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

DEREGULATION OF EDUCATION SERVICES AND QUALITY ASSURANCE IN FEDERAL AND STATE UNIVERSITIES IN SOUTH EAST, NIGERIA

Emmanuel Igwe Chukwunonyerem, Prof. B.E. Alumode and Oko, Ndubuisi Ogbonnia
Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education,
Ebonyi State University Abakaliki.
Email: emmaigwemadu4ever@gmail.com. Phone:08028793338

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the influence of Deregulation of Education Services on Quality Assurance in Federal and State Universities in South East, Nigeria. Two research questions and two hypotheses guided the study. The study adopted descriptive survey research design. The population of the study was 824 academic administrators who are concerned with administrative services in Federal and State Universities in South East Nigeria. There was no sampling, the whole population was used because the population was manageable. The instrument for data collection was researcher developed questionnaire titled "Deregulation of Educational Services and Quality Assurance Questionnaire" (DESQAQ). The instrument 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. 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 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 influence the quality of staff but do not negatively influence provision of teaching facilities 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 influence the quality of staff and provision of teaching facilities in Federal and State universities in South East Nigeria. Based on the findings of the study the researcher recommended that Federal and state Governments in the South East Zone of Nigeria should only support but not interfere in the recruitment of staff and consolidate on provision of teaching facilities for quality assurance.

Keywords: Deregulation, Education Services, Quality Assurance, University

Introduction

Education is in most cases believed to be the architect of development. It is also a means to achieve development. If the state has a responsibility to educate or help citizens for development, then education becomes a right of the citizens. Anything that deprives the state from its responsibility is opposed to this right. University education in Nigeria started with the establishment of the Yaba College of Education in 1932 which gave birth to University College in Ibadan 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 these schools 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 the purpose of 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 in the exclusive legislative list until the beginning of the Civil War in 1967. In 1970, the military government announced the complete takeover of schools from the missions (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 with unnecessary bureaucracy as contained in the National Policy on Education editions (2004, 2008 and the latest 2014).

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 students' 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 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 complete monopoly of the education system. In furtherance of this, the government thought it wise to withdraw her 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, 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 & Nwite 2019). Ofojebe and Ezugoh (2010) 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 emphasis of school inspection away from physical enumeration of school facilities to assessment of teaching and learning processes. This is because the essence of specifying Minimum Academic Standard in any level of education is to enhance quality.

From the fore-going, 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 teaching staffs are the ones actually 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, 2014:26) 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' population, but if there are no enough facilities, the teachers will be incapacitated. Qualified teaching staff in the school system are basically tutorial personnel with the responsibility of transferring knowledge to the learners (Chukwuma, 2019). In order to ensure quality in the educational sector, teaching and learning facilities must be adequately available. Facilities 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 carryout research, do assignment and have current information in their various fields. Library provision is needed to supplement teachers' effort and make it easier for learners to do assignment and researches. Also included in this list is well ventilated and spacious classrooms and theatres. Projectors, computers, flannel boards are sine qua non in this ICT era. The teacher as well as student need 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, buildings are essential requirement 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, 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.

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

Statement of the Problem

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, godfatherism and others which could bring about recruitment of unqualified staff; these factors totally 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 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.

In addition, it was also speculated that requirement for admission of students is 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 gave the researcher the impetus to study to find out whether deregulation of educational services has influence on the quality assurance in the Nigeria university education system.

Purpose of the Study

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

1. Determine the influence of deregulation of education services on recruitment of quality staff in federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.
2. Ascertain the influence of deregulation of education services on provision of teaching facilities in 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 influence of deregulation of provision of education services on

recruitment of quality staff in federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria?

2. What is the influence of deregulation of provision of education services on provision of teaching facilities in 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 influence of deregulation of provision of education services on recruitment of quality staff in 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 influence of deregulation of provision of education services on provision of teaching facilities in 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 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 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 0.822. 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 was compared with P-values, where the t.value is less than the P-value, the hypothesis was accepted (meaning significant) and where the t-value is greater than the P-value, the hypothesis was rejected (meaning not significant).

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 East, 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 East

		FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES N=425			STATE UNIVERSITIES N=364		
S/N	ITEMS	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 East 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 East, Nigeria. Based on the following 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 East 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 provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria?

Data collected with item 7-12 of the instrument were also analyzed using mean and standard deviation. Summary of results is presented in table 2.

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

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 East, Nigeria

		FEDERAL UNIVERSITIES N=425			STATE UNIVERSITIES N=364		
S/N	**ITEMS**	**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 ingredient 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 East. 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 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 provision of library facilities in State Universities is not adequate while provision of health facilities is not adequate in both Federal and State Universities in South East against the quality assurance benchmark.

Hypothesis: There is no 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 staff in the Universities in South East, Nigeria.

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

Data collected from items 1-6 in Section B of the research instrument were used to test this hypothesis 1. 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 influence of deregulation of provision of educational services on the quality of staff in the Universities in South East.

S/N	Category of Uni Respondents	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**

Result on Table 3 revealed that the t- value of 119.19 is greater than p-value of 0.12 of Academic Administrators in Federal and State Universities in South East of Nigeria. Hence Ho_I is rejected. This means that Academic Administrators from Federal and State Universities were not of same opinion; hence there is significant difference in 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 staff in the Universities in South East**.**

Hypothesis 2: 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 provision of educational services on provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria.

Data collected from item 7-12 in Section B of the research instrument were used to test this hypothesis 2. Summary of results were shown on Table 4.

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

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 provision of educational services on provision of teaching facilities in 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	3.38	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 Ho_2 is rejected. The implication is that the Federal and State Universities were not of same opinion on the extent of influence of deregulation of provision of educational services on provision of teaching facilities in federal and state universities in South East.

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 high extent do deregulation influence the provision of educational services on the quality of staff in Federal and State Universities in South East, 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' opinion show that deregulation has led to 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 deregulation 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 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 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 provision of educational services on the quality of staff in the Universities in South East, Nigeria. This difference in opinion emanates from the fact that since the introduction of the policy, budgetary allocation to the sector continues 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-students' ratios is not always adhered to. This is not healthy for both the students and the lecturers in terms of enhancing quality of assessment.

In support of this, Okuwa (2015) writes that recruitment of new lecturers is one of the problems bedevilling 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 with regard to quality of academic staff. Deregulation of provision of educational services has caused 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.

The 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 South East. 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 East, 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 surprise 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 Nigeria university education system pose some daunting challenges as regard recruitment of qualified staff and 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 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 call 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

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

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.

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.

Chukwuka, O. (2019). Status of education and quality assurance practices. *Unpublished Dissertation*. University of Nsukka, Nigeria

Ejiogu, A. M. (2013). Higher education and the issue of relevance. In A. M. Ejiogu and D. Ajyeyalemi (Eds.). *Emergent Issues in Nigerian Education* Lagos: Joja press Limited. Pp183-200.

Eworo, G.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Nigeria's History of Education.* Nigeria: Ushie Printer & Publishing Company.

Fafunwa, A. B. (2004). *History of Education in Nigeria.* Ibadan: NPS Educational Publisher.

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

Hornby, A. S. (2008). *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*, Special Price New Edition.

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.

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.

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.

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*

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.

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.

Osiobe, K. *(2011).* Adequacy of Teaching Manpower for the Universal Basic Education in Urban and Rural Schools in Delta State, Nigeria'.

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

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