RESEARCH ARTICLE

PROBLEMS HINDERING QUALITY PROVISION IN NIGERIAN UNIVERSITIES: A REVIEW OF ACADEMIC OFFICERS

*Dr. Adeniyi Temitope Adetunji

Department of Business Administration, Bowen University Iwo, Nigeria

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
	Every organized or established institution will want to provide quality services irrespective of who owns the organization, especially in the case of a university where the primary aim is to provide quality graduates of sound character, to transform the organization as well as be productive and creative in making a living for themselves. In light of this broad agenda many institutions have been established all over the world and Nigeria in particular has been committed to quality improvement. Universities are multifaceted units that impart knowledge and produce quality graduates, but the process of transforming students into quality graduates is a huge task, and universities have not been exempt from the many challenges. This paper is designed to look into problems hindering the provision of quality services from an academic officer's perspective. The paper uses a standard literature review technique to discuss quality. A qualitative approach was adopted with the use of interviews as the main research instrument. Thematic analysis was used for the discussion of the findings. The findings reveal that 4 major challenges hinder quality provision in the country.

INTRODUCTION

In today's educational context, it is very easy to make judgments on wants and needs, even when one knows they are unachievable. No wonder researchers often find it hard to define quality. Many studies have focused solely on measuring quality while they fail to identify quality in the process of what they measure, an approach that triggered Adetunji (2014) to assert that quality should not be a measure in higher education, rather it should be put into every activity of the organization, starting from environmental facilities that aid learning or make the environment conducive to learning, input, process and finally output. Adetunji explains that each element of environmental facilities, input, process and output, is important and requires quality assurance, while the totality of the assurances requires proper management. He claims that if the multifaceted system of the university is ever to provide quality services to the customer, the university first needs to identify who the right customers are. It is argued by Adetunji (2014) that students in Nigerian universities cannot be classified as customers because they pay less and do not take ownership of their education provision, with a government contribution of

Corresponding author: Dr. Adeniyi Temitope Adetunji,
Department of Business Administration, Bowen University Iwo, Nigeria.

over 80% of their tuition fees limiting their right to reject poor provision of education. Nonetheless, students in private universities should be classified as customers, because they pay 100% of their tuition fees themselves. Such students have not been classified as customers, because such tuition fees are paid by their parents or guardians, thereby giving their parents/guardians opportunity to dictate what they want their child to study. This approach takes away their rights as customers. In management or business it is assumed that customers have rights, because they know what they want and they pay for it. Therefore they can be easily identified, and it is easy to tell if what they are offered meets their needs and satisfies them. This is not the case with university education as it is very difficult to say whether or not students know what they require. This assertion complicates the matter of how best to access quality while it establishes the complexity of university education. As students are not paying customers it is difficult to tell whether students have a right to quality education. As a result, in the last 2 decades, students have continued to accept what is given to them by the university whether it is of high quality or not. Today it is very difficult to know where to start the investigation of what quality is in university education, owning to the fact that students, who are at the receiving end of the education provision, are not in a position to determine or reject any form of knowledge given to

them. These challenging issues put mounting pressure on many factors that actually hinder the provision of quality education in the country. Surprisingly, it is often easy for people to say education is declining or that it is of no quality, without understanding what the causes of the decline are. This paper tries to fill this gap by studying the hindrances affecting quality education provision in the country, but for better clarification, the paper will discuss what past researchers around the world define as quality as in their opinion.

Quality Definition

In creating a definition of quality in the university sector, many authors have focused on the many features and elements that make for customer satisfaction, because they have adopted the idea of quality from the manufacturing sector. In the business process, when the customer is satisfied, or when the product is fit for purpose, then quality is met (Adetunji, 2015). A similar view, from Eagle and Brennan (2007) and Schwantz (2012), identifies five proportions or service features for assessing general service quality, namely tangibles, reliability, responsiveness, assurance and empathy. They point out that failure to meet customer expectations in any of these features can result in a satisfaction gap.

In turn, to have a clearly defined system for quality management, it is essential to possess a well-defined assertion of precisely what quality in universities means, as suggested by Chua (2004) and Doherty (2008). Wittek and Kvernbekk (2011) raised the concern that there are various definitions of quality, reflecting different approaches to quality management and taking into account different aspects of, and perspectives on, quality. For example, quality has been connected to offering distinctive or special products or services from a user-oriented perspective. A complementary correlated definition of quality includes fitness for purpose, conforming to requirements or specifications and achieving excellence, as cited by Sahney, Banwet and Karunes (2006) and Watty (2005). This was evident in the recent work of Wittek and Kvernbekk (2011, citing Westerheijden *et al.* 2007); they held the view that there is a need to answer the question of what quality is. Later approaches by many researchers (Harvey and William, 2010; Newton, 2010; Nakpodia, 2011; Okechukwu and Okechukwu, 2011) report quality to be a concept in which whole organizations foster the capacity to continually learn and implement customers/users wants.

The emphasis is on quality as a total organization-wide effort which should be a way of life, influencing the attitude and behaviour of everyone, an assertion which was also supported by the work of Jura (1998), Harvey (2005), Doherty (2008), Cheng (2009) and many more. Quality is thus observed to be a state of mind and not confined to mere processes or procedures, as claimed by Jackson (2000). Likewise, Cheng (2009) and Ardi, Hidayatno and Zagloel (2012) argue that when quality is applied to the university context, industry-centred concepts of quality present noteworthy limitations, and, as with other services, are inconclusive. Again, there is long-standing debate about the relevance of re-defining business ideas to make them relevant to universities, which are perceived as being for the public good (Campell and Rozsnyani, 2002; Al-alawi *et al.*,

2009). Moreover, in recent years, discussion about quality in university has evolved, extending from experience to techniques and styles to process, which has been linked with the following definitions, as discussed by many authors (Campell and Rozsnayi, 2002; Wiklund *et al.*, 2003; Watty, 2005; Morley, 2003; Doherty, 2008; Harvey, 2009; Stensaker *et al.*, 2011; Veiga *et al.*, 2012; Hallinger, 2012): being exceptional or distinctive (excellence), achieving consistency particularly in process, being fit for purpose (conformity to specified objectives or standards), being accountable, effective and efficient (providing value for money) and being transformative, wherein education is considered an ongoing process of transformation including the empowerment and enhancement of all involved.

On another note, Srikanthan and Dalrymple (2003) define quality as management relative. They argue that management map the various definitions with the varying significances and perspectives of each agency. Srikanthan and Dalrymple elaborated on this idea, saying that the consistency, conformity and fitness for purpose definitions may be associated with employees (such as the vice-chancellor, registrar, bursar, university librarian, directors etc.), while definitions related to value for money and excellence would be more relevant to students, parents/guardians, sponsors and funding bodies (Doherty, 2008; Hallinger, 2013). Lomas (2002) defines 'fitness for purpose' as 'conformity to predetermined objectives or standards' (p.73) known as benchmarking. Eagle and Brennan (2007) pointed out that the definition of quality as fitness for purpose and conformity is used extensively in business and has been quite popular in university as well. Further findings by Al-alawi *et al.* (2009) reveal that the fitness for purpose definition of quality is the major prevailing view of quality amongst accounting academics in Australia. The fitness for purpose definition has a convincing business-related orientation and stipulates that if the product attains the purpose for which it is intended, it simply means that its quality is assured. In reality, where the product or service is complex, such as in the case of a university, defining its purpose is no simple matter and any assumptions can weaken the product or outcome. This approach to quality is useful if the objectives, standards, specifications and indicators used for judging quality and evaluating whether the proposed objectives have been attained are clear and accepted by all involved constituencies (Cheng and Tam, 1997; Cullen *et al.*, 2003). Another view of fitness for purpose is the flexibility to adjust to all other views of quality: for example, the purpose may be identified as excellence, value for money or transformation (Watty, 2005).

Another definition focused on students has been put forward by the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (2004, p.1), which defines academic quality as '*how well the learning opportunities provided to students enable them to achieve their award*'. This involves ensuring the suitability and effectiveness of teaching, overall backing structures, assessments and learning opportunities provided to the students. Again, this definition has been criticized based on the fact that it is too general to be readily implemented (Eagle and Brennan, 2007; Doherty, 2008). Veiga *et al.*'s (2012) definition of educational quality is more comprehensive, although still generic, and covers the whole process of education. It states that the

character of features, such as the education process (input, process and output), of the education scheme that offers services by meeting explicit and implicit expectations, is quality education that satisfies both internal and external strategies (p.23). Similar to the issue of educational quality is the issue of standards, which is another term that is broadly subjective and can have various definitions (Doherty, 2008). The most frequently cited primary text, by Yorke (1999), makes the distinction that, while quality is the totality of all the features that stimulate the students' experience, academic standards refers to the set of expectations about the students' programme of study. Conversely, Doherty (1997) refers to the nature and levels of student attainment required as assessment or output standards. Likewise, Lomas and Tomlinson (2000) claim that standards are measures of outcome that provide faultless and unambiguous judgments about whether the outcomes are satisfactory. They also claim that the standards set for a programme of study are inevitably linked to the outcomes and ensure a definite level of skills and knowledge from graduates of that programme. A key characteristic of standards is that they are never static, although Morley and Aynsley (2007) and Cartwright (2007) flag the issue that what constitutes desirable graduate qualifications and characteristics are the standards, which implies standardisation or homogenisation with tacit and explicit understandings. Ekundayo and Ajayi (2009) add that the increasing focus on student satisfaction and modification of universities might increase assertions of falling academic standards and grade inflation. A supporting declaration made by Rolfe (2002) and Stensaker, Harvey and Amaral (2011) is that, from all indications, students consider university primarily as a route to a career, while they are indifferent as to whether high standards are maintained or achieved in the process of their study.

In a work completed by Gallifa (2009), he notes that there are increasing claims of students shopping around for the easiest courses with the highest grades. Other authors such as Marsh and Roche (2000) and Akinyemi and Abiddin (2013) challenge these assertions, as they found that lecturers who give students lighter workloads are in fact not rated positively. They uncovered a positive relationship between grades obtained by students and their evaluation of teaching, because students perceive that they have learned more when they obtain good grades, not because they have been taught properly. However, similar to the problem of defining quality is the problem of defining the purpose of creating universities, as described by Doherty (2008), who argues that universities' purpose has a close link with the concepts of quality and standards. Alani (2009) maintains that it is impossible to arrive at a single particular purpose for any system of education, as the needs of the diverse key actors, although overlapping in many respects, are different. In a general view, Harvey (2005) and Eagle and Brennan (2007) say that the objective of university education is to develop the acquisition of knowledge and skills for both intrinsic and instrumental purposes. In support of this, Obasi, Akchie and Obasi (2010) emphasize the role of private or public universities to enhance societal cohesion and ensure that their graduates are able to live up to general expectations in the labour market and add value to the community in general. Another claim, made by Heyneman (2006) and Modebelu and Joseph (2012), stresses that the more a university demonstrates

professional standards and good behaviour, the more likely it is that its students will contribute to social capital, that is, be willing to work towards a common goal and understand diversity. Dauda (2010) and Elassy (2013) argue that dependence on a particular meaning of quality can be the cause of conflicting interests and can result in communication problems. Indeed, Modebelu and Joseph (2012) observe that it may be unsuccessful to seek a single best definition of quality, as it is not a 'unitary concept' but must be defined in terms of '*qualities*'. Rodgers (2008) states that quality will always be subject to varying interpretations, although Iacovidou *et al.* (2009) clarify that there are various points of similarity in many of the definitions. Ultimately, the complex and multi-faceted concept of quality in university may not be best described by a single definition and cannot easily be assessed by only one indicator.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This paper adopts a qualitative approach with the use of semi-structured interviews as the sole research instrument. The paper studies problems hindering the provision of quality management in Nigerian universities using a purposive sampling technique to select five universities in the south-west area of the country. The south-west area was considered more academically inclined than other geo-political zones in the country. This is evidenced by the way the admissions quota system is allocated. The five universities operate similarly to each other with five major faculties, Social and Management Science (SMS), Sciences and Science Education (SSE), Law (LAW), Agriculture and Extension (AGR) and Medicine (MED). The commonality was assumed to strongly tie the selected universities. The deans of faculty/school of each university were selected for the interview. The interview section lasted between 15 and 45 minutes. 5 participants were selected from each university, giving a total of 25 participants, however only 24 participants took part in the study as one of the participants did not give an interview on the premise that his workload was too tight and he was involved in so many meetings he could not find time for the interview.

The 24 participants in the study represent an area, silent in past literature, that this paper intends to unfold. The participants' opinions on problems that hinder quality management were similar, therefore the research uses thematic analysis to analyse the findings using commonality or repetition as means of identifying the themes. The themes identified are countless, but due to the nature of this paper, 5 major themes were discussed that had the highest occurrence.

University	Participants				
	SMS (A)	SSE (B)	LAW (C)	AGR (D)	MED (E)
1	*	*	*	*	-
2	*	*	*	*	*
3	*	*	*	*	*
4	*	*	*	*	*
5	*	*	*	*	*

A1, B1…E1 are respondents from university 1, A2, B2…. E2 are respondents from university 2 while A5, B5…E5 are respondents from university 5. A1, A2, …A5 are the deans of SMS, B1, B2, …B5 are the deans of SSE while E2, E3,… E5

are the deans of MED. The participants' opinions resulted in the 5 major hindrances discussed in the findings.

Findings

Inadequate funding

The majority of participants identified inadequate funding as the most critical challenge that threatens the realization of good quality higher education in Nigeria. Three of the respondents were of the opinion that the problem of inadequate funding of education has been a curse on the educational development in the country (A3, C2, E4). Two of the respondents maintained that a major limit to attaining academic excellence in Nigerian universities is financial constraints (B2, D5). Another respondent said that financial constraints have made many academics and non-academic work under difficult circumstances (B1). Four respondents argued that many institutions of higher learning in Nigeria were unable to provide facilities such as student hostels, or properly equipped laboratories and workshops (A3, A5, B3, C1). Two respondents expressed the idea that finance had been a major issue which affected building facilities, paying staff salaries regularly, building lecture halls, research grants, allowances and medical bills (A4, E2). All the deans of faculty involved in the study agreed and acknowledged that the key to the survival of Nigerian universities in the near future lies in the country's ability to produce applied and theoretical knowledge in science, technology and humanities.

Five respondents stressed that there is a need to re-negotiate the purpose for which university education was established in the country (A2, B4, B5, C4, E2). Three other participants were of the view that there is a need for university management to reach a consensus on the need for a rational and scientific procedure for determining the funding requirements to begin revitalizing the Nigerian university system (A4, C2, E5). Two respondents were of the opinion that despite all efforts made by the Nigerian government to support university education, it appears it is not enough (C3, D1). Another dean of faculty from a medical school pointed out that government needs to show more commitment to the adequate funding of higher education, especially the medical school (E2). Two other respondents from the medical school who contributed to the discussion were of the opinion that although they wanted the government to fund the medical school more than before, other departments should not be ignored (E3, E5). One respondent said,

I can tell you this from experience that, the way organization works is through collective effort of different departments or units (E3).

Inadequate or poor quality teaching staff

Many of the respondents supported the view that a big challenge to the attainment of quality in higher education in Nigeria is the lack of academic staff. Four respondents mentioned that teachers are the hub of any educational system (B4, C5, D4, and E3). Two other respondents confirmed that teachers determine the quality of education they provide because they transmit educational policies into practice and

action (A3, D1). Five respondents were of the opinion that without an adequate number of well-informed teachers, and a stimulating and fully prepared curriculum to meet students' needs while they discharge their responsibilities in schools effectively, we cannot have good education (A4, B3, D3, D5, E2). Three respondents were of the view that without good education, we cannot hope to successfully meet the challenges of a changing world for long (B4, D1, E2). Three deans of faculty from law departments seemed to concur with the above statement when they noted that good teachers are needed for good education which in turn is indispensable for social change (C1, C3, C4). One of the respondents claimed that having good teachers will increase social transformation and national development (C4). A respondent from a social and management science department said,

I think I need to make this point clear to you that the importance of teachers cannot be over emphasized (A2).

A respondent who supported the earlier statement made by the dean of the social and management science department, expressed in his own words,

I can confirm to you that despite knowing the importance of teachers in the attainment of good education, institutions of higher learning in Nigeria are short of lecturers to adequately manage or handle teaching and learning activities within the system (B1).

Three of the respondents explained that the difficulty of teachers not being effective in discharging their duties is a result of inadequate funding, with institutions not being able to employ additional lecturers due to low finances (B3, C5, E3). One respondent pointed out that the few available lecturers are seriously overworked (C5). Five respondents said that even in some institutions of higher learning in the country, there is a shortage of lecturers, and as a result their programmes are not accredited by the accreditation agencies, i.e. the NUC (A1, B4, C2, C3, and D1). Two deans from science faculties were of the opinion that attainment of good quality higher education requires teaching staff of adequate number and quality (B3, B4). Another respondent from an agricultural sciences department identified the problem of de-intellectualization of academia, putting it down to the low quality of staff some institutions of higher learning in Nigeria produce (D5). Another respondent attributed the problem to a lack of resources as well as the poor finances of the institution (C1). Five respondents shared a common view that where there is poor quality of lecturers and inadequate teaching staff the attainment of good quality higher education will be difficult (A2, C2, C3, E2, E3). One respondent said,

I think that the poor quality of lecturers working in the university is the major reason why many stakeholders have proclaimed that quality of university education in Nigeria is declining (C3).

Lack of vibrant staff development programmers

Surprisingly, few of the participants attributed the problems universities in Nigeria are facing to a lack of vibrant staff

development programmes. Six of the respondents shared a common view that in most institutions of higher learning in Nigeria, staff lack development programmes such as training and re-training (A3, B1, C5, D1, D4, E3). Three respondents were of the view that vibrant staff development programmes being introduced on a continuous basis would help academic and non-academic staff to modify and clarify their skills, attitudes, values, behaviour and competencies (A4, B5, D2). One respondent said,

I think developmental programmes will help develop and grow staff knowledge and thus become more effective and efficient in the performance of tasks (D2).

Another respondent explained,

I think staff development is paramount because knowledge of today is only sufficient for today (C1).

In this era of emergent knowledge and the explosion of the knowledge based economy, staff development should be a priority for any nation (B5). Two respondents argued that the weakness of post graduate programmes in some institutions of higher learning in Nigeria required a strong staff development programme (A3, B4). One respondent maintained that universities are staffed by lecturers who are not familiar with the topography of the educational landscape (B4). This respondent was supported by another who said that some staff in Nigerian universities have never been expected to formulate their own philosophies of education or their own views about teaching and learning, which is one reason why they have been traditional in their dealing with students (D2). To buttress this point, two respondents noted that given the increasing number of simulated scholars in Nigerian higher education institutions in the wake of the immense and rapid expansion of the universities, it is clearly seen that the doctorate degree is not sufficient for true scholarship, even though we are yet to meet the doctorate degree holder requirements in the university (C1, C5).

Two respondents said that a significant relationship existed between lecturer's productivity and manpower development (E2, E3). In addition, a respondent from a law faculty reported that a lack of staff development programmes accounted for the deterioration in quality of university education in Nigeria (C3). Similarly, one respondents explained,

I think any employee who is not exposed and trained to continuous reskilling in the contemporary methods and new discoveries in his or her field will soon become irrelevant to the organization (C2).

Four participants agreed that due to lack of opportunity for re-equipping, reskilling and mentoring of junior lecturers by professors, the junior lecturers were not exposed to new ideas, theories, research, facts or findings (A1, C4, D2, E3). Various scholars reported the deficiency of teacher education programmes in Nigeria (B1). One respondent said,

I think there is a need for additional training for teachers if quality in university education is to be attained in the country (C4).

Frequent labour disputes and closure of universities

The majority of respondents agreed that frequent labour disputes and the closure of universities have a direct impact on the quality of provision of universities in Nigeria. This was emphasized by four respondents who said that one of the biggest challenges to quality university education in Nigeria is the closures of institutions subsequent to incessant staff union disputes (B1, C2, D3, D5). Two respondents said that academic staff don't like going on strike but when the government fails to pay their salaries they have no choice but to take such action (E2, E4). Three other respondents said that the closure of institutions affects the realization of educational aims and objectives, as well as staff productivity (A3, C1, D4). One of the respondents explained,

I put this to you, imagine if you have to be home for six months as a result of strike, tell me how will you be productive, already there is discontinuity in your lectures, you can't start all over again, you have to continue from where you stop. Many students might have been disconnected from what you taught last (D4).

Another respondent mentioned,

I think government encourages staff going on strike, maybe the government enjoy it, I don't know because at the end of the day staff will go on strike for 3 months without work and they will be paid for not working after they call off the strike (B2).

A respondent, who raised a similar point to the dean of social and management science, said,

I think the government needs to know how they have continued to affect the operation of the university due to delay of payment, lack of response or slow response to university requests (A4).

Four respondents pointed out that the Senior Staff Association of Nigerian Universities (SSANU) and Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) in the last fourteen years had embarked on strikes that have lasted up to six months. They explained that without a doubt this action had negative effects on the quality of service provision of the universities (A3, B2, B4, E3). Two respondents identified the variables that led to strikes as poor funding, lack of autonomy or academic freedom, non-implementation of SSANU/FGN or ASUU/FGN agreements, all of which led to frequent trade union disputes as poor conditions of service for staff continue (C5, E4). Three deans from science faculties asserted that the disruption of academic programmes of institutions of higher learning affects students' learning outcomes, since lecturers find it difficult to complete the course work when due (B2, B4, B5). Another dean, from a faculty of law, was of the opinion that the frequent disputes and strikes galore by university students and staff leave students with little or no time to complete either their practical or theoretical work. He explains,

I think this has caused the university to gradually ignore the practical aspect of teaching as very little time is left to focus on theoretical aspects of the work (C2).

Five other deans shared a similar view that, in most cases, a semester's course work is sandwiched into a few weeks, during which time lectures are rushed to make up for the time lost to strike (A3, B2, C5, D2, E4). One dean expressed the idea that this type of academic rush is a big threat to attainment of quality university education in Nigeria (B2). Two other respondents claimed that the high the level of crisis, continued disruption and hostility of lectures to students when they returned from strike, as well as lower standards, affect productivity, and poor productivity will definitely affect the quality of the system (A1, E3). No wonder the debate as to whether Nigerian universities are producing quality education remains unanswered by the sector, while it fails to respond to the needs of the users.

Conclusion

The four major issues identified in this paper are not the end of all problems hindering the provision of quality education in Nigerian universities, but are the ones that were repeatedly and commonly listed in the review of the interviews with the 24 participants involved in the study. Therefore, resolving all these problems does not mean that quality will be achieved automatically. Likewise, not resolving these problems does not mean that quality will not be achieved. It depends on what you understand by quality and your view of quality at the particular time you are talking about the subject. It is worth mentioning here that the problems listed in this paper vary from one university to another, and therefore the paper does not provide solutions to the problems. The first stage of this research is to identify major challenges hindering quality provision in Nigerian universities. I also need to bring to the readers' attention that there are other problems not discussed in this paper but identified during the interview, which include poor customer service, that is the relationship between lectures/staff and students is poor; corrupt practice such as examination malpractice, unfair dealings among staff and students; a culture of laziness and procrastination; poor ethical standards such as an inconsistency in approach, behaviour and policy in practice; a lack of continuous professional development; and a situation where students can easily predict what approach a lecturer will use in taking his/her subject, showing that lecturers themselves are not creative in imparting knowledge. All these were raised during the interview section but further studies looking into contemporary issues or problems of Nigerian universities can look into them in detail. Having identified all these problems, solutions depend on individual levels of understanding of the problems. It is hard to assume that a similar approach will solve all the problems in all the universities. Again it is the responsibility of individual readers to study their environment properly to know whether or not similar problems exist and how best to resolve them.

REFERENCES

Adetunji, A. T. 2014. A critical realist study of quality management in Nigerian universities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cardiff Metropolitan University, South Wales, United Kingdom.

Adetunji, A. T. 2015. Quality Issues: Beyond The Nigerian Institution. *International Journal of Research Studies in Management,* 4(2), 3-13.

Akinyemi, G. M. and Abiddin, N. Z. 2013. Quality Administration and Management in Higher Education in Nigeria: Implications for Human Resource Development. *International Education Studies*, 6(4), 225-235.

Alani, R. A. (2008). Accreditation outcomes: quality of access to university education in Nigeria, *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(3), 301-312.

Ardi R., Hidayatno, A. and Zagloel, M. 2012. Investigating relationships among quality dimensions in higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education,* 20(4)*,* 408-428.

Campell, C. and Rozsnyani, C. 2002. "Quality Assurance and the Development of Course Programs", Papers on Higher Education, Bucharest, Unesco-CEPES, [Online]. Available at: http.www.emeraldinsight.compublished/emeraldfulltext article/pdf/1200140103_ref.html [Accessed 10 June, 2015].

Dauda, R. O. S. 2010. Investment in Education and Economic Growth in Nigeria: An Empirical Evidence. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 55, 158- 169.

Doherty, G. D. 2008. On quality in education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 16(3), 225-65.

Eagle, L. and Brennan, R. 2007. Are students customers? TQM and marketing perspectives. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 15(1), 44-60.

Ekundayo, H. T. and Ajayi, I. A. 2009. Towards effective management of university education in Nigeria. *International NGO Journal*, 4(8), 342-347.

Harvey, L. 2005. A history and critique of quality evaluation in the UK. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 13(4), 263-276.

Harvey, L. 2009. "A critical analysis of quality culture". [Online]. Available at: http.www.inqaahe.org/admin/files /assets/subsites/1/documenten/1241773373_16-harvey-a-critical- analysis-of-qualityculture.pdf [Accessed 19 September 2015].

Harvey, L., and Williams, J. 2010. Fifteen years of quality in higher education. *Quality in Higher Education*, 16(1), 3–36.

Heyneman, S. P. (2006). "Global Issues in Higher Education". Journal U.S.A, [Online]. Available at: http://usinfo.state.gov/journals/itgic/0206/ijge/heyneman.html [Accessed 31 October, 2015].

Iacovidou, M., Gibbs, P. and Zopiatis, A. 2009. An exploratory use of stakeholder approach to defining and measuring quality: the case of Cypriot higher education institution. *Quality in Higher Education*, 15(2), 147-165.

Marsh, H. W. and Roche, L. A. 2000. Effects of grading leniency and low workload on students' evaluation of teaching: popular myth, bias, validity, or innocent bystanders? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 92(1), 202-28.

Modebelu, M. N. and Joseph, A. 2012. Strategic Planning Procedure: An Imperative for Effective Management of Higher Education in Nigeria. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(15), 20-30.

Nakpodia, E. 2011. Team Management as an Effective Technique for the Management of Schools in Nigeria. *African Journal of Social Sciences*, 1(1), 83-91.

Obasi, I. N., Akuchie, R. C. and Obasi, S. N. 2010. Expansion of Higher Education Access through Private Universities in Nigeria (1999-2009): A Decade of Public Policy Failure? Paper presented at a National Conference on Education for Nation Building and Global Competitiveness, organized by NERDC at the International Conference Centre, Abuja.

Okechukwu, F. C. and Okechukwu, F. C. 2011. "Total Quality Management in Higher Education: Symbolism Or Substance? a Close Look at the Nigerian University System". [Online]. http://books.google.com.my/books?hl=enandlr=andid=IA [Accessed 11 September 2015].

Sahney, S., Banwet, D.K. and Karunes, S. 2006. An integrated framework for quality in education: application of quality function deployment, interpretive structural modelling and path analysis. *Total Quality Management*, 17(2), 265-285.

Stensaker, B., Harvey, L. and Amaral, A. 2011. *Accountability in higher education: global perspectives on trust and power*. New York: Routledge.

Veiga, A., Rosa, M. J., Tavares, D. and Amaral, A. 2012. Why is it difficult to grasp the impacts of the Portuguese quality assurance system? *European Journal of Education*, 48(3), 454-470.

Watty, K. 2005. Quality in accounting education: what say the academics? *Quality Assurance in Education* 13(2), 120-131.

Yorke, M. 1999. Assuring quality and standards in globalised higher education. *Quality Assurance in Education*, 7(1), 14 - 24.

****