Accreditation: Enhancement Tool For Quality Control In Universities In Rivers State

Isi, Fortune Ihuoma

Department of Educational Management, Faculty of Education,
Ignatius Ajuru University of Education, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt

Abstract: The focus of this study was to ascertain the impact of Accreditation as an enhancement tool for quality control, in Universities in Rivers State Nigeria. The study was guided by four objectives, four Research Questions and Four Hypotheses. The study adopted descriptive design using random sampling technique. A sample size of 182 determined using Krejcie and Morgan Sampling Table (1970) obtained from population of 410 comprise of University managers, and other categories of workers. After careful validation of instrument, One hundred and Eighty-Nine (189) questionnaires were distributed and One Hundred and Eighty- Two (182) copies was retrieved, Mean and standard deviation were employed to answer the questionnaires while the Spearman Rank Order Correlation in SPSS version 22.0 statistics was employed to analyze the hypotheses. Findings revealed that Accreditation is a major strategy for quality control in universities, that accreditation results are not monitored as a follow up to maintain consistency, It was also revealed that Universities do a lot of window dressing during accreditation as a result making it difficult for the National Universities Commission (NUC) to come up with authentic result. It was therefore recommended that university leadership should present the universities the way they are for accreditation to enable them know the area they need to improve on, they should also constitute internal and external follow up team.

Keywords: Accreditation, Enhancement, Tool, Quality Control, University Management

I. INTRODUCTION

The importance of university Education in any country's developments is overwhelming and cannot be overemphasized. Nigeria is a home to over 200 million people with about 350 distinct languages. The main aim of the Federal Government is to mainstream policies, coordination and monitoring in the tertiary institutions to maintain a uniform standard and achieve the national goal of education.

According to Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004) the teaching and research function of Higher Education has important role to play in national development especially in the development of high-level work force.

The National Policy on Education (1998) defines Tertiary or University Education as education given at the post-secondary level, which include; the Universities, Polytechnic, Monotechnics and Colleges of Education in Nigeria Higher Education.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Universities are governed by a body known as the National Universities Commission(NUC), one of their objective is to ensure standard education, quality education, ensure that programmes are accredited; universities abide by the policies and regulations governing the institutions and the establishment of programmes. They approve the establishment of new universities, monitor the existing ones and accredit new programmes. From time to time, they go for university accreditation exercise to see if the universities are maintaining quality assurance. Despite what the NUC do, it seems that the impacts is not felt in the Universities, the standard of education has remained at the same level where universities are underfunded, over populated with students, under furnished with facilities, dilapidated structures, and obsolete materials in the library, laboratory, Certificate forgery, embezzlement and under employed with personnel. Hence, the

reason for this study; to evaluate and enhance the accreditation strategy in order to improve the university quality control mechanism.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The result of this study will provide reasonable information to the agencies that monitors institutions, be it primary, Secondary or higher institutions, it will give the Government an insight on the measure to take in improving the accreditation strategy for quality control, they .will find out if the strategy is working as planned, what hinders its effectiveness and how to improve on it.

AIM AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

The aim of the study was to investigate the impact of accreditation as a quality control tool in the universities in Rivers State. The study will address the following objectives:

✓ Ascertain the impact of types of accreditation on institutions quality control
✓ Determine the impact of different accreditation status on institutions quality control
✓ Examine the impact of accreditation process in the institutions quality control
✓ Determine the deficiencies in accreditation process of the institutions

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Four research questions were posed guide the study

✓ To what extent has types of accreditation affected the quality control of the institutions
✓ To what extent has different accreditation status affected the quality control of the institutions
✓ To what extent has accreditation process enhanced the institutions quality control
✓ To what extent has deficiencies of accreditation process affected the institutions quality control

HYPOTHESES

FOUR HYPOTHESES WERE TESTED FOR THE STUDY

✓ Accreditation types has not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions
✓ Different accreditation status has not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions
✓ Accreditation Process has not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions
✓ Deficiencies of accreditation exercise has not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions

STUDY AREA

The Location of the study is Port Harcourt Metropolis; it is one of the major local Government Areas of Rivers State. Nigeria. It is one of the largest Cities in Rivers State; it is equally competing alongside with Lagos and Abuja in economic and population growth due to its large

industrialisation this why this study in order to study the educational sector because of its younger generation.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

OVERVIEW OF ACCREDITATION

Accreditation is one of the strategies to improve quality control in tertiary institutions and achieve the above listed goals; we must not ignore the need to oversee the affairs or activities that go on in the universities. NUC is the body that regulates the universities; they are responsible to set up minimum academic standard policies, academic programs and the courses to run in the universities. They plan, organize, manage, fund, supervise and monitor the development of tertiary and university education.

Accreditation is the official recognition and approval of universities, programmes and courses that are run in the universities, it is an official review that the universities have met specific standard. It is peer and self-assessment based specifically for public accountability and for general purpose of improving academic standard. It ensures quality assurance and to maintain parity in all the relevant and important institutions to meet specific standards, it ensures that degrees are not just attained but sustained.

Accreditation exercise in universities is a process based on self and peer assessment. It is for the improvement of academic quality and accountability, done periodically. Accreditation provides opportunity to advise the government or private owners of institutions on how to revitalize their institutions in line with set standards. (Isyaku &Akale, 2003)

Accreditation is a pre-requisite for the various awards, and degrees in our higher institutions, it major aim is to ensure quality programme and ensure the quality of degrees and maintain parity in all relevant institutions in accordance with the set standards. Accreditation is the only strategy that has stood the test of time in ensuring quality in the tertiary institution, it is a quality assurance strategy through which educational services and activities are, evaluated, determined and verified to have met with appropriate and approved standards by the appropriate agency.

CONCEPT OF QUALITY CONTROL

Quality control is the mechanism by which an educational system employs to ensure that the education it delivers serves the purpose for which it was intend to; to ensure that the education it offers retains its standard and remains relevant to the needs of the society. It is a retroaction used to determine the quality of a product or a system after processing and wastages would have occurred, and then we can reject or ratify what is left. (Ijaiya, 2001)

Ayodele (2008) sees quality control as a certain relative measure against a common standard; he opines that quality in education means different things to different people and perceived differently by different professionals. In higher education, quality could mean the quality of graduate it produces and quality of learning it offer. So, one can say that quality control is the systematic organization of things put in

place to maintain stability and excellent that would win the confidence and trust of one's client. We have External and Internal Quality control:

Simply, External is the action of the external body (NUC, NBTC, UBE, etc) and Internal is the mechanisms put in place to guide the quality of the products within the organization (Universities etc).

Considering the vision of the commission to be dynamic regulatory agency acting as a catalyst for positive change and innovation for the delivery of quality university education in Nigeria, we have to consider some of the strategies they have employed over the years to achieve this vision and the extent to which this strategies have worked.

Other strategies include benchmarking. Supervision, exchange and linkage programmes but for the purpose of this study only accreditation was discussed in detail.

Bench marking is comparing the academic performance, standard products of the academic institutions.

Supervision is a critical watch over the institutions to see if they are following the guidelines prepared by NUC

Exchange and linkage programme is a process whereby services are exchanged, staff of one university goes to the other university to study their system for a period of time, learns a new thing and employ it to improve in their area of weakness, a student gets a double degree from two university at the same time. (Isi, 2015),

THE GOALS OF TERTIARY EDUCATION

✓ To contribute to national development through high-level relevant man power training.
✓ To develop the intellectual capability of individuals understand and appreciate their local and external environments.
✓ To develop and inculcate proper values for the survival of the individual
✓ To promote and encourage scholarships and community services.
✓ To forge and cement national unity
✓ To promote national and international understanding and institutions
✓ To acquire both physical and intellectual skills which enables the individuals to be self-reliant and useful members of the society

ACCREDITATION AS AN ENHANCEMENT TOOL TO ENSURE QUALITY CONTROL IN UNIVERSITIES

The council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) in Washington defines accreditation as a process of external review engaged by higher education to evaluate programmes to ensure quality and standard. Accreditation is one of the most effective strategies that the NUC have employed over the years to improve on the quality of the universities; over the years it has been one of the existing criteria for quality control in Nigeria. (Okojie, 2008)

In Nigeria, accreditation involves teams of experts from other institutions who are engaged by relevant agencies or commissions (NUC, NBTE and NCCE) to visit respective institutions at a given periodic interval most probably every

five years for accreditation or for re-accreditation of new and existing courses and programmes. We have the team chair that is selected by the Commission through accreditation, this team of persons reviews the university's programmes and course; they do this to ensure that universities have the necessary facilities, personnel, and infrastructure, that they are obeying the NUC laid down policies and guidelines for quality and unified university education.

The essence of accreditation is to validate the quality of graduates of the universities, polytechnics and colleges of education if they are adequate for employments and for further studies.

It provides the universities opportunities for self-evaluation on both available academic infrastructure and quality of available personnel and resources (Isyaku and Akale, 2003).

The process of accreditation is designed whether or not the universities have met or exceeded the stipulated standards set by the external body such as government, national quality assurance agency or professional association for accreditation, and whether it is achieving its mission or stated objectives.

Accreditation makes university programmes legitimate and appropriate institution programme or module of study. Accreditation is aimed at strengthening the programme of the universities for quality assurance; it assures the educational community, the general public and other organisations that the accredited institutions have met the required standards for effective and quality education. (Obadara, &Alaka, 2013)

The extent to which an institution accepts and fulfils the responsibilities inherent in this process is a measure of its concern for quality in Higher education and its commitment to strive for quality achievement.

TYPES OF ACCREDITATION

According to United States Department of Education (USDE) there are two types of accreditation which are;

✓ *INSTITUTIONAL ACCREDITATION:* This type of accreditation applies to an entire institution indicating that every institutional objective was to achieve institutional quality, though it has been very easy to run a unified educational system in Nigeria. The agency in charge of university accreditation (NUC) performs institutional accreditation as the national accreditation agencies do, such as the board (NBTE).

In Nigeria institutional accreditation is a choice of the institution, they apply to the agency for accreditation when they have introduced new programme or course in the institution to get accredited status and when they do they abide under the regulation of the agency and agrees to take responsibilities for her improvement. Institutions want to recognise as an accredited institution because of its importance for example institute of chartered accountant exempts students from accredited institution from taking its professional examinations. (Utuka, 2011)

✓ *PROGRAMMATIC OR SPECIALISED ACCREDITATION:* The accreditation type applies to the programmes, departments, or school that are part of the institutions. The accredited unit maybe as large a college or school or as small as curriculum within the discipline,

Most of the accrediting agency reviews the units within an institution of higher education.

Accreditation of institution be it institutional or programmatic, it is an avenue to examine the institution in relation to where it ought to be. It serves as a quality assurance process, through these universities and programmes ensure quality and standards, it is a signal to both parents and students that an institution is accredited or not, such institutions meets standards for its faculty curriculum and services to students. It becomes very paramount for the agencies to do a thorough job and reports in sincerity to the federal government who through the ministry of education and the agencies monitors the quality institutions and the programmes in which students enrol. (Utuka, 2011)

THE GOALS OF ACCREDITATION

External quality assurance according to martin and Anthony (2006) has three main purposes.

- Quality control
- Accountability/Guidance
- Improvement purposes

Accreditation in the Nigeria University system has three stated objectives namely:

- ✓ To ensure that at least the provisions of the minimum Academic standards (MAS) documents are attained, maintained and enhanced
- ✓ To assure employers of labour and other members of the community that Nigerian graduates of all academic programmes have attained an acceptable level of competence in their areas of specialization and
- ✓ Certify to the international community that the programmes offered in Nigeria universities are of high standards and their graduates are adequate for employments and for further studies

Programmes are evaluated and scored based on the following criteria

Staffing	32
Academic content	23
Physical facilities	25
Library	12
Funding	5
Employers rating	3
Total	100

Each criterion has component indices with varying weightings' as contained in the manual of accreditation procedures for academic programmes in Nigeria universities. According to the national universities commission, Nigeria, the accreditation status for a programme is determined after a summary of scores awarded by each panel member is entered into the accreditations panel report form (NUC/APRF) which becomes the accreditation panel's recommendation.

ACCREDITATION PROCESS

Global Practice in accreditation typically adopts four major processes which include:

- ✓ *DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDS:* Fundamental to the process of accreditation is agreement on a set of standards sponsored by a national accrediting body, which are applied evenly to all institutions of higher education or their programs in the country. These standards, whether institutional or programmatic accreditation follow the component list for institutional accreditation as earlier highlighted.
- ✓ *SELF-EVALUATION:* The institution or program undergoing the process is asked to respond to the standards in a written report. It is typical that several months are allowed for this process to assure that the self-evaluation includes as much of the community as possible (e.g., administrative and teaching staff, students, employers, etc.)
- ✓ *EXTERNAL REVIEW:* A team of experts, representative of the national higher education community (professional community in the case of programmatic accreditation) review that self-evaluation report prepared by the institution are as compared to the standards for accreditation and visit the institution/programme is doing what it says it is doing.
- ✓ *ACCREDITATION DECISION:* Based on the self-evaluation and the feedback of the external reviewers, a decision is reached by the national accreditation body as to whether the institution or programme is accredited or not or is on probation for a certain period of time during which improvement have to be made before its status can change.

TYPES OF ACCREDITATION STATUS

- ✓ *FULL ACCREDITATION STATUS:* a total overall score of 70% and above in addition to scoring at least 70% in each of the core areas of staffing, academic content, physical facilities and library. When an institution acquires the full status it gives them the opportunity to be the public choice, it announces their quality of programme
- ✓ *INTERIM ACCREDITATION STATUS:* an overall score of 60% or more but less than 70% OR an overall total score of 70% and above but with a score less than 70% in any of the four core areas identified in (A)above. This status puts or keeps the institution in a probation period, by this they prepare for another accreditation after maybe 2 or 3years having corrected, updated and made amendments of the previous mistakes, corrections and shortfalls.
- ✓ *DENIED ACCREDITATION STATUS:* An overall score of less than 60%. Denial means that the institution will have stop running that programme for the time being. The visitation of an accreditation team to higher institutions of learning is meant to be a careful audit of the academic programmes of the institutions and of the variables which have influence on the quality assurance of the systems and their products. Relevant agencies/ commissions publish the results of the accreditation exercise for the respective institutions and the general public. Programmes of courses maybe granted Full, Interim or Denied accreditation.

Each of these has implication for the operation of the system. We should note that two major problems emerged.

These problems are (i) maintenance of standards and ensuring quality assurance of the present set of higher institutions that we have and (ii) obtaining and increasing funds to cope with the enlarged student population.

DEFICIENCIES OF ACCREDITATION PROCESS

University education faces more challenges over questions of performance by the citizens, there is a great challenge to satisfy those looking for quality education, different people, and agencies, and labour markets looking for benchmarks to take graduates in their ranks; it becomes necessary for accreditation process in order to checkmate the quality of institution, research, programmes and courses. According to Kevin care new American foundation "No one likes accreditation but no one knows what to do". Some of the challenges are seen in the area of:

✓ *COST:* If what the institution benefits are not commensurate with what is spent both on the institution and in terms of fund, then quality assurance is not worthwhile. Practicing accreditation is costly, the most important goal of every institution is to provide quality education and maintain standards. Maintaining a standard is quite expensive, it is always not possible to reduce the cost of education, if we must achieve quality education, but it is not necessary to have efficiency and reduce the cost of education without compromising standards, to be successful with cost reduction, we must outsources tasks, this is by looking out to other means to tackle activities that are not directly to the school. Ensuring that students that graduate at record time, it will help the university to save more money.

✓ *DEVELOPING A SELF-EVALUATION CULTURE:* Accreditation ensures regular and constant development, performance, and improvements on curriculum, accountability is required and it becomes a burden for the staff and lecturers because they must put in energy and time. From time to time it is necessary for the institutions to check their performances; this can be done by setting up a Pre- accreditation team that will carry out the exercise maybe quarterly or yearly as the case maybe. (Okojie, 2008)

✓ *INSTITUTIONAL AUTONOMY:* Accreditation exposes how each institution function in order to achieve their goals, how they define their vision, mission, any institution that is built on set of principle and policies sees accreditation as a treat its existing principles already existing, it is advisable for institutions to adapt a balance.

✓ *WINDOW DRESSING:* Universities do a lot of window dressing during accreditation; the essence of accreditation is not to destroy any institution but to help improve the universities standard and quality, draw Government attention to areas of need and to ensure that the universities are complying with the NUC standards. The fact remains that NUC do not get the actual result due to the inability of the universities to present their institutions the way they are; they go about hiring personnel to make up staffing, borrow facilities, books to update their libraries during accreditation, the university management will paint the enter building and do clean up but as soon as the accreditation is over everything goes back as usual. This is a very big factor that hinders accreditation process. Universities are meant to present themselves as they were and after accreditation should be able to accept the report and make amends. (Isi, 2015)

✓ *LACK OF POST ACCREDITATION EXERCISE:* Many institutions do not actually have the materials they present during accreditation exercise, they either hire, borrow or improvise and after accreditation they return the materials back to their owners while the system remain as they were.

Heads of Departments, Deans of faculties, Vice Chancellors and the managers of the organisation do not in earnest purchase or make available what they have proposed for the accreditation.

III. CONCLUSION

National Universities Commission and the universities have good and perfect plans to establish and maintain quality in the tertiary education but, it is very obvious that there is no consistency in the implementation of this strategies and plans to achieve quality education. They also do not uphold their responsibilities; the research found out that there is duty negligence both on the side of the university management and NUC. This is seen in the area of poor output of graduates, lack of facilities and personnel even after due accreditation process. Though the commission and the university management are bedevilled with many challenges such as; Window dressing, depressed funding, inadequate infrastructure, university autonomy, and unemployment. It is not difficult to establish criteria for successful and full accreditation status, but very difficult to uphold these criteria without compromise by the bodies or institutions involved.

✓ Research Question One: To what extent has accreditation types affected the quality control of the institutions

ITEM	SA	A	SD	D
1.Every institutional objectives was to achieve institutional quality				
2.The agencies in charge performs institutional accreditation				
3.It is a choice of the institution				
4.Institutions apply only when there is new programme				
5.Institutions are recognised by the type of accreditation				
6. Programmatic accreditation applies to programme, department, faculties and school in the institutions.				
7.It is a quality assurance process				

ITEM				
8.It helps the agencies to do a thorough job				
9.Agencies monitors the institutions and reports back to the Federal Government				
10. It is very stressful to institutions				

✓ Research Question Two: To what extent has different accreditation status affected the quality control of the institutions

ITEM	SA	A	SD	D
1. It gives the institution the opportunity to become public choice.				
2. It announces their quality of program.				
3. It gives them the power to admit and run that particular program.				
4. It gives the institution room for improvement.				
5. Denied Accreditation stops the Institution from running an illegal program or unapproved programme.				
6. It is a careful audit of the program.				
7. Agencies publish result to alert the public.				
8. It helps the institution to maintain standard.				
9. It helps Institutions to ensure quality programs.				
10. They obtain and increase funds to cope with student's population.				

✓ Research Question Three: To what extent has accreditation process enhanced the institutions quality?

ITEM	SA	A	SD	D
1. It is applied evenly to all institutions of higher learning.				
2. Irrespective of type of accreditation, they follow component list.				
3. Institutions are asked to respond to standards in written report.				
4. Development of standard is fundamental to accreditation process.				
5.self-evaluation include administrative, staff, students etc.				
6. External reviewed				

ITEM				
includes the visit to the institution, to see what they're to do.				
7. National accreditation body makes decision on whether institution or program is accredited or not.				
8. Institution or program are reaccredited in 3 or 5 years.				
9. Accreditation panel.				

✓ Research Question Four: what extent has deficiencies of accreditation excess affected the institutions quality control

ITEM	SA	A	SD	D
1. Quality control is not worthwhile if institutions spend more than they get.				
2. To maintain a standard is quite expensive practicing accreditation is expensive.				
3. It is not always possible to reduce the cost of education.				
4. If we achieve must achieve quality we must out source.				
5 .Accreditation exposes how institution functions in order to achieve their goals.				
6. Any institution built on principles sees accreditation as a treat.				
7. Universities do a lot of window dressing in order to earn full status.				
8. Universities are not adequately funded during accreditation.				
9. There is no follow up after accreditation.				
10. Those in charge do not earnestly purchase what is approved for the department a faculty.				

IV. RESULTS

RESEARCH QUESTION 1

To what extent has types of accreditation affected the quality control of the institutions?
N=182

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
1.	Every institutional objective was to achieve institutional quality.	3.14	0.85	-0.99	0.65	High
2.	The agencies in charge perform institutional	3.15	0.90	-1.08	0.58	High

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
	accreditation.					
3.	It is a choice of the institution.	1.92	1.01	0.86	-0.39	Low
4.	Institutions apply only when there is new programme.	2.12	1.00	0.53	-0.79	Low
5.	Institutions are recognised by the type of accreditation.	2.97	1.00	-0.83	-0.31	High
6.	Programmatic accreditation applies to programme, department, faculties and school in the institutions.	3.21	0.95	-1.15	0.43	Very High
7.	It is a quality assurance process.	3.14	0.91	-1.08	0.56	High
8.	It helps the agencies to do a thorough job.	3.18	0.85	-1.11	0.97	High
9.	Agencies monitor the institutions and reports back to the Federal Government.	3.15	0.89	-1.25	1.17	High
10.	It is very stressful to institutions.	3.15	0.83	-1.01	0.83	High
	Grand Mean & SD	**2.91**	**0.92**			**High**

Table 1: The Extent to which types of Accreditation affected the Quality Control of the Institutions

Results in table 1 show the extent to which types of accreditation affected the quality control of the institutions. The results indicated that the item mean for this subscale ranged from 1.92 (SD = 1.01) to 3.21 (SD = 0.95). The highest scored item in this subscale was 'programmatic accreditation applies to programme, department, faculties and school in the institutions' (Mean = 3.21; SD = 0.95). The lowest scored item was 'it is a choice of the institution' (Mean = 1.92; SD = 1.01) respectively. This was the least item among others. Although, all the items are highly rated with their various $means > 2.50$ and a grand mean of 2.91(SD=0.92) except item 3 and 4.

RESEARCH QUESTION 2

To what extent has different accreditation status affected the quality control of the institutions?
N=182

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
11.	It gives the institution the opportunity to become public choice.	3.13	0.90	-0.94	-0.03	High
12.	It announces their quality of program.	2.97	1.00	-0.83	-0.31	High
13.	It gives them the power to admit and run that particular program.	3.14	0.80	-0.99	0.652	High
14.	It gives the institution room for improvement.	3.14	0.80	-0.99	0.66	High
15.	Denied Accreditation stops the Institution from running an illegal program or	3.18	0.80	-1.04	0.98	High

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
	unapproved programme.					
16.	It is a careful audit of the program.	3.16	0.80	-1.1	0.98	High
17.	Agencies publish result to alert the public.	3.13	0.90	-0.94	-0.03	High
18.	It helps the institution to maintain standard.	3.14	0.90	-1.08	0.56	High
19.	It helps Institutions to ensure quality programs.	3.14	0.90	-1.02	0.54	High
20.	They obtain and increase funds to cope with student's population.	3.15	0.80	-1.01	0.83	High
	Grand Mean & SD	**3.13**	**0.09**			**High**

Table 2: The Extent to which Different Accreditation Status Affected the Quality Control of the Institutions

Results in table 2 show the extent to which different accreditation status affected the quality control of the institutions. The results indicated that the item mean for this subscale ranged from 2.97 (SD = 1.00) to 3.18 (SD = 0.80). The highest scored item in this subscale was 'denied accreditation stops the institution from running an illegal program or unapproved programme' (Mean = 3.18; SD = 0.80). The lowest scored item was 'it is a choice of the institution' (Mean = 2.97; SD = 1.00) respectively. This was the least item among others. Although, all the items are highly rated with their various $means > 2.50$ and a grand mean of 3.13(SD=0.09).

RESEARCH QUESTION 3

To what extent has accreditation process enhanced the institutions quality control?
N=182

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
21.	It is applied evenly to all institutions of higher learning.	3.14	0.91	-1.08	0.56	High
22.	Irrespective of type of accreditation, they follow component list.	2.97	1.00	-0.83	-0.31	High
23.	Institutions are asked to respond to standards in written report.	3.02	0.98	-0.9	-0.11	High
24.	Development of standard is fundamental to accreditation process.	3.16	0.85	-1.02	0.72	High
25.	self-evaluation include administrative,	3.13	0.95	-0.94	-0.03	High

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
	staff, students etc.					
26.	External reviewed includes the visit to the institution, to see what they're to do.	3.08	0.95	-0.9	-0.03	High
27.	National accreditation body makes decision on whether institution or program is accredited or not.	3.17	0.81	-0.95	0.68	High
28.	Institution or programs are reaccredited in 3 or 5 years.	2.96	1.07	-0.72	-0.74	High
29.	Accreditation panel.	3.18	0.81	-1.04	0.98	High
	Grand Mean & SD	**3.09**	**0.93**			**High**

Table 3: The Extent to which Accreditation Process Enhanced the Institutions Quality Control

Results in table 3 show the extent to which accreditation process enhanced the institutions quality control. The results indicated that the item mean for this subscale ranged from 2.96 (SD = 1.07) to 3.18 (SD = 0.81). The highest scored item in this subscale was 'accreditation panel' (Mean = 3.18; SD = 0.81). The lowest scored item was 'institution or programs are reaccredited in 3 or 5 years' (Mean = 2.96; SD = 1.07) respectively. This was the least item among others. Although, all the items are highly rated with their various *means* > 2.50 and a grand mean of 3.09(SD=0.93)

RESEARCH QUESTION 4

To what extent has deficiencies of accreditation process affected the institutions quality control?
N=182

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
30.	Quality control is not worthwhile if institutions spend more than they get.	3.10	0.65	-0.23	1.03	High
31.	To maintain a standard is quite expensive practicing accreditation is expensive.	3.02	0.98	-0.9	-0.11	High
32.	It is not always possible to reduce the cost of education.	2.99	1.03	-0.71	-0.65	High
33.	If we achieve must achieve quality we must out source.	2.96	0.97	-0.65	-0.53	High
34.	Accreditation exposes how institution functions in order to achieve their goals.	2.93	0.99	-0.73	-0.43	High
35.	Any institution built on principles sees accreditation as a	3.18	0.83	-1.1	1.09	High

S/NO	Items	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis	Remark
	treat.					
36.	Universities do a lot of window dressing in order to earn full status.	2.96	1.07	-0.72	-0.74	High
37.	Universities are not adequately funded during accreditation.	3.04	0.88	-0.76	-0.01	High
38.	There is no follow up after accreditation.	2.96	1.07	-0.72	-0.74	High
39.	Those in charge do not earnestly purchase what is approved for the department a faculty.	3.14	0.86	-1.07	0.8	High
	Grand Mean & SD	**3.03**	**0.93**			**High**

Table 4: The Extent to which Deficiencies of Accreditation Process Affected the Institutions Quality Control

Results in table 4 show the extent to which deficiencies of accreditation process affected the institutions quality control. The results indicated that the item mean for this subscale ranged from 2.93 (SD = 0.99) to 3.18 (SD = 0.83). The highest scored item in this subscale was 'any institution built on principles sees accreditation as a treat' (Mean = 3.18; SD = 0.80). The lowest scored item was 'accreditation exposes how institution functions in order to achieve their goals' (Mean = 2.93; SD = 0.99) respectively. This was the least item among others. Although, all the items are highly rated with their various *means* > 2.50 and a grand mean of 3.03(SD=0.93).

HYPOTHESIS 1

Accreditation types have not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions.

Correlations

			Accreditation Types	Quality Control
Spearman's rho	Accreditation Types	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.954**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	182	182
	Quality Control	Correlation Coefficient	.954**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	182	182

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 5: Comparing Accreditation Types and Quality Control of the Institutions using Spearman Rho correlation statistics

The result in table 5 above shows that the relationship between accreditation types and quality control (r(180)=.954; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis one while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between accreditation types and quality control as such accreditation types are associated with quality control.

HYPOTHESIS 2

Different accreditation status has not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions.

Correlations

	N		Different Accreditation Status	Quality Control
Spearman's rho	Different Accreditation Status	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.974**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	182	182
	Quality Control	Correlation Coefficient	.974**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	182	182

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 6: Comparing Different Accreditation Status and Quality Control of the Institutions using Spearman Rho correlation statistics

The result in table 6 above shows that the relationship between different accreditation status and quality control (r(180)=.974; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis two while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between different accreditation status and quality control as such different accreditation status is associated with quality control.

HYPOTHESIS 3

Accreditation process has not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions.

Correlations

			Accreditation Process	Quality Control
Spearman's rho	Accreditation Process	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.987**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	182	182
	Quality Control	Correlation Coefficient	.987**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	182	182

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 7: Comparing Different Accreditation Process and Quality Control of the Institutions using Spearman Rho correlation statistics

The result in table 7 above shows that the relationship between accreditation process and quality control (r(180)=.987; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis three while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between accreditation process and quality control as such accreditation process is associated with quality control.

HYPOTHESIS 4

Deficiencies of accreditation exercise has not significantly affected the quality control of the institutions.

Correlations

			Deficiencies of Accreditation Exercise	Quality Control
Spearman's rho	Deficiencies of Accreditation Exercise	Correlation Coefficient	1.000	.964**
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.000
		N	182	182
	Quality Control	Correlation Coefficient	.964**	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.
		N	182	182

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Table 8: Comparing Deficiencies of Accreditation Exercise and Quality Control of the Institutions using Spearman Rho correlation statistics

The result in table 8 above shows that the relationship between deficiencies of accreditation exercise and quality control (r(180)=.964; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis four while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between deficiencies of accreditation exercise and quality control as such accreditation process is associated with quality control.

V. DISCUSSION

THE EXTENT TO WHICH ACCREDITATION TYPES AFFECTED THE QUALITY CONTROL OF THE INSTITUTIONS

The purpose of this study is to examine the above. This was verified by research question one and tested with hypothesis one. Items 1-10 on the B part of the questionnaire were carefully constructed to answer this question. The grand mean stood at 2.91(SD=0.92). The result shows that the relationship between accreditation types and quality control (r(180)=.954; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis one while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between accreditation types and quality control as such accreditation types are associated with quality control.

THE EXTENT TO WHICH DIFFERENT ACCREDITATION STATUS AFFECTED THE QUALITY CONTROL OF THE INSTITUTIONS

The purpose of this study is to examine the above. This was verified by research question two and tested with hypothesis two. Items 11-20 on the B part of the questionnaire were carefully constructed to answer this question. The grand mean stood at 3.13(SD=0.09). The result shows that the

relationship between different accreditation status and quality control (r(180)=.974; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis two while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between different accreditation status and quality control as such different accreditation status is associated with quality control.

THE EXTENT TO WHICH ACCREDITATION PROCESS ENHANCED THE INSTITUTIONS QUALITY CONTROL

The purpose of this study is to examine the above. This was verified by research question three and tested with hypothesis three. Items 21-29 on the B part of the questionnaire were carefully constructed to answer this question. The grand mean stood at 3.09(SD=0.93). The result shows that the relationship between accreditation process and quality control (r(180)=.987; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis three while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between accreditation process and quality control as such accreditation process is associated with quality control.

THE EXTENT TO WHICH DEFICIENCIES OF ACCREDITATION PROCESS AFFECTED THE INSTITUTIONS QUALITY CONTROL

The purpose of this study is to examine the above. This was verified by research question four and tested with hypothesis four. Items 30-39 on the B part of the questionnaire were carefully constructed to answer this question. The grand mean stood at 3.03(SD=0.93). The result shows that the

relationship between deficiencies of accreditation exercise and quality control (r(180)=.964; p<.0001) is strongly positive and significant at .05 alpha level. Since p<.05, we have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis four while retaining the alternative at .05 alpha level. This implies that there is a significant relationship between deficiencies of accreditation exercise and quality control as such accreditation process is associated with quality control.

REFERENCES

[1] Alani, R.A & Ilusanya, G. (2008), Accreditation outcomes, quality of and access to university education in Nigeria. Journal of quality assurance in education, 16(3), 301-312

[2] Isyaku, K & Akale, M.A.G (2003), Strategies for achieving and maintaining quality teacher education, the experience of NCCE 1990- 2003.paper presented at the 18th annual congress of Nigerian academy of education (NAE) university of Port Harcourt

[3] Isi, F.I (2015), Assessment of National universities Commission quality control strategies in Nigerian universities.

[4] Okoji, J.A (2008), Licensing accreditation and quality assurance in Nigerian universities: achievements and challenges: a paper presented at a session of the 2018 CHEA summer workshop

[5] Obadara, O.E &Alaka, A. A (2013), Accreditation and quality assurance in Nigerian universities, Journal of education and practice, 4(8).34-41

[6] Utuka, G (2011), Demonstrating quality evaluation of institutional and programme accreditation in Ghana. International journal of vocational and technical education, 3(8), 133-142