and those who did not.
2. There is no significant difference between the teaching and the non-teaching member of Nigerian universities staff as research the possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhanced for national development in Nigeria.

Review of Related Literature

Generally speaking it is the different countries on the planet earth that make up the nations of the world. These nations have different people and things in various groups and combinations which according to Horby (2005) and Pearson Educational limited (2005) need development. National development as concept has different connotations by different professional and groups. For instance, Economists understand national development from the view point of Gross Domestic Products and per capital income as well as the balance of trade between nations, Lipsey (1989) Obasi (2000) Robert (2003) and Ebong (2006). Sociologists and Civil Servants view it from the angle of peace and harmonious relationship, Bako (2002), Asuu (2009), Anikpo (2011) and Ethel (2013). Engineers and technologists look at it from the manufacturing and construction potentials, Ajenka (2012), Unachukwu(2013) and Nwodim (2013). Business Tycoons see National development from the angle of trade connections and business extensions, Ajumogabia (2011), the Port Harcourt chamber of commerce, industry, mines and Agriculture (2013).

Management and administration experts see National development from the angle of effective and efficient utilization of available human and material resources, Koontz and Weirich (1989) Lassa (2001), Mathis and Jackson (2006) and Onyekwere (2013). Educationalists understand National Development from the point of improvement and contribution to knowledge and intellectual capability, Handson (2002) Glatthorn (2005), Fullam (2009) and Tobiri (2012).

From the above understandings of national development, there is an underlying implicative thread common to all of them and that is leadership. Briman, Desminone Porter and Guret (2006), Nnabuo Okorie,

Nwideduh and Uche (2006), Meenyinikor (2008) and Radio Link(2013) are in agreement that leadership is the position of a leader- a person who is in charge, first before, central during and last after any action(s) – who must have follower(s). The implication of leadership is that there must be collaborations between two or more individual human or legal beings.

Although Fanton (2010) Obinna (2013) and Anya (2013) dwelt mainly on collaboration with universities, the Port Harcourt chamber of commerce, industry, mines and agriculture (2013), the institute of corporate administration of Nigeria (2013) and Ajienska (2013) pointed out other-areas of partnership, merger, amalgamation, conglomeration and marriage.

However, Ade-Ajayi (2001), Adebola and Ademola (2004) and Akpama (2007) are very much concern with the sustainability of the collaboration for national development. It is very important to summarise and note very well that the federal republic of Nigeria, (2001,2004) stipulate the goals of tertiary education of which university education is the apex to include the contribution to national development through high level relevant manpower training as well as to develop and inculcate proper value for the survival of the individual and society.

It is the view of this paper that the term value is not restricted and should not be restricted to money, an amount of money or money's worth that is what money can purchase or procure, but should includes the importance, usefulness, significance, interesting quality or ideas of something or somebody real or imagined, physical or emotional and tangible or intangible. This makes the type of value under consideration in this paper to be positive, profitable, acceptable, permissible and lucrative.

On the other hand, creation connotatively is the act or process of making, designing, inventing, manufacturing, producing or arranging something new, different or additional that has not been in existence before. The above had also been the views of Sherr and Teeter (1991) UNIESCO (2002) and Etfah (2003) as well as the requirement of Akpan (2008) and Onyekwere (2012). The missing link therefore is the specification of the leadership styles and collaborative areas national development from the universities –Ivory towers.

METHODOLOGY

This study used the descriptive survey research designed. This was because the informative required for to study were all in existence and what was needed was to elicit them from the available respondents who were also on ground. The population consisted of all the convectional universities in Nigeria. According to the Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (2012), there are

100 conventional universities in Nigeria made up of 25 federally funded, 30 state-owned and 45 owned by private individuals and faith-based organizations.

The stratified random sampling technique was used for the selection of 10% of the target population having in view the number of statistical computations anticipated for the study. Thus, there were 3 each of the federal and state –owned and 4 for the privately owned. It was done in such a way and manner that all the six geopolitical zones of the nation and the federal capital territory were equally represented as shown in table 1 below.

Related literature review document analysis and interview scheduled were applied in the self construction of questionnaire which was the major instrument of the study. The questionnaire was validated by demo colleagues who are experts in research instrumentation. The validated questionnaires were tested with the test-retest reliability technique to have a reliability coefficient ratio of 0.86 before it was administered. The principal researcher employed the assistance of colleagues and trained research assistants to administer the 25 copies of the questionnaire to both the teaching and non teaching members of staff at each of the chosen universities in the sample within two weeks. At the end 486 copies were retrieved out of the total of 500, which means that there was a 97.2% rate of returns. This was made up of 246 or 98.4% and 240 or 96% for both the teaching and non teaching members of staff respectively as shown in table 2.

For the purpose of answering the research questions, descriptive statistic including sample percentages and frequencies were applied but the chi signified the students t-test inferential statistics were applied in testing the hypothesis at 5% significant level of confidence using the appropriate of freedom.

Presentation and Analysis Results

Answering Research Questions

Research Question 1

What style(s) of leadership will enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria?

Table 3 is about the style of leadership that will enhance value creation through collaborative leadership in Nigerian universities. Specifically, at shows that the democratic leadership style with the series number 4 is the accepted style because it has the highest frequency of 339 out of the total 486 that responded and scored a percentage of 69.76% which is far above the average of 50%. The other styles were not accepted because of their low frequencies and percentage scores that were not up to the 50% average scores.

Table 1 Population and Style

Particulars/variables	Conventional universities			Total
	Federal	State	Private	
Population	25	30	45	100
sample (10% of population)	3	3	4	10
S/N Geopolitical Zones				
1. North –East	=	Maiduguri	Taraba	2
2. North –West	Kano	=	=	1
3. North Central	=	Benue	=	1
4. South –East	=	=	Anambra	1
5. South - West	Lagos	=	Ibadan	2
6. South- South	Port Harcourt	Rivers	=	2
Federal capital territory	=		Abuja (Federal)	1
Total Sample	3	3	4	10

Table 2 Instrument Administration & Retrieval Returns

	Teaching staff	Non-teaching staff	Total
Sample copies			
Retrieved copies			
Retrieval Rate of Returns			

Table 3 Leadership style for value creation through collaboration

S/N	Name of Leadership style	Frequency f	Parentage %	Ranking Remarks
1.	Charismatic Leadership Style	11	2.32	3 rd NA
2.	Laissez Faire Leadership Style	2	0.43	4 th NA
3.	Autocratic Leadership Style	134	27.49	2 nd NA
4.	Democratic Leadership Style	339	69.76	1 st A
	Total	486	100%	

A = Accepted style of leadership because of the high frequency and a percentage score of over 50% average.

NA = Not accepted for low frequency and low percentage score.

Table 4 Level of acceptability of democracy for value creation and national development

Staff/frequency	Accepted: Agreed		Not Accepted: Not agreed		Σ	
	f	%	f	%	F	%
Teaching	186	76	60		246	
Non-Teaching	153	64	87	24	240	51
				36		49
Total	339	70	147	30	486	100

Level of acceptability = 70% (very high)

Research Question2

What is the level of acceptability of the identified style(s) of leadership that will enhance the value creation for national development in Nigeria by the number of staff of Nigeria?

Table 4 is about the level of acceptability of the identified style of leadership that will enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria by university members of staff. Specifically it shows that the teaching members of style have a frequency 186 or 76% for accepted and 60 or 24% not accepted. On the other

Table 5 Possible Areas for Value Creation through Collaborative Leadership

S/N	Areas for value creation through collaboration	Teaching staff N = 246 frequency %		Non –Teaching staff N = 240 frequency %		Total N = 486 frequency %	
1.	Exchange of personal & commodities	182	74	134	56	316	65
2.	Quality Output production of graduates, goods & services	236	96	233	97	469	97
3.	Efficient Resource Allocation & Utilization	228	93	209	87	437	90
4.	Management & Administration	219	98	223	93	442	91
5.	International Diplomacy & Globalization	147	60	125	52	272	56
6.	Work Ethicques, industrial Actions & Work stoppages	180	73	171	71	351	72
7.	Safety, Security & Crime Control	241	98	216	90	457	94
8.	Recording, Bookkeeping, Accounting & Accountability	233	95	230	96	463	95
9.	Procedures before & during marriage relationship including procreation & Child upbringing	138	56	192	80	330	68
10.	Religious Preaching & Modes of Worshipping God	140	57	154	64	294	61
11.	Governance, Government & Leadership aspiration	202	82	187	78	389	80
12.	Information and Communication Technology Processing & Presentation/Reposting	224	91	214	89	438	90
13.	Rewards, Awards & Promotion	239	97	228	95	467	96
	Total	2609	1061	2,516	1048	5125	1055
	Average	201	82	193	81	394	81

Table 6

Staff Frequency	Accepted: Agreed		Not Accepted: Not agreed		Σ	df	α	χ^2 value		Ho.1
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected				cal	tab	
Teaching	186	172	60	74	246	1	1.05	C 7.65	3.84	reject
Non-Teaching	153	167	87	73	240					
Total	339		147		486					

P>0.05

hand, the non-teaching staff has a frequency 153, or 64% for accepted and 87 or 36% for not accepted. Since the total (186+153) is 339 which is 70% for accepted (agreed), it is concluded that the level of acceptability of the identified style of leadership that will enhance value creation for National Development in Nigeria is 70% and is very high.

Research Question 3

What are the possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhanced for national development in Nigeria?

Table 5 in about possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhanced for National Development in Nigeria. Specifically it shows that there are 13 possible areas, each of which has the frequencies and percentage scores by both the teaching

and non-teaching members of staff of Nigerian universities. There is also a total column the teaching and the nonteaching staff as well as the combined percentage scores.

On the average, 201 or 82% of the teaching staff and 193 or 81% of the non-teaching staff which give a total of 394 or 81% of all the respondents are of the view two there 13 possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhance for national development in Nigeria.

Testing the Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference in opinion between the teaching and non-teaching members of staff who accepted the identified style(s) of leadership that will enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria and those who did not.

Table 7 Particular for Decision on Hypothesis 2

Staff	N	Σ	\bar{X}	S.D	Variance	df	α	X ² value		Ho.2
								cal	tab	
Teaching	13	1061	82	233	54289	24	0.05	0.011	2.064	Accept
Non-Teaching	13	1048	81	221	48841					
Total	26	2109	163	454	103,130					

P < 0.05

Table 6 shows the particulars inform which the decision for hypothesis 1 in based. Specifically it shows that at 0.05 significant levels with 1 degree of freedom the calculated Chi-square value of 7.65 in greater than the table value of 3.84 hence hypothesis 1 in rejected. It is therefore concluded that there is a significant difference in the opinion between the teaching and the we non-teaching members of staff who accepted the identified style of leadership enhance value creation for national development in Nigeria and those who did not.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the teaching and the non-teaching member of Nigerian universities staff as research the possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhanced for national development in Nigeria.

Table 7 supplies the particulars from which the decision for Hypothesis 2 is anchored. Specifically it shows that with 24 degree of freedom at 0.05 significant level of confidence, the calculate students t value of 0.011 is less than the table value of 2.064 hence hypothesis 2 is accepted. Therefore, it is concluded that there is no significant difference between the teaching and the non-teaching members of staff of Nigeria causative as regards the possible areas where value creation through collaborative leadership will be enhanced for national development in Nigeria.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This study has specified that the democratic leadership style will enhance value creation for national development. This specification agrees with Briman et al (2006) and Nnabuo et al (2008) that leadership is only the position of a leader whose activities ensures the collaboration of ethics and according to Lassa (2001) Mathic etal (2006) Onyelewere (2013) effectively and officially use the available human and material resources to achieve predetermined objectives. Without a leadership style that embraces the different individuals and groups in a nation Horby (2005) as well as the professionals Robert (2003). Ajinenka (2012) and Unachikwu (2013) meaningful collaboration that will lead to successes in development will be lacking. Also the study reviews a very high level of acceptability for democracy as a leadership style that will enhance economic, social –political and technological

development of the nation Buko (2002) Anikpo (2011) and Nwodim (2013).

Another important revelation of the study is the specification of possible areas for value creation so an to enhance national development. It might be agreed that these areas are not new Sheldrake (2000) Obi (2003) and Garet (2009) but according to Osokoya (2010) Faciton (2010) Ajumogobic (2011), Anya (2013), the Port Harcourt chamber of commerce industry, mines and Agriculture (2013) and the instituted of corporate administration of Nigeria (2013) they point out the areas of priority that can be just tacked using scale of preference earlier identified by Lipsey (1989). This priority or the drawing of scale of preference and channeling of resources to address is what accounts for effective and efficient management Koontz and Wechrich (1989) Fullam (2009) and Tombari (2012) hence repressible for classification of nations as developing or developed. These personalities, professional and groups are all most appropriately highly baked known and identified from the Ivory tower-universities. The federal republic of Nigeria (2004) Ajienka (2012).

CONCLUSION

All over the world and particularly in Nigeria, one of the goals of university education is to develop and inculcate proper values for the survival of the individual and the society. Value creation is therefore one of the most importance desires of every individual, human or legal, because it has to do with the outmost satisfaction of wants and sufficient provision of needs when required. This cannot be done independently and alone. The identification of a generally acceptable style of leadership that will create an atmosphere for enhanced participation as well as proper specification of appropriate areas where collaboration is mostly needed is very vital not only for the individual and society but also for national development.

RECOMMENDATION

The following recommendation and hereby made

1. Democratic principles and associated ideologies should be enhanced and enforced into all activities and

practices in the Nigeria universities since democracy in the generally accepted best style and in line with global and international best practice.

2. Special training workshops seminars, submits, and lectures for value creation through collaboration should be intensified and encouraged by the government, government agencies and the universities to cover ever those outside their institutions.

3. Special concessions in the forms of tax rebates rates reduction or outright removed of levies should be practice individuals and forms in partnerships, mergers amalgamations or agglomerations by the government to encourage value creation through collaboration in order to enhance national development.

4. Nigeria universities should annually publish their various outputs during their convocation and graduations so that the citizenry will become aware of their areas of specialization in terms of goods and service to enhance collaboration for national development.

REFERENCES

- Ade-Ajayi JF (2001). "Paths to the sustainability of Higher Education in Nigeria the Nigeria Social Scientist. 4(2): 8.
- Adebola OJ and Ademola A (2004). Quality sustenance in Nigerian Educational System: Challenges to government. Paper presented to NAEAP Conference at Jos.
- Ajienka JA (2012). The New Uniport: The making of an entrepreneurial university. Port Harcourt: Uniport- publications.
- Ajienka JA (2013). Recognizing the power of information Unique Uniport 1(3):3.
- Ajumogobia HO (2011). "The challenge of National Building: Empowerment expectation and Entitlement". Convocation lecture of the 19-23rd convocation of Rivers State University of Science and Technology, October 14.
- Akpama EG (2007). Educational reforms for sustainable development in Nigeria. Journal for Nigeria Education Philosophy 20(2) 20-27.
- Akpan O (2008). Recreating Education for National Building. A lead paper, presented at the annual National Conference of ASSEQEN held in COE, Afiha-NSip Akwa Ibom State; May 12-16.
- Anikpo M (ed) (2011). "The 2009 Asuu Strike". Issues, intrigues and challenges Ibadan: Freedom press and publishers.
- Anya AO (2013). The Idea and uses of the University in the 21st century: 29th convocation lecture. Port Harcourt: University of Port Harcourt press Ltd.
- ASUU (2009). Agreement between the Federal Government of Nigeria (FGN) and the Academic staff union of universities (ASUU) October 2009. Abuja: ASUU.
- Bako S (2002). Union, State and Crises of Higher Education. A paper presented at the 27th committee of Registrars of Nigeria. Universities meeting at Ogun State University, October 18-19.
- Briman B, Desminone L, Porter A and Garet M (2006). Designing Professional development that works. Educational Leadership 57(8): 28-33.
- Ebong JM (2006). Understanding Economics of Education. Port Harcourt: Eagle Lithograph Press.
- Effah P (2003). State of Higher Education in Ghana in Teferra, D and A Altbach P.G. (Eds). Africa Higher Education: an International Reference Handbook. Indiana: Indiana University Press. Pp 338-349.
- Ethel T (2003). Nduka tasks FG on Asuu Crisis Educational Development. Uniport weekly 15(8):2.
- Fanton JF (2010). Universities as strategic partners in National Development: A convocation lecture delivered at University Port Harcourt, Nigeria on 6 May, 2010 during the 26th convocation of the University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State.
- Fullam M (2009). Teacher Development and Educational Change. London: Falmer Press.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2001). Manual on University Management. Abuja: National Universities Commission.
- Federal republic of Nigeria (2004). National Policy on Education. Abuja: NERDC.
- Garet MS (2009). What makes. Professional Development Effective. American Edu. Res. J. 38(4):915-945.
- Gbosi AN (2003). Economics of Human Resources Development. Port Harcourt. Emihai printing and publishing co.
- Glatthorn A (2005). Quality teaching through Professional Development. California: Corwin Press.
- Handerson E (2002). The Evaluation of in-service teacher Chicago: University of Chicago Printing Press.
- Hornby AS (2001). Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary of Current English 6th Edition. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Igwe LEB (2000). Fundamental Theories, Concepts, Principles and Practice of Educational Administration. Port Harcourt: Petrup Enterprises Nig.
- Joint Admisson and Matriculation Board (2012). 2013Unified Tertiary Matriculation Brochure 2012/2013 Academic Session. Abuja: JAMB
- Koontz H and Wehrich H (1989). Management 9th Edition. New York: McGraw-Hill Bose Company.
- Lassa PN (2001). "Management of Human and Material Resources in tertiary Education in Nigeria." Being a paper presented at the workshop for Provosts of Colleges of Education in Nigeria with the theme of improving effectiveness and efficiency in the management of today's tertiary institutions held at University of Nigeria Nsuka September.
- Lipsey RG (1989). An Introduction to Positive Economics London: Weidenfold and Nicolson Ltd.
- Mathis RL and Jackson JH (2006). Human Resource Management, eleventh. Edition. London: Thomson Corporation.
- Meenyinikor JND (2008). Zaa Mesi Lead Me. Port Harcourt: Emhai Printing Publishing Co.
- Nwodim O (2013). The making of an Entrepreneurial University: Ajenka's score card et 3. Unique Uniport 1(3): 6-7.
- Obi E (2003). Educational Management and Practice. Enugu: Jamoe Enterprises (Nig).
- Obasi E (2000). The Economics of Education in Nigeria Mbaise: New Vision Publishers.
- Obinna N (2013). University –Industry Partnership: The total E and P example Uniport Weekly 1(3):17.
- Onyekwere G (2012). Value Creation as an Organizational Growth strategy. Paper presented at 3rd Quarter Management conference of the institute of cooperate administration of Nigeria Abuja.
- Onyekwere G (2013). Understanding New World of work and the emerging challenges. Keynote address at inst of corporate administration address Admin professionals summit. Gbana –Accra July,22-26.
- Osokoya IO (2010). History and Policy of Nigeria Education in World Perspective Ibadan: AMD Publishers.
- Pearson Education Ltd (2005). Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English: The Living Dictionary , 9th Edition. Lagos: Longman Nig PLC.
- Radio Link (2013). Federal Radio Network discussion centre for management development. Saturday 14. Sept- 8 -10am.
- Robert B (2003). Economic Growth in a Cross Section Countries. Quarterly J. Eco. 106(2): 407-414.
- Sheldrake J (2000). Management theory: from Taylorism to Japanization London: Thormson Learning – Business Press.
- Sherr L and Teeter D (Eds) (1991). Total Quality Management in Higher Education: New Direction for Institutional Research No.71 Sanfrancisco: Jossey-Bass.
- The Institute of Corporate Administration of Nigeria (2013). Training will enhance your Professionalism and Marketability. 2013 Q3 Newsletter pp1-4.
- The Port Harcourt Chamber of Commerce Industry, Mines and Agriculture (2013) membership Benefits Newsletter 1(6):2.
- Tombari O (2012). Education will fare Worse in 2012. The Punch

Newspaper Thursday, January 5, 7 (2004) 32.
UNESCO (2002). *Constructing Knowledge Societies: New challenges for Tertiary Education*. Washington: UNESCO.

Unachukwu E (2013). Port Harcourt Chamber of Commerce Industry Mines and Agriculture Newsletter 1(6): 1-4.