

Deregulation of Education Services: an Enabling Tool in Enhancing Quality Assurance in Universities in Nigeria

Basake Julius Alochere^{1*}, Betiang, Peter A², Kevin Johnson Wandira³, Adie Joy⁴, Othman Ngwali Haji⁵

^{1,2}College of Education Open and Distance Learning Kampala International University Uganda.
Julius.basake@kiu.ac.ug peter.betiange@kiu.ac.ug 0000-0001-9465-9022 0000-0001-98733-533

³International University of East Africa Kampala Uganda

⁴Faculty of Education, University of Calabar, Nigeria.

⁵Tanzania Zanzibar, P O Box: 1462, haji.othman@studmc.kiu.ac.ug

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the influence of the Deregulation of Education Services on Quality Assurance in Federal and State Universities in South-South, Nigeria. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The study population was 824 academic administrators concerned with administrative services in Federal and State Universities in South-South Nigeria. There was no sampling, the census technique was employed (the whole population was used because the population was manageable). The instrument for data collection was researcher researcher-developed questionnaire titled "Deregulation of Educational Services and an Enabling Tool for Quality Assurance Questionnaire" (DESETQAQ). The instrument was validated by three experts, one in Measurement and Evaluation from Science Education and two from the Educational Foundations Department, all in Kampala International University Uganda. The reliability coefficient of the instrument is 0.822. Statistical mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while the hypotheses were tested using a t-test at 0.05 alpha level of significance with the help of SPSS. The study found among others that: deregulation of the provision of educational services negatively influences the quality of staff but does not negatively influence the provision of teaching facilities in Federal and State universities in South-South, Nigeria while the hypotheses revealed that there were significant differences in the opinions of the respondents on how deregulation educational services influence the quality of staff and provision of teaching facilities in Federal and State universities in South-South Nigeria. Based on the study's findings, the researcher recommended that Federal and State Governments in the South-South Zone of Nigeria should only support but not interfere in the recruitment of staff and consolidate the provision of teaching facilities for quality assurance. \

Keywords: Deregulation, Education Services, Quality Assurance, University

Introduction,

Education is in most cases believed to be the arc architect of development. This means the state has a responsibility to educate or help its citizens to be educated for their development, thereby making education a right of the citizens. In orders words, any state that fails on this responsibility is opposed to this right.

Higher education in Nigeria started with the establishment of the Yaba High College in 1932 aced with its unique challenges ranging from prolong the duration of the programme to reconginiation of her certificates aside the shores of Nigeria. With the need for higher level manpower, the University College in Ibadan was established in 1948 as a campus of the University of London. With the setting of the Ashby and Harrison Commissions in 1959 and 1960 respectively to examine the manpower needs of the country, and their recommendations that the country needed both intermediate and higher level manpower, more universities were established.

The management and financing of Primary and secondary schools in Nigeria were initially left to the whims and caprices of the various religious bodies by the Colonial Government. It was not until 1925 that the Colonial Government showed concrete interest in the development of education in Nigeria when the Education Ordinance was enacted (Fafunwa 2004 as cited in Chukwuka, 2019).

Furthermore, at the tertiary level, Fafunwa noted that the colonial government also showed interest in providing higher education for Nigerians with the setting up of Phelps Stroke Commission. According to him, January 1934 marked the official commissioning of the first tertiary educational institution by Sir Donald Cameron. This was followed by the Elliot's Commission, specially set up for higher education. This effort gave birth to the University College Ibadan in 1948 and accordingly, the tempo for government's involvement in the control and funding of education increased from there. After independence, University education continued to be on the exclusive legislative list, but after the Civil War of 1967 1070 to. The military government in order to return confidence on citizens announced the complete takeover of schools from the missions and other bodies thereby making the government the sole financer of the educational system (Fafunwa, 2004).

Prior to the take-over of schools from their respective proprietors in the 1970s, education was owned and managed by various agencies; regional and state governments, local authorities, voluntary agencies and private proprietors as earlier noted. Most of these private, community and voluntary agency schools were indeed famous, competing favourably with the few ones owned and controlled by government. With the takeover of these schools, Nigeria's education system became over-centralised and characterised by unnecessary bureaucracy as contained in the National Policy on Education (FRN, 2013).

Unfortunately, in administration, there is a difference between policy formulation and implementation, and so the document could not provide the needed magic that could completely turn around the fortunes of the nation's education. Consequently, the education system was marked with overcrowded student hostels; classrooms without desks and seats for students, libraries and laboratories without necessary equipment or infrastructure; dilapidated buildings and absence of meaningful staff development programmes coupled with the short supply of qualified staff and ill-equipped products that could not favourably compete with their counterparts from other countries (Ejiogu, 2013). With this type of ugly picture, coupled with the Nigerians' system of education, it was no longer worthwhile for the government to have a monopoly on the education system. In furtherance of this, the government thought it wise to withdraw its monopoly and in turn decentralise the education sector. In the bid to carry out this decision, the policy of deregulation was introduced.

The term deregulation simply put, means removal of control. It also implies divestment of monopolistic control over a system or an institution allowing the participation of corporate, non-corporate, governmental and non-governmental bodies. In strict economic parlance, the Hornby (2008) defined deregulation as the process by which government removes selected regulations on business in order to encourage the efficient operation of markets. Aja (2011) simply viewed deregulation as giving access to the general public to operate maximally in the economic areas formally monopolised by the government. In this light, Babarinde and Farayola (2018) posit that, deregulation can be seen as a policy thrust of economic restructuring based on the Washington consensus which expresses faith in the efficiency of markets, that states are unnecessary, that privatization, deregulation and open capital market promotes economic development, and that government should not do more than balance budgets and fight inflation.

Deregulating the educational system also implies making the education sector autonomous, and free from unnecessary interference by the government. By this fact, groups or individual is free to enter into the business of providing education to the citizens. Among other reasons behind this lofty idea is to ensure quality assurance (Archibong, 2013).

Quality assurance involves a systematic procedure of ensuring that education meets the specified conditions requisite to the actualisation of its goals (Agwu and Nwite 2019). Egwu, Basake, Mbah and Emesini (2020) also supported this view as they maintained that quality assurance entails the quality of teaching personnel, quality of available instructional/teaching materials, equipment and facility, school environment and pupils, and quality education delivery. It embraces all functions and activities that will ensure that quality is maintained in the university system. Articulating this view, the Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN 2014) stated that, in recent years, there has been a considerable international interest in establishing ways of monitoring the quality of education in schools. Much of this has focused on the need to shift the emphasis of school inspection away from the physical enumeration of school facilities to the assessment of teaching and learning processes.

This is because the essence of specifying Minimum Academic Standards at any level of education is to enhance quality. From the foregoing, if quality assurance must be enforced in the university educational system in Nigeria (Federal and State Universities), the quality of staff is paramount. This is predicated on the fact that the teaching staff, for instance, are the pivotal point on which the wheel of the system revolves. The academics are the ones saddled with the responsibility of transforming the learners because as the adage goes, 'no one can give what he/she does not have'. Supporting this, the Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2013:26) recognised that "no education system may rise above the quality of its teachers". Besides qualification, the staff strength must be increased to match the population of the students' enrolment. Constant retraining of staff is also a good practice for improvement in the quality of education.

On the other hand, there might be enough qualified teachers to match students' enrolment, but if there are not enough facilities, the lecturers will be incapacitated. Qualified lecturers in the school system are tutorial personnel with the responsibility of transferring knowledge to the learners (Chukwuma, 2019). To ensure quality in the educational sector, teaching and learning facilities must be adequately available. A facility as used here refers to the physical and spatial enablers of teaching and learning. They include classrooms, libraries, laboratories, workshops, playfield, hostels, staff offices, text books, projectors, flannel board, computers and others (UBE cited in Orji, 2021). Both the teachers and students need current text books to carry out research, do assignment and have current information in their various fields. Library provision is needed to supplement teachers' efforts and make it easier for learners to do assignments and research. Also included in this list are well-ventilated and spacious classrooms and theatres. Projectors, computers, and flannel boards are sine qua non in this ICT era. The teacher as well as student need a computer for browsing and typing of materials. Students need desks to sit on to receive lectures and write examinations. Wonah, (2012) averred that just as enough textbooks, and buildings are essential requirements for learning to take place, so also are desks, chairs and tables because without them, the learner and the staff will not be comfortable in class.

In other words, a university education offers people specialized education, making them experts in their respective fields (Basake, 2019). The only medium open to them to do or achieve this is strict compliance with quality assurance indicators as laid down by the various regulatory bodies mandated to do this. For instance, Okojie (2010:101) stated that “the National Universities Commission is a regulatory agency for university education in Nigeria which has the mission of ensuring the orderly development of a well-coordinated and productive university system that will guarantee quality and relevant education for national development and global competitiveness”. Unfortunately, researcher’s observation shows that most of the universities do not have adequate qualified staff, with dilapidated buildings scattered everywhere in our university campuses, infrastructural facilities are in short supply, admission processes are shrouded in secrecy with many candidates each year not being able to secure admission. The stake-holders in university education as well as parents and employers are complaining about the employability of graduates from the university system whom they alleged that they may not defend their certificates.

In recent time, there has been public outcry about the seeming decline in standard of university education which was alluded to inadequate qualified staff, dearth of teaching facilities, dilapidated buildings, moral decay and incessant strikes due to assumed poor funding of the Nigeria university education system. It is alleged that recruitment of staff in the universities is mostly influenced by political patronage, corruption, favouritism, tribalism, religion, nepotism, godfathers and others which could bring about the recruitment of unqualified staff; these factors negate the quality of education at this high citadel of learning.

It is believed that the number of students demanding for university education in Nigeria has been on the increase every year and the available facilities in the universities can no longer meet this demand to guarantee quality instructional delivery. The researcher observed that in most universities in the South-South of Nigeria, the lecture halls are overcrowded with majority of the students standing in the corridors during lectures. Besides, the libraries are stocked with obsolete textbooks, journals and serials. This attests to the current Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) and other unions’ call for proper funding to revitalise Nigerian universities.

In addition, it was also speculated that the requirement for admission of students is influenced, as those who are on the government list and those who paid concessional fees are given admission to study professional courses like medicine, law and other related courses. This may lead to admitting less qualified students which could result to the production of half-baked graduates in the country. On the other hand, government agencies that are supposed to ensure quality assurance in the university sector seem to be complacent.

This scenario has reached a worrisome state to the extent that general public was in doubt on the need for the deregulation of education vis-à-vis university education in Nigeria. This gave the researcher the impetus to study to find out whether deregulation of educational services influences quality assurance in the Nigerian university education system.

Research Questions

The following research questions have been raised to guide the study

1. What is the influence of deregulation of the provision of education services on the recruitment of quality staff in federal and state universities in Nigeria?
2. What is the influence of the deregulation of provision of education services on the provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in Nigeria?

Hypotheses

The following null hypotheses have been formulated for the study and were tested at a 0.05 level of significance.

- H0₁:** There is no significant difference between mean ratings of Federal and state Universities Academic Administrators on the influence of deregulation of the provision of education services on recruitment of quality staff in universities in Nigeria
- H0₂:** There is no significant difference between mean ratings of Federal and state Universities Academic Administrators on the influence of deregulation of provision of education services on provision of teaching facilities in universities in Nigeria.

Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey design is the plan of study which enables the researcher to collect data from a well-defined population and systematically select segments of the population in order to determine the attributes of the population. The study was carried out in the South-South of Nigeria. The zone comprises of six states namely Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Cross River, Edo, Delta and Rivers. The region known as Niger Delta is known for its rich oil deposit. They also have a vested interest in all levels of education. That is why each state in the zone owns one or more state and federal universities plus numerous polytechnics, colleges of Agriculture, education, health and others. The population of this study comprises 824 academic administrators who are concerned with administrative services in Federal and State Universities in South-South Nigeria. These units are: Directors of Planning Units, Director of Quality Assurance, Deans of facilities, Heads of Departments. The sample size for this study comprised all the eight hundred and twenty four (824) academic administrators who are concerned with administrative services in Federal and State Universities in South-South Nigeria. The entire population was used for the study as the population is considered handy. Therefore, there was no sampling. The instrument for data collection was researcher researcher-developed questionnaire titled “Deregulation

of Educational Services and Quality Assurance Enhancer Questionnaire” (DESAQAEQ). The structured questionnaire was based on four (4) a points rating scale of Highly Influenced (HI), Influenced (I), Not Influenced (NI), and Highly Not Influenced (HNI) with their nominal values attached as 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. The instrument was validated by three (3) experts: two in the Department of Educational Foundations and one in Measurement and Evaluation from the Department of Science Education; all from the Faculty of Education, Kampala International University, Uganda i. To ascertain the internal consistency of the instrument Cronbach Alpha technique was used for its analysis. These gave an overall reliability score as 0.822. The result indicated that the instrument was reliable and therefore considered appropriate for use (Uzoagulu, 2011). In answering the research questions, mean and standard deviation while t-test was used to test the null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance).

Findings and Results

Research Question One: What is the influence of deregulation of provision of education on recruitment of quality staff in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria?

The data collected with items 1-6 of the instrument were used to answer the above stated research question. Data were analyzed using mean and standard deviation. Summary of result is presented in table 1.

Table 1: Mean Rating of the Respondents on the influence of deregulation of provision of education services on recruitment of quality staff in federal and state universities in South-South

S/N	ITEMS	FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES N=425			STATE UNIVERSITIES N=364			DECISION
		X	SD	DECISION	X	SD	DECISION	
1.	Most universities employ unqualified lecturers without regards for quality assurance benchmark	2.60	0.49	Influenced	2.99	0.63	Influenced	
2.	Number of lecturers in federal universities are inadequate as against quality assurance benchmark	2.61	0.48	Influenced	3.00	0.01	Influenced	
3.	Most universities depend so much on contract lecturers which can impede quality assurance	2.40	0.49	Not Influenced	3.20	0.40	Influenced	
4.	Government does not sponsor the training of lecturers from universities to ensure quality assurance	2.63	0.52	Influenced	3.60	0.48	Influenced	
5.	Deregulation has led to brain-drain in the university system, this affects quality assurance practices negatively.	3.00	0.04	Influenced	3.39	0.48	Influenced	
6.	Staff mix in universities in South-South do not meet NUC minimum standard	2.63	0.51	Influenced	3.60	0.48	Influenced	
	Grand Mean	2.64	0.42	Influenced	3.29	0.30	Influenced	

From the data presented in table 1 above, all the academic administrators of Federal and State Universities that responded to the questionnaire items agreed that deregulation of provision of educational services influence the quality of staff in Federal and State Universities in South-South, Nigeria. Based on the items 1, 2, 4, 5 and 6. This shows that deregulation has led to employment of unqualified lecturers without regards for quality assurance benchmark, number of lecturers not being adequate as against quality assurance benchmark, lack of sponsorship for training of lecturers from universities to ensure quality assurance, that deregulation led to brain-drain in the university system and also indicating that staff mix in universities in South-South is not appropriate this affects quality assurance practices negatively. But in item 3 the respondents disagreed indicating that their universities do not depend so much on contract lecturers which can help to ensure quality in the university education system.

Research Question Two: What is the influence of deregulation of provision of education services on the provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria?

Data collected with items 7-12 of the instrument were also analyzed using mean and standard deviation. A summary of the results is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Mean Rating of the Respondents on the influence of deregulation of provision of education services on provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria

S/N	ITEMS	FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES N=425			STATE UNIVERSITIES N=364		
		X	SD	DECISION	X	SD	DECISION
7.	Facilities in federal universities are better than those in state universities thereby endangering quality assurance	3.38	0.49	Influenced	2.60	0.48	Influenced
8.	Facilities provided in both universities are not adequate for improving quality assurance of the school	2.59	0.49	Influenced	1.60	0.48	Not Influenced
9.	Facilities provided make teaching/learning more practical to enhance quality assurance practices	3.21	0.96	Influenced	3.00	0.00	Influenced
10.	Sport is a necessary ingredients for students' academic achievement	2.61	0.49	Influenced	2.79	0.74	Influenced
11.	Provision of library facilities are adequate in state universities	1.59	0.49	Not Influenced	1.39	0.48	Not Influenced
12.	Health facilities in federal universities are better than those in state universities	1.06	0.41	Not Influenced	3.60	0.48	Influenced
Grand Mean		2.40	0.55	Not Influence	2.49	0.44	Not Influenced

From the data shown in table 2 above, academic administrators of Federal and State Universities agreed deregulation of provision of educational services do not influence the provision of teaching facilities in Federal and State Universities in South-South. Thus, items 7, 8, 9, and 10 with mean scores of: 3.38, 2.59, 3.21 and 2.61 were above the criterion point of 2.5 but items 11 and 12 had mean scores with mean scores of 1.59 and 1.06 respectively were below. This implies that deregulation of educational services in the provision of teaching facilities is better in federal universities but not adequate in both universities to enhance practical classes and sports. The means value for items 11 and 12 which are between 1.06 and 1.59 indicated that the provision of library facilities in State Universities is not adequate while the provision of health facilities is not adequate in both Federal and State Universities in the South against the quality assurance benchmark.

Hypothesis 1

H₀₁: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of academic administrators of federal and state universities on the extent of the influence of deregulation of the provision of educational services on the quality of staff in the Universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Data collected from items 1-6 in Section B of the research instrument were used to test this hypothesis 1. A summary of the results of the data analysis is presented in Table 3:

Table 3: t-test of difference in the mean responses of academic administrators of federal and state universities on extent of the influence of deregulation of the provision of educational services on the quality of staff in the Universities in South-South.

S/N	Category of Respondents	Uni	N	Mean	SD	t-	df	Alpha	P.V	Decision
1	Federal Universities		425	2.60	0.49	9.70	787	0.05	0.03	Significant
	State Universities		364	2.99	0.63					
2	Federal Universities		425	2.61	0.48	15.02	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities		364	3.00	0.00					
3	Federal Universities		425	2.40	0.49	24.41	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities		364	3.20	0.40					
4	Federal Universities		425	2.63	0.52	26.86	787	0.05	0.32	Significant
	State Universities		364	3.60	0.48					

5	Federal Universities	425	3.00	0.04	-16.4	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.39	0.48					
6	Federal Universities	425	2.63	0.51	-26.8	787	0.05	0.39	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
Average					119.19			0.12	Significant

The result in Table 3 revealed that the t- t-t-value of 119.19 is greater than the p-value of 0.12 of Academic Administrators in Federal and State Universities in South-South Nigeria. Hence H_{01} is rejected. This means that Academic Administrators from Federal and State Universities did not agree; hence there is a significant difference in the mean ratings of academic administrators of federal and state universities on the extent of the influence of deregulation of the provision of educational services on the quality of staff in the Universities in South-South.

Hypothesis 2

H₀₂: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of academic administrators of federal and state universities on the extent of influence of deregulation of the provision of educational services on the provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria.

Data collected from items 7-12 in Section B of the research instrument were used to test this hypothesis 2. A summary of the results is shown in Table 4.

Table 4:t-test of difference in the Mean Responses of academic administrators of federal and state universities on the extent of influence of deregulation of the provision of educational services on the provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria

S/N	Category of Respondents	Uni	N	Mean	SD	T	df	Alpha	P.V	Decision
7	Federal Universities		425	3.38	0.49	22.17	787	0.05	0.66	Significant
	State Universities		364	2.60	0.48					
8	Federal Universities		425	2.59	0.49	28.18	787	0.05	0.38	Significant
	State Universities		364	1.60	0.48					
9	Federal Universities		425	3.21	0.96	4.17	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities		364	3.00	0.00					
10	Federal Universities		425	2.61	0.49	4.16	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities		364	2.79	0.74					
11	Federal Universities		425	1.59	0.49	5.77	787	0.05	0.69	Significant
	State Universities		364	1.39	0.48					
12	Federal Universities		425	106	0.41	77.69	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities		364	3.60	0.48					
Average						23.69			1.28	Significant

The result of the **t-test** on Table 4 indicated that the t- value of 23.69 is greater than P-value of 1.28. Hence H_{02} is rejected. The implication is that the Federal and State Universities did not agree on the extent of influence of the deregulation of the provision of educational services on the provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in the South.

Major Findings

Based on the results of data analysis as presented above, the study revealed that:

1. Deregulation of the provision of educational services influence the quality of staff in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria negatively.
2. Deregulation of the provision of educational services do not influence provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria

Discussion

From the data presented in research question one above, the academic administrators of Federal and State Universities that responded to the questionnaire items agreed to a high extent do deregulation influences the provision of educational services on the quality of staff in Federal and State Universities in South-South, Nigeria. This is evident in the fact that not all the items in the cluster could meet up with the cut-off point while most of the items did meet up with the cut-off point. The respondents' opinions show that deregulation has led to employment of unqualified lecturers without regard for quality assurance promotion, number of lecturers not being adequate as against the quality assurance benchmark, lack of sponsorship for training of lecturers from universities to ensure quality assurance, that deregulation led to brain-drain in the university system and also indicating that staff strength in universities in South-South is negligible this vehemently affects quality assurance practices negatively. This finding showed that quality has been compromised by the implementers of deregulation as a policy. Lecturers are the engine room for quality assurance to be guaranteed. They

provide the road map for effective implementation of the school curriculum. Unqualified staff should not be employed in the institutions. While the result of hypothesis revealed that there was a significant difference between the mean ratings of academic administrators of federal and state universities on extent of the influence of deregulation of the provision of educational services on the quality of staff in the Universities in South-South, Nigeria. This difference in opinion emanates from the fact that since the introduction of the policy, budgetary allocation to the sector has continued to dwindle. The statutory 26% as recommended by the United Nations has not been met. The implication of this is that the budgetary allocation to public universities is always below their carrying capacity. Academic staff strength therefore is grossly inadequate as university authorities cannot employ new ones. The resultant effect of this is that the NUC's position on lecturers-student ratios is not always adhered to. This is not healthy for both the students and the lecturers in terms of enhancing the quality of assessment.

In support of this, Okuwa (2015) writes that recruitment of new lecturers is one of the problems bedevilling the university system in Nigeria. This development cannot guarantee quality in the system if something urgent is not done about it. While Archibong's (2013) supported this by asserting that deregulation of provision of educational services is a bane rather than a boon to the university system in Nigeria especially regarding the quality of academic staff? Deregulation of the provision of educational services has caused a shortage in the number of qualified academic staff as a result of lack of adequate incentive. Brain drain, causes shortage of staff in the system (Archibong's 2013). This situation is counter-productive as it impedes also on the quality of teaching and the quality of products. In agreement with Osaat (2009) who observed that the academic staff strength in Nigerian universities are grossly inadequate and blamed this on deregulation of provision of educational services because since the introduction of the policy government is no longer taking care of the system adequately in terms of funding.

Research question two revealed that deregulation has a low influence on the provision of educational services on provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in the South. Both Federal and State Universities agreed that facilities make teaching/learning more practical to enhance quality assurance practices and that sport is a necessary ingredients for students' academic achievement but deregulation of educational services affects the quality of facilities in both federal and state universities in the area under study such as lack of functional libraries, inadequate health facilities and other necessary facilities that can enhance effective teaching and learning while the hypothesis revealed that there is significant difference between the mean ratings of academic administrators of federal and state universities on the extent of influence of deregulation of provision of educational services on provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South-South, Nigeria.

In support of the findings, Osiobe (2011) states that accreditation helps in enforcing the provision of necessary facilities in the university system. Facilities, when adequately provided makes teaching and learning easier and more concrete to students' understanding. But as important as facilities are in teaching-learning situation most public and private universities lack it. This situation is not good for the university system; let alone ensuring quality in the system. The researcher is not surprised because this finding corroborates Eworo's (2004) writing that a careful look at our educational institutions indicates both infrastructural and classroom facilities are generally lacking. The finding of this study if not properly addressed will be counter-productive to the development of university education in Nigeria especially with regard to quality assurance, judging from the all-important role education plays in the development of any nation. Facilities are the most potent force that drives the fortune of the education sector aright. This is why it is one of the conditions in which the accreditation of programmes is based. Without good facilities for teaching and learning, programmes will not be accredited.

Conclusion

It is clear from the findings of this study that deregulation of the provision of education services in the Nigerian university education system poses some daunting challenges as regards the recruitment of qualified staff and the provision of teaching facilities. There is no doubt that universities need full autonomy and academic freedom to be in-charge in the administration and management of their institution. The situation where he who plays the piper dictates the tune syndrome being manifested now, especially in state universities may not be healthy for the university education system where the highest level of manpower needed for the development of the society is produced. Also, the success of the deregulation policy on education calls for more collaboration between government and private individuals such as voluntary agencies to partner in the provision of education services in the universities; while the supervisory agents of the government will be more up and doing in their duties.

Recommendations

From the findings of the study, the following recommendations were made:

1. Federal and state universities should be given freedom in the recruitment of their staff to instil quality in the system.
2. Federal and state universities should consolidate on provision of functional teaching facilities especially library and ICT equipment for effective teaching and learning in both universities.

REFERENCES

1. Agwu, L. & Nwite, O. (2019). Application of quality assurance practice at the secondary school level of education in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning*, 19 (3), 69-83
2. Archibong, I. A. (2013). Strengthening internal quality assurance for improved education delivery in Nigerian public Universities. *Research on Humanities and social science*. 3(1), 2222-2863.
3. Babarinde, K. & Farayola, J. A. (2018). *Kantian Moral test for Deregulating Education in Developing Societies*. Philosophy of Education Association of Nigeria (PEAN). Pp.8 – 13.
4. Basake J A (2019) Governing Councils Task Performance and The Management Of Public Universities In South-South Geo-Political Zone Of Nigeria Unpublished PhD thesis. Ebonyi State University Abakaliki
5. Chukwuka, O. (2019). Status of education and quality assurance practices. *Unpublished Dissertation*. University of Nsukka, Nigeria
6. Egwu S O, Basake J.; Mbah B A. and Emesini N (2020) “Administrative Strategies Employed By School Administrators in the Attainment of Quality Assurance in Secondary Schools.” *IOSR Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)*, 10(2), 2020, pp. 21-28.
7. Ejiogu, A. M. (2013). Higher education and the issue of relevance. In A. M. Ejiogu and D. Ajeyalemi (Eds.). *Emergent Issues in Nigerian Education* Lagos: Joja Press Limited. Pp183-200.
8. Eworo, G.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Nigeria's History of Education*. Nigeria: Ushie Printer & Publishing Company.
9. Fafunwa, A. B. (2004). *History of Education in Nigeria*. Ibadan: NPS Educational Publisher.
10. Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2014). National policy on education. Lagos: NERDC.
11. HHornby, A. S. (2008). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*, Special Price New Edition.
12. Obunadike, J. C. (2011). University Education Strategically Tailored toward Youth Empowerment and Labour Market in Nigeria. In P.K. Uchendu, U. G. Emetarom, and O. Nwosu (eds). *Higher Education and Nigerian National Development*. Owerri: Barloz Publisher. Pp.2 – 11.
13. Ofojebe, W. N. & Ezugoh, T. C. (2010). Teachers' motivation and its influence on quality assurance in the Nigerian Educational System African Research Review. *An International Multi-Disciplinary Journal, Ethiopia*, 4(2), 398-417.
14. Okojie, J. (2010). Policy Directives at the System Level –NUCD Response over the Years. In J. Okojie (Ed). *Nigeria: Laj-Pat Najar Business printer* Pp.101-125.
15. Okuwa, O. B. (2015). Human resources development and goal achievement in education for all (EFA). *Journal of Educational Administration and Planning* 9(3)92-114
16. Orji, U. (2021). Proliferation of public primary school and human resources in River state: Implication on entrepreneurship Education. *African Journal of Educational Research and Development (AJERD)* 3(2), 405-407.
17. Osaat, S.D. (2005). Deregulation of Education and Citizenship rights to Education. In A.O. Enoh (E.d), *Deregulation of Education in Nigeria: Philosophical perspective*. Nigeria: Saniz Books.
18. Osiobe, K. (2011). Adequacy of Teaching Manpower for the Universal Basic Education in Urban and Rural Schools in Delta State, Nigeria'.
19. Uzoagulu, A., E. (2011). *Practical Guide to Writing Research Project Report in Tertiary Institutions*. Enugu: Cheston Publishers.
20. Wonah, D. E. (2012). Parental role towards successful implementation of the Universal Basic Education (UBE) scheme. *Journal of Education*, 2(1), 131-139. Ushie Printers, Nigeria