AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.16 (1), September-December, 2025 https://ajemates.org

PLACE OF DEREGULATION OF EDUCATION SERVICES AS RELATES TO QUALITY ASSURANCE IN UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH EAST, NIGERIA

Igwe Emmanuel Chukwunonyerem[1], Prof. B.E. Alumode[2], and Oko Ndubuisi Ogbonnia[3]
Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, Ebonyi State University Abakaliki.
Email: emmaigwemadu4ever@gmail.com or Ndubuisiogbonnia@gmail.com
Phone:08028793338, 07067663549

ABSTRACT

The study focused on the Place of Deregulation of Education Services as relates to Quality Assurance in Universities in South East, Nigeria. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. Descriptive survey research design was used for the study. The population of study comprised eight hundred and twenty-four academic administrators who are concerned with administrative services in Federal and State Universities in South East Nigeria. The entire population was used as the sample size. The instrument for data collection was researcher developed questionnaire which was validated by three experts, one expert in Measurement and Evaluation from Science Education while two in Educational Administration and Planning from Educational Foundations Department all in Ebonyi State University. Statistical mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while the hypotheses were tested using t-test at 0.05 alpha level of significance with the help of SPSS. The study found among others that: deregulation of provision of educational services negatively impact admission of qualified students and production of quality graduates in Federal and State universities in South East, Nigeria while the hypotheses revealed that there were significant difference in the opinions of the respondents on how deregulation educational services impact the admission of qualified students and quality of graduates in Federal and State universities in South East Nigeria. Based on the findings of the study the researcher recommended that concessional fees and quota system of admission should be discouraged as these encourage admission of unqualified students and there should be periodic review of various University programme curriculum contents and continuous staff professional development to meet the demands of the realities of the society as this will help in the producing quality graduates.

Keywords: Deregulation, Education, Services, Deregulation of Education Services, on Quality Assurance, Universities

Introduction

Education is a veritable means of effecting national development. Consequently, the Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2014) adopted education as instrument par excellence for effecting national development. To this end, government, private individuals and

organizations have established educational institutions at all levels in order to satisfy the educational needs and aspirations of the people. Education is widely acclaimed as the pivotal point on which the wheel of the development of any nation or society rests (Eworo, 2014). This is largely due to the fact that education brings new knowledge that can be used in the development of the society, as well as, individual members of the society. In view of this, countries all over the world are investing much in the provision and funding of education. Education is seen as the basic right of every citizen. Deregulation therefore relieves the government of some responsibilities and allows them the opportunity to do the needful when appropriate. It breeds serious competition and also enhances the quality of services provided.

In education, deregulation means that education would seize to be public goods or services provided solely by government, but shall witness the involvement of interested individuals and corporate bodies (Danhassan & Abdulmumirie, 2020). Kalusi and Ozano (2015) corroborated the fore-going by saying that, deregulation in education sector means removal of all forms of barriers of constraints to entry into the education sector by private persons who are competent and qualified to do so. It is a fair ground for competition among individuals, group and organizations willing to provide educational services to members of the society.

In this context, deregulation means throwing the door open to encourage wider participation by individuals, groups and non-governmental organizations in the setting up, ownership and management of educational institutions and the provision of educational services. This view tallies with Ejide (2015) who averred that deregulation of education means decentralizing the control of the educational system, freeing the schools from rules, mandates and government monopoly, and allowing the control of the educational system to revolve on local authorities nearer to the students. Additionally, Ekpo and Anuna, (2015), affirmed that deregulation as a new applicable concept in education applies government divesting its interest in it and encouraging private sector participation in the management of the education system for the achievement of the pre-determined objectives and goals of education. In this context, therefore, deregulation implies divestment of monopolistic control of government over the provision of educational services thereby allowing corporate, non-corporate, private and non-governmental bodies to establish and manage educational institutions according to their whims and caprices. In order words, deregulation in education ensures the emergence of private schools in every sector of the society.

In Nigerian context, the idea is traceable to the period when her public sector was being mismanaged leading to poor performance, thereby imposing more

burden on government finance. This prompted the government into the idea of privitalization and commercialization programme which consequently took off in late 80s. The legal backing of this programme also saw the enactment and promulgation of decree number 25 on deregulation (Decree no 25, 1988). The coming into force of this decree laid the foundation upon which the policy of deregulation was built upon. The essence of the evolution of deregulation was to create a synergy between the government and private agencies in rendering qualitative services in all facet of the economy.

The national policy on education document, also explained why quality assurance mechanism became important or necessary in Nigerian education system. However, quality assurance appears to be a major challenge of Nigeria's education system because a critical look at the educational institutions reveals low standard and quality schools and their products. Observable infrastructural decay, obsolete facilities, teachers' low morale, low grades in public examinations, cultism, and examination malpractices among students are indicators of the poor state of education in Nigeria.

Similarly, Arikewuyo (2014) viewed quality in education to be adjudged by both its ability to enable students perform well in standard examinations and relevance to the needs of the students, community and the society as a whole. This can only be possible if the needed manpower, infrastructure, facilities, and other necessities are put in place to ensure that the system work fine. Buttressing this point Ayodele (2018) asserted that quality assurance entails the quality of teaching personnel, quality of available instructional materials, equipment and facility, school environment and pupils, and quality of education delivery. It embraced all functions and activities that will ensure that quality of the academic (teaching, curriculum) and structures (building, infrastructures) are guaranteed to bring about quality of the programme/instructional delivery.

Admission criteria is another variable in ensuring quality assurance. The Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2014) saw the need for this and clearly stipulated that each tertiary institution is at liberty to select candidates for admission. It went further to state that this has to be done in conjunction with the authorised board. In this sense, the authorised Board is Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB). JAMB has the prerogative of conducting quality entrance examinations for intending candidates and setting the cut – off marks. Of recent, there is duplication of functions as various universities or tertiary institutions are now organising Post – UME (tagged screening or aptitude test). The essence of this is to synchronise candidates' scores in JAMB. Admission into all universities therefore must be on merit. The laid down parameters must be strictly adhered to by both state and federal tertiary universities. Entry requirements is another yardstick for admission.

Candidates must of necessity possess five credits either at one or two sittings in relevant subjects relating to candidates' proposed course. All these are to ensure production of quality graduates.

The essence of quality education in Nigeria is to make products of the system to be useful to themselves and the society at large. Quality product from any institution is a result of good and well-articulated input. A good quality product here refers to a quality graduate from Nigeria universities whether public or private. A graduate from university 'A' should be able to compete favourably with another graduate from university 'B' or a graduate from outside the country (Ehi-Oshio, 2016). From the fore-going, Ehi-Oshio (2016) maintained that quality assurance is the bedrock of any university education system the world over. The underlying purpose of quality assurance is to ensure that universities produce high quality and competent graduates who can compete globally in their respective discipline.

The provision of university education in Nigeria is of tripartite dimensions (federal, state, and private). This is in accordance with the provision of the 1999 constitution amended part II, paragraphs 27-30, which returned education to the original listing in the concurrent legislative list. Taking advantage of this constitutional provision, many state governments came out early in the second Republic with statements of intension to establish their own universities. State owned universities are basically universities, funded and managed by state government. Private individuals took advantage of the provision of the 1999 constitution as amended which empowered private individuals to establish universities if they so desire and are capable of manning it effectively. The nation began to witness the upsurge of private universities. Today, scores of private universities are in almost all the states of the federation. The issues bothering the mind of this researcher is whether all these universities are of world class standard in terms of quality of staff, facilities, admission process and the quality of the graduates from these institutions.

University education prepares people for the acquisition of knowledge and skills for effective job performance in all facets of the national economy and an individual's personal life (Mgbekem, 2004). In other words, university education offers people specialized education, making them experts in their respective fields (Obunadike, 2011). The only medium open to them to do or achieve this is strict compliance to 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.

Confirming this, Omolewa (2010:41) noted that "there have been a struggle by all the universities to maintain some standards of excellence, and at least to ensure that the universal goal of university education is protected but they are fraught with challenges that includes: improving the learning environment, quality of staff, facilities, infrastructure, academic freedom and other problems". These are the worries that inspired the researcher into undertaking this study to find out whether deregulation is a bane or boon to the university system.

Statement of the Problem

It is believed that the number of students demanding for university education in Nigeria has been on increase every year that 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 East of Nigeria, the lecture halls are overcrowded with majority of the students standing at the corridors during lectures. Besides, the libraries are stocked with obsolete text books, journals and serials. This attest to the current Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) and other unions' call for proper funding to revitalise Nigeria universities. It was also speculated that requirement for admission of students are influenced, as those who are in the government list and those that 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 supposed to ensure quality assurance in 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 motivated the researcher to find out whether deregulation of educational services has influence on the quality assurance in the Universities.

Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study was to investigate whether deregulation of educational services has impact on quality assurance in universities in South East. Specifically, the study sought to:

1. Examine the impact of deregulation of education services on admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.16 (1), September-December, 2025 https://ajemates.org

2. Find out the impact of deregulation of education services on production of quality graduates from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

Research Questions

The following research questions have been raised to guide the study

1. What is the impact of deregulation of provision of education services on admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria?
2. What is the impact of deregulation of provision of education services on production of quality graduates from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria?

Hypotheses

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

$H0_1$: There is no significant difference between mean ratings of Federal and state Universities Academic Administrators on the impact of deregulation of provision of education services on admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria

$H0_2$: There is no significant difference between mean ratings of Federal and state Universities Academic Administrators on the impact of deregulation of provision of education services on production of quality graduates from federal and state universities in South East, 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 selected segments of the population in order to determine the attributes of the population. The study was carried out in South-East of Nigeria. The zone comprises of five states namely Abia, Anambra, Ebonyi, Enugu and Imo. The region known as Igbos is known for industry and agriculture. They also have vested interest in all levels of education. That is why each state in the zone has great number of 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 East 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 East 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 developed questionnaire titled "Deregulation of Educational Services

and Quality Assurance Questionnaire" (DESAQAQ). In developing the instrument (questionnaire), the researcher consulted literature from where he drew relevant items on deregulation of provision of educational services and quality assurance in Nigerian Universities and developed it. The structured questionnaire was based on four (4) points rating scale of Strongly Agree (AG), Agreed (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD) with their nominal values attached as 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. The instrument was first validated by three (3) experts: two in the Department of Educational Foundations (Educational Administration and Planning) and one in Measurement and Evaluation from Department of Science Education; all from the Faculty of Education, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki. The validated instrument was trial tested with thirty (30) academic administrators in South-South Geographical Zone of Nigeria which is outside the study area. To ascertain the internal consistency of the instrument Cronbach Alpha technique was used for its analysis. These gave an overall reliability score as 0.77. The result indicated that the instrument was reliable and therefore considered appropriate for use (Uzoagulu, 2011). In answering the research questions, data collected from respondents was analysed using SPSS (Statistical Software Package for Social Sciences) using mean and standard deviation to answer research questions 1-4. In taking decision for the research questions, 2.50 was used as bench mark for decision taking. The 2.50 was derived by adding the nominal values of the rating scales and divided by the number of cases. Thus: 4+3+2+1 = 10 ÷ 4 = 2.50. Therefore, any item in the instrument with the mean score of 2.50 and above was regarded as the factor that influenced deregulation of education and any item with the mean score below 2.50 was adjudged as the factor that did not influence deregulation of education. In testing the hypotheses, t-test was used to test the entire null hypotheses at 0.05 level of significance. Then the t-values were compared with P-values, where the t-value is less than the P-value, the hypothesis was accepted and where the t-value is greater than the P-value, the hypothesis was rejected.

Results

Research Question One: What is the impact of deregulation of provision of education services on admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria?

Data collected with item 1-6 of the instrument, which dwelt on the impact of deregulation of education on admission of qualified students. Data were also analysed using mean and standard deviation. Summary of result is presented in table 1.

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.16 (1), September-December, 2025 https://ajemates.org

Table 1: Mean Rating of Respondents on impact of deregulation of provision of education services on admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria

		FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES N=425			STATE UNIVERSITIES N=364		
S/N	**ITEMS**	**X**	**SD**	**DECISION**	**X**	**SD**	**DECISION**
1.	Deregulation of educational services has led to mass admission of unqualified candidates into the universities	1.44	0.60	Disagree	3.60	0.48	Agree
2.	Deregulation of educational services has provided opportunities for more candidates to gain admission into the universities	3.01	0.13	Agree	3.60	0.48	Agree
3.	Deregulation of educational services offer parents opportunities to make choice in their ward's admission	2.97	0.14	Agree	2.00	0.00	Disagree
4.	Deregulation of educational services minimizes impact of quota system in admission process	1.40	0.50	Disagree	2.59	0.49	Agree
5.	Deregulation of educational services provides opportunities for children from wealthy families to gain access to university education	3.01	0.13	Agree	3.60	0.48	Agree
6.	Deregulation of educational services is hindering equitable access to qualitative education to Nigerians	2.61	0.48	Agree	3.00	0.00	Agree
	Grand Mean	**2.40**	**0.33**	**Disagree**	**3.06**	**0.32**	**Agree**

The data presented in table 1 above, revealed that Academic Administrators of Federal Universities agreed that deregulation of provision of educational services do not influence the admission of qualified students into Federal Universities in South East, Nigeria but it does in State Universities. Thus, Academic Administrators of Federal Universities on 2, 3,5 and 6 had mean scores of 3.01, 2.97, 3.01 and 2.61 which are above the criterion reference point of 2.5 while items 1 and 4 were below. That is to say that deregulation of educational services has provided opportunities for more candidates to gain admission into the both Universities, deregulation of educational services offer parents opportunities to make choice in their ward's admission in universities, deregulation of educational services provides opportunities for children from wealthy families to gain access to university education and deregulation of educational services is hindering equitable access to qualitative education to Nigerians while deregulation of educational services has led to mass admission of unqualified candidates into the universities and hindering equitable access to qualitative education to Nigerians. Also, the academic Administrators of State Universities disagreed on item 3 that deregulation of

educational services does not offer parents opportunities to make choice in their ward's admission. Academic Administrators of Federal Universities disagree on item 4 which means that deregulation of educational services does not minimizes impact of quota system in admission process in federal universities. Academic Administrators also agreed that deregulation of educational services has led to mass admission of unqualified candidates into the state universities thus negating the quality assurance goal.

Research Question Two: What is the impact of deregulation of provision of education services on production of quality graduates from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria?

Data collected with item 7-12 of the instrument, which dwelt on the impact of deregulation of provision of educational services on the quality of products from Federal and State Universities. Data were also analysed using mean and standard deviation. Summary of results is presented in table 2.

Table 2: Mean Rating of Respondents on the impact of deregulation of provision of education services on production of quality graduates from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria

		FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES N=425			STATE UNIVERSITIES N=364		
S/N	**ITEMS**	**X**	**SD**	**DECISION**	**X**	**SD**	**DECISION**
7.	Deregulation has led to brain-drain in the university system such that will affect quality assurance	3.01	0.13	Agree	3.60	0.48	Agree
8.	Most public universities employ unproductive lecturers which is not healthy for quality assurance practices	3.59	0.49	Agree	3.39	0.48	Agree
9.	Most state universities depend so much on part-time, lecturers which can impede quality assurance	3.38	0.48	Agree	3.00	0.01	Agree
10.	State Government does not sponsor the training or retraining of lecturers from state universities to ensure quality assurance	1.44	0.60	Disagree	3.60	0.49	Agree
11.	The number of lecturers in state universities are grossly inadequate as against quality assurance bench mark	3.01	0.13	Agree	3.60	0.48	Agree
12.	Most university programme curriculum contents do not reflect the realities of the present-day society	2.61	0.48	Agree	2.60	0.48	Agree
	Grand Mean	**2.84**	**0.38**	**Agree**	**3.29**	**0.40**	**Agree**

The data presented in table 2 above based on the grand mean of 2.84 and 3.29 for Federal and State Universities respectively showed that the academic administrators of that responded to the questionnaire items agreed that

AJEMATES
African Journal of Educational Management, Teaching and Entrepreneurship Studies
VOL.16 (1), September-December, 2025 https://ajemates.org

deregulation of provision of educational services influence the quality of products from Federal and State Universities in South East, Nigeria. The responses to items 7,8,9, 11 and 12 showed that deregulation has led to brain-drain in the university system, employment of unproductive lecturers, depending so much on part-time lecturers, grossly inadequate number of lecturers as against quality assurance benchmark and curriculum contents that do not reflect the realities of the present society which by implication may affect the quality of the graduates. Responses on items 10 indicated disparity in sponsoring the retraining of lecturers' improvement and staff strength between federal and state universities in South East which invariably affects quality assurance goals and in extension quality of graduates negatively.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the mean rating of academic administrators of federal and state universities on extent of the impact of deregulation of provision of educational services on the admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

Data collected from items 1-6 in section B of the research instrument were used to test this hypothesis 3. Summary of results of data analysis are 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 impact of deregulation of provision of educational services on the admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

S/N	Category of Uni Respondents	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Alpha	P.V	Decision
1	Federal Universities	425	1.44	0.60	54.53	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
2	Federal Universities	425	3.01	0.13	23.61	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
3	Federal Universities	425	2.97	0.14	129.0	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	2.00	0.00					
4	Federal Universities	425	1.40	0.50	33.43	787	0.05	0.43	Significant
	State Universities	364	2.59	0.49					
5	Federal Universities	425	3.01	0.13	23.61	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
6	Federal Universities	425	2.61	0.48	15.02	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.00	0.00					
	Average				**26.53**			**0.43**	**Significant**

The result of t-test analysis presented in Table 3 above indicated that the t-value of 26.53 is greater than P-Value of 0. 43 of Academic Administrators in State and Federal University in South East. Hence Ho_3 is rejected. This is because from the table above, each of the items obtained a t-value that was greater than the p-value of 0.43. The average t- value of 26.53 was greater than the average p-value of 0.43. Hence HO_1 is rejected. Based on this, the researcher hereby upheld the alternative

hypothesis that there is a significant difference in the mean ratings of academic administrators on the extent of the influence of deregulation of provision of educational services on the admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference between the mean ratings of academic administrators of federal and state universities on the impact deregulation of provision of educational services on the quality of products from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

Data collected from items 7-12 in section B of the research instrument were used to test this hypothesis 2. Summary of results of data analysis are presented in table 4.

Table 4: t-test of difference in the mean responses of academic administrators of federal and state universities on the impact of deregulation of provision of educational services on the quality of products from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria

S/N	Category of Uni Respondents	N	Mean	SD	T	df	Alpha	P.V	Decision
7	Federal Universities	425	3.01	0.13	23.61	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
8	Federal Universities	425	3.59	0.49	5.77	787	0.05	0.69	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.39	0.48					
9	Federal Universities	425	3.38	0.48	15.02	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.00	0.00					
10	Federal Universities	425	3.01	0.13	23.61	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
11	Federal Universities	425	1.44	0.60	54.53	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
12	Federal Universities	425	3.01	0.13	23.09	787	0.05	0.00	Significant
	State Universities	364	3.60	0.48					
	Average				**20.83**			**0.10**	**Significant**

Result in Table 4 above indicated that the mean ratings of Academic Administrators of State and Federal Universities on extent of the impact of deregulation of provision of educational services on the quality of products from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria was significant (rejected) as the t- values of 20.83 were greater than p-values of 0.10. Hence Ho_2 is rejected. This means that, the sampled respondents from Federal and State Universities were not of same opinion on how deregulation of provision of educational services impact the quality of products from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria

Discussion

For research question one which borders on the extent deregulation of educational services has impact on admission process as a means of ensuring quality in Nigerian universities, findings indicate that majority of the respondents are of the opinion that deregulation of provision of educational services has impact on admission process in Nigerian

universities. Deregulation of educational services has impact because it has provided opportunities for more candidates to gain admission into the universities, offer parents opportunities to make choice in their wards' admission, provides opportunities for children from wealthy families to gain access to qualitative education and deregulation of educational services is hindering equitable access to qualitative education to Nigerians while mass admission of unqualified candidates into the universities is hindering equitable access to qualitative education to Nigerians and this was vehemently objected by State universities in the South East. While the hypothesis revealed that there was significant difference between the mean rating of academic administrators of federal and state universities on extent of the impacted of deregulation of provision of educational services on the admission of qualified students into federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

This finding is not surprising to the researcher especially with the array of materials or outcries by so many scholars on this issue. For instance, Ozurumba, (2019) enumerating the various problems confronting the university system in Nigeria averred that in addition, universities often times admit students who do not meet the entrance requirements for admission into universities based on concessional fees.

In research question two, the data analysed on the impact of Deregulation of Provision of Educational Services on the Quality of Products from Federal and State Universities. Deregulation has impacted on the employment of unqualified lecturers without regards for quality assurance promotion, 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 reregulation led to brain-drain in the university system and also indicating that staff strength in universities in South East is negligible this vehemently affects quality assurance practices. Some of the employers of labour are complaining about the quality of graduates that the university system is producing nowadays and that some of the graduates lack efficient communication skills. While hypothesis revealed that there is significant difference between the mean ratings of academic administrators of federal and state universities on extent of the influence of deregulation of provision of educational services on the quality of products from federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

This finding is not strange to the researcher as available literatures attest to this fact. For instance, Makotsi (2011), commenting on state of affairs in the university system vis-a-vis the backdrop of deregulation, are of the view that the situation was not like this before the introduction of this policy. This assertion further confirmed the labour market report on the prospect of Nigerian graduates by Gbenu (2012) which shows that employers complained that current graduates are poorly prepared for work. The report affirmed that academic

standards have fallen drastically over the past decade and that a university degree is no longer a guarantee for good communication skills and technical competence. As a result of this, Nigerian graduates are viewed as half-baked and ill-equipped for labour market.

Conclusion

It is clear from the findings of this study that deregulation of the provision of education services in the Nigeria university education system pose some daunting challenges as regard admission of qualified students as well as the quality of graduates. 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 play 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 are produced. Also, the success of 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. Concessional fees and quota system of admission should be discouraged as these encourage admission of unqualified students.
2. There should be periodic review of various University programme curriculum contents and continuous staff professional development to meet the demands of the realities of the society as this will help in the producing quality graduates.

REFERENCES

Arikewuyo, M.O. (2014). Effective Funding and Quality Assurance in the Nigerian Education System. *A Paper Presented at the 1st National Conference of the Institution of Education*, Olabisi Onabanjo University Ago-Iwoye Jan. Pp.12 – 15.

Ayodele, J. B. (2018), School size, class size and teachers' quality and correlation of internal efficiency in primary schools in Ondo State Nigeria. *Journal of Education Administration* 56(1) 70-75.

Danhassan, M. A. & Abdulmumine (2020). Deregulation of Education and Citizenship Right to Education: A critical analysis. In A. O. Enoh (Ed) *Deregulation of Education in Nigeria: Philosophical perspective* pp 23-28.

Ehi-Oshio, P. (2016). *Reform of the Legal Framework for Quality Assurance in Nigerian Universities* online website.

Ejide, B. (2015). Morality and order in a deregulated educational system. In A. O. Enoh (Ed). *Deregulation of Education in Nigeria: Philosophical*

Perspective. 166-179. Nigeria: Saniez books.

Ekpo, T. N. & Anuna, M.C. (2015). Perspective on Deregulation of Education System in Nigeria. In G.O. Akpa, S. U Udoh, E. O Fagbamiye. *Deregulating the Provision and Management of Education in Nigeria*. The Nigerian Association for Educational Administration and Planning (NAEAP) 1 – 3.

Eworo, G.M. (2014). *An Introduction to Nigeria's History of Education.* Nigeria: Ushie Printer & Publishing Company.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2014). National policy on education. Lagos: NERDC.

Free Encyclopaedia (2011). Retrieved online at https://www.wikipedia.org

Gbenu, J. (2012) *Fundamental issue in school management*. New Dechi: A.I. T. Bs

Kalusi, J. I. & Ozano, P. B. O. (2015). Deregulation of Education and Citizenship Right to Education in Nigeria. *In Nigerian Journal of Educational Philosophy*. 12(1) 14 – 19.

Makotsi, R. (2011). Sharing resources-how library networks can help reach education goals. Book International, http://www.bookaid.org

Mgbeken, S.J.A. (2004). University Education in Nigeria. Historical Background and General Information. The rationale and objective for establishing University Education in Nigeria, highlight. In S. J. A. Mgbeken (ed). *Management of University Education in Nigeria*. Calabar: Baye Communication.

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.

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.

Omolewa, M. (2010). Highlights of Historical Development of university Education in Nigeria. In j. Okojie, I. Oloyede, and P. Obanya. *Fifty Years of University Education in Nigeria; Evolution, Achievement and Future Development.* Nigeria University of Ilorin and National Universities Commission. Pp. 27-46.

Ozumba, G. O. (2019). Philosophy of Education for National Development with Particular References to Nigeria. In G.O. Ozumba, Q.I. Obinaju and I. J. Nwankwor (eds). *Philosophy and Education in the Third Millennium A.D*. Nigeria: Verax Global. Pp. 1-12.

Uzoagulu, A., E. (2011). *Practical Guide to Writing Research Project Report in Tertiary Institutions*. Enugu: Cheston Publishers.