UNIOFFA JOURNAL OF INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDIES (OJIS)
A Multidisciplinary Journal of Science, Management and Social Sciences

IMPACT OF QUALITY ASSURANCE ON EDUCATION SERVICE DELIVERY IN ILORIN METROPOLIS OF KWARA STATE, NIGERIA (2019-2024)

MUHAMMED IDRIS DANJUMA. Ph.D
Muhammed.danjuma@kwasu.edu.ng, (+234) 08031963854

AKEEM AYANDA ARABA. Ph.D
Araba.akeem@kwasu.edu.ng, (+234) 08058381111

HAMMED AKANBI ORIRE
Hammedorire1@gmail.com, (+234) 08164636993
Kwara State University, Malete, Department of Politics and Governance

ABSTRACT

Quality assurance in education has become a central focus of academic and policy discussions worldwide due to its crucial role in improving service delivery and educational outcomes. The main objective of this study is to examine the effect of quality assurance on service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education. The study was anchored on deming's total quality management (TQM) theory. This study used descriptive design through primary data with the used of questionnaire method. The qualitative and quantitative data were presented and analyzed using table of frequency distribution and regression analysis through statistical package for social science (version 20.0). The finding shows that systematic and continuous monitoring through inspections, reporting, and performance feedback strengthens accountability and responsiveness in educational service provision. The study concludes that quality assurance mechanisms exert a significant influence on educational service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education. The existence of well-defined legal frameworks provides a structural foundation for quality management, but the level of effectiveness depends on implementation fidelity, funding, and personnel capacity. The study recommends that the Ministry should regularly review and update its legal and policy documents guiding quality assurance to reflect current educational realities. Dissemination workshops and sensitization programs should be conducted to improve awareness among all staff levels and monitoring and evaluation exercises should be conducted more frequently and supported by digital reporting tools to ensure transparency, timeliness, and efficiency in inspection and feedback.

Keywords: Quality Assurance, Legal Framework, Mechanism, Service Delivery, Education.

Introduction

Quality assurance in education has become a central focus of academic and policy discussions worldwide due to its crucial role in improving service delivery and educational outcomes (Alfolabi & Ayuba, 2020). The concept of quality assurance encompasses systematic efforts to ensure that educational services meet predetermined standards, enhancing the effectiveness of teaching and administrative processes. In the Ministry of Education, particularly in developing countries like Nigeria, quality assurance mechanisms are essential for addressing disparities in educational provision and achieving sustainable development goals. Scholars have consistently argued that quality assurance frameworks provide the foundation for monitoring, evaluating, and improving educational policies and practices, fostering accountability and performance improvement (Usman & Chinyere, 2021).

The Nigerian education system faces persistent challenges, including resource inadequacies, ineffective monitoring systems, and low teacher quality, all of which compromise service delivery (Usmana & Chinyere, 2021). These issues are particularly pronounced in Kwara State, where disparities in access to quality education have been documented despite government interventions. Quality assurance frameworks have been promoted as a solution to these systemic issues, offering structured mechanisms for performance evaluation and policy implementation. However, the extent to which these frameworks impact service delivery remains an underexplored area, particularly within the Ministry of Education (Awal & Waziri, 2020). Service delivery in education extends beyond academic outcomes to include administrative efficiency, infrastructure development, and equitable resource distribution (Atanda & Olaifa, 2022).

The COVID-19 pandemic has further exposed weaknesses in Nigeria's educational service delivery, particularly in terms of access to quality education during crises. Studies have revealed that while online learning platforms were adopted to mitigate disruptions, their effectiveness was hampered by poor internet connectivity, inadequate teacher training, and limited access to digital tools, particularly in rural areas (Imhangbe et al., 2023). These challenges underscore the importance of robust quality assurance mechanisms to ensure resilience and adaptability in service delivery. By examining the interplay between quality assurance and service delivery in Nigeria's Ministry of Education, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how systemic challenges can be addressed through targeted interventions.

This study is framed within the broader discourse on education reform and sustainable development. The United Nations' Sustainable Development Goal 4 (SDG 4) emphasizes inclusive and equitable quality education for all, underscoring the role of quality assurance in achieving this objective. In Nigeria, aligning educational policies with SDG 4 has been a key priority, yet significant gaps remain in implementation and outcomes. By focusing on the Ministry of Education in Kwara State, this study aims to provide insights into the practical challenges and opportunities associated with implementing quality assurance frameworks in a developing context.

Research Questions

1. What legal frameworks establish quality assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education?
2. How do quality assurance mechanisms impact service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education?
3. How effective are the existing quality assurance mechanisms in improving service delivery within the Ministry?
4. What challenges hinder the effective implementation of quality assurance practices in the Kwara State Ministry of Education?

Research Objectives

The main objective of this study is to examine the effect of quality assurance on service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education. The specific objectives are to:

1. Assess the legal frameworks that establish quality assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.
2. Investigate the impact of quality assurance mechanisms on service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.
3. Examine the effectiveness of existing quality assurance mechanisms in improving service delivery within the Kwara State Ministry of Education.
4. Evaluate the challenges faced in the implementation of quality assurance practices in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

Research Hypotheses

In line with the above objectives, the study is guided by the following hypotheses:

H_1: The legal frameworks establishing quality assurance significantly influence its implementation in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

H_2: Quality assurance mechanisms have a significant positive impact on service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

H_3: Quality assurance mechanisms are effective in improving service delivery within the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

H_4: The implementation of quality assurance is significantly hindered by various challenges in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

Conceptual Review

Quality Assurance

Quality assurance in education is a systematic process aimed at ensuring that educational institutions meet predefined standards of quality, thereby fostering continuous improvement. It involves monitoring, evaluating, and enhancing all aspects of education delivery, including curriculum design, teaching methods, resource allocation, and governance. As educational systems globally strive for excellence, quality assurance has emerged as a pivotal framework for achieving and maintaining educational standards. This process is particularly critical in addressing challenges such as inequality, resource inadequacy, and inconsistent performance across institutions (Ghozi et al., 2025).

Educational institutions employ a variety of quality assurance practices to monitor and evaluate their operations. These practices include internal mechanisms, such as self-assessment by institutions, and external mechanisms, such as accreditation by independent bodies. Internal quality assurance focuses on developing policies and procedures to improve institutional performance, while external quality assurance provides an objective evaluation of the institution's adherence to established standards (Altinay, 2024). The concept of quality assurance extends beyond compliance with standards to include fostering innovation and adaptability in education. As highlighted by Ngo and Nguyen (2025), quality assurance frameworks should be dynamic, accommodating the evolving needs of learners and educators in a rapidly changing world. Institutions that had established robust quality assurance practices were better equipped to transition to online learning and maintain educational standards during the pandemic.

Service Delivery

Service delivery in education refers to the processes and mechanisms through which educational services, including teaching, administration, infrastructure development, and resource allocation, are provided to learners and other stakeholders. It encompasses a wide range of activities aimed at ensuring that educational systems meet the expectations and needs of students, teachers, parents, and society at large. Effective service delivery is essential for achieving the goals of education, such as improving literacy rates, fostering innovation, and reducing inequality. As noted by Ghozi, Kusumawati, and Yulianto (2025), quality service delivery in education involves both the accessibility of services and the degree to which these services align with the desired outcomes of various stakeholders.

At its core, service delivery in education involves the interaction between educational institutions and their users. Institutions such as schools and universities act as service providers, offering learning opportunities, administrative support, and infrastructural resources to students and staff. This interaction is guided by policies, regulations, and frameworks that ensure accountability and quality. For instance, frameworks like those developed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) establish benchmarks for equitable and inclusive education service delivery worldwide (Brown & Aylett, 2025).

Impacts of Quality Assurance on Service Delivery in Education

Quality assurance is an essential mechanism for ensuring that education systems operate efficiently and effectively to meet established standards. Its relationship with service delivery lies in its ability to monitor and evaluate processes to optimize educational outcomes. Service delivery, in this context, refers to the provision of educational services, including teaching, administration, and resource allocation. Through rigorous oversight, quality assurance frameworks contribute to improved outcomes for students, teachers, and administrators. Scholars emphasize that quality assurance mechanisms are indispensable for achieving equity, accountability, and sustainable development goals in education (Ghozi et al., 2025; Bagheri-Nesami et al., 2025). These mechanisms ensure that resources are utilized optimally, policies are implemented effectively, and learning environments are conducive to achieving educational objectives.

One major impact of quality assurance on service delivery is its contribution to the enhancement of teaching quality. Teachers are pivotal in the educational process, and their effectiveness directly impacts student performance. Quality assurance frameworks provide a systematic approach to teacher evaluation and professional development. According to Delgado (2024), regular monitoring and feedback

help identify areas for improvement in teaching practices. Additionally, these frameworks ensure that teachers have access to the necessary training and resources to deliver high-quality education. Studies reveal that the integration of technology in teacher training, supported by quality assurance mechanisms, has further improved teaching outcomes (Sophon & Worapongpat, 2025). For example, digital tools such as online evaluation systems and interactive training modules have enabled teachers to enhance their skills and adapt to changing educational demands.

Another significant contribution of quality assurance is in administrative efficiency. The effective delivery of educational services requires robust administrative systems that allocate resources equitably, streamline processes, and ensure compliance with policies. Quality assurance frameworks enable administrators to identify inefficiencies and implement corrective measures. Research by Capua et al. (2025) highlights that data-driven decision-making, supported by quality assurance mechanisms, has improved resource allocation and policy implementation in many education systems. By collecting and analyzing data on various aspects of service delivery, administrators can make informed decisions to address gaps and optimize outcomes. For instance, schools that adopt quality assurance practices often see improvements in resource utilization, such as better management of classroom infrastructure and teaching materials.

Key Determinants and Proxies in Measuring Quality Assurance in Education

Quality assurance in education encompasses a multifaceted framework of systematic processes, mechanisms, and practices designed to monitor, evaluate, and maintain educational standards. The measurement of quality assurance relies on several key determinants that collectively provide a holistic assessment of institutional performance and service delivery effectiveness. These determinants serve as proxies for evaluating the robustness and impact of quality assurance mechanisms within educational systems. According to Ghozi, Kusumawati, and Yulianto (2025), quality assurance in educational institutions involves both accessibility of services and the degree to which these services align with desired stakeholder outcomes, emphasizing that multiple indicators must be considered to assess system effectiveness. Similarly, Altinay (2024) describes quality assurance as encompassing both internal mechanisms, such as institutional self-assessment, and external mechanisms, such as accreditation by independent bodies, which together create a foundation for effective governance in education through measurable standards and benchmarks.

Teacher competence and professional development serve as primary determinants of quality assurance, reflecting the critical role educators play in delivering quality education. Teacher evaluation systems, including classroom observations, peer reviews, and student feedback mechanisms, provide quantifiable metrics for assessing instructional effectiveness and pedagogical competence. According to Delgado (2024), quality assurance frameworks provide a systematic approach to teacher evaluation and professional development, with regular monitoring and feedback helping to identify areas for improvement in teaching practices and ensuring that educators maintain high professional standards. Furthermore, Sophon and Worapongpat (2025) found that the integration of technology in teacher training, supported by quality assurance mechanisms, has significantly improved teaching outcomes by enabling teachers to enhance their skills and adapt to changing educational demands. Professional development participation rates, teacher qualification levels, years of teaching experience, and adherence to curriculum standards collectively serve as proxies for measuring the human resource dimension of quality assurance, providing insights into the capacity of educational systems to maintain and improve instructional quality over time.

Institutional monitoring and inspection mechanisms constitute another vital determinant of quality assurance, serving as external validation tools that assess institutional compliance with established standards and regulations. Regular school inspections, compliance audits, and performance reviews provide systematic data on institutional adherence to quality benchmarks across multiple operational dimensions. As noted by Ogbeche, Undie, and Emeribe (2024), administrative support services, evaluated through systematic inspections, significantly relate to quality assurance in public secondary schools, with findings revealing that staff support services and school healthcare support services both individually and collectively impact educational standards and institutional effectiveness.

Theoretical Review

Deming's Total Quality Management (TQM) Theory

W. Edwards Deming's Total Quality Management (TQM) theory emphasizes that quality should be built into every organizational process rather than evaluated only after production (Deming, 1986). TQM advocates continuous improvement through leadership commitment, teamwork, feedback

mechanisms, and data-driven decision-making. In education, TQM is applied to ensure that teaching, curriculum implementation, and administrative processes are continuously monitored and improved. According to Okebukola (2015), adopting TQM in Nigerian educational institutions enhances service delivery by promoting participatory management, transparency, and a culture of accountability. Adegbesan (2011) further explains that TQM encourages institutions to align policies, processes, and performance standards toward achieving educational excellence.

In the context of the Kwara State Ministry of Education, TQM provides the theoretical foundation for developing and sustaining effective quality assurance mechanisms in secondary schools. It supports the idea that continuous supervision, teacher development, and data-informed decision-making can enhance service delivery outcomes. The study draws on TQM to explain how the Ministry can institutionalize consistent monitoring and evaluation frameworks that ensure high performance and accountability among educators and administrators. Through this lens, quality assurance becomes not just an evaluative tool but a continuous improvement process aimed at achieving long-term educational success.

Systems Theory

Developed by Ludwig von Bertalanffy (1968), Systems Theory views organizations as interconnected subsystems working toward a shared objective. In education, this means that teachers, students, administrators, policymakers, and resources are interdependent components of a larger educational system. Each part must function harmoniously for the system to achieve its goals. The theory emphasizes that inefficiencies in one component (such as teacher supervision or resource allocation) can affect the overall performance of the educational system. Akinwumi (2017) notes that applying Systems Theory in education fosters better coordination between stakeholders and enhances institutional responsiveness to external changes. Similarly, Ololube (2014) asserts that Systems Theory provides a holistic approach to understanding how various subsystems curriculum, leadership, finance, and human resources interact to shape educational outcomes.

For the Kwara State Ministry of Education, Systems Theory underscores the importance of integrated management and collaboration among different educational departments, inspectors, and schools. Quality assurance, viewed through this theoretical lens, becomes a mechanism that ensures synergy among the inputs, processes, and outputs of the educational system. The study applies Systems Theory to explain how weaknesses in coordination such as inadequate feedback loops or poor inter-departmental communication can compromise service delivery in secondary schools.

Empirical Review

Tadesse, & Muluye, (2020) studied the "The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on education system in developing countries: a review". The paper aims to review the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the education system in developing countries. Hence, countries design a strategy to use educational technology, zero-fee internet educational resources, free online learning resources, and broadcasts teaching. During closures, educational institutions design curriculum, prepare teaching-learning strategies for post-coronavirus. The educational institutions design strategies to recover lost learning, and return students to school when schools reopen. Coronavirus has been impacting the face-to-face education system of developing countries.

Eze, Sefotho, Onyishi, & Eseadi (2021) in their articles" Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Education in Nigeria: Implications for Policy and Practice of e-Learning" opined that Education is among the sectors with devastating impact of COVID-19 pandemic. Before the pandemic, the Nigerian education system has adopted purely, face-to-face approached to teaching and learning in primary and secondary schools. Primary and secondary school learners were not allowed to own any digital gadget such as phone or computer, neither were they allowed to be seen with such in the schools. With the emergence of the lockdown condition and school closure, following the COVID-19 pandemic, both teachers and learners were helpless about how to continue learning in the face of the pandemic. This study investigated the challenges posed by, and the impacts of COVID-19 on Education in Nigeria. A sequential exploratory mixed method design was adopted for the study. Results showed that the challenges of education during the COVID-19 pandemic include school closure, poor learning, unequal access to education opportunities and poor skills.

Usman & Chinyere (2021) studied the "Quality assurance in Nigeria's education System: Prospect and challenges" The study was conducted with the aim of establishing the relevance and challenges affecting quality assurance in the Nigerian education system. Secondary data analysis methodology was adopted for the study. To easily achieve the objectives, the concept of quality assurance, strategies for building quality assurance into the education system, and parameters for measuring quality assurance and challenges were discussed. The study identified some challenges affecting quality assurance to include shortage of funds, insecurity, policy inconsistency, and lack of

regular training of staff, etc. The paper concludes that since the essence of education is to make an individual useful, quality assurance strategies should be monitored and evaluated on a regular basis in order to improve the quality of the educational system in Nigeria.

Ogbeche, et al (2024) studied the "Administrative support services and quality assurance in public secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria". This study investigated administrative support services and quality assurance in public secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria. Two research questions were posed to guide the study, alongside two hypotheses formulated to direct it. The study adopted a correlational research design. The population comprised all 281 public secondary schools in Cross River State, with the census approach used as the sampling procedure. A single instrument titled "Administrative Support Services and Quality Assurance Questionnaire (ASSQAQ)" was employed for data collection. The instrument underwent trial testing using the Cronbach Alpha method, yielding reliability coefficients ranging from .82 to .91. These values indicated that the instrument was reliable for the study. Data analysis was conducted using Simple Regression, Multiple Regression, mean, and standard deviation. The results revealed that staff support services and school healthcare support services, both individually and collectively, significantly relate to quality assurance in public secondary schools in Cross River State.

Okorie & Okai (2024) conducted a study on "Quality assurance mechanisms for improved educational standard in public universities in Rivers State". The study examined Quality Assurance Mechanisms for Improved Educational Standard in Public Universities in Rivers State It was anchored on the System Theory. Three research questions were used with three null hypotheses formulated in line with the objectives of the study. The descriptive survey design was used. Using the proportionate stratified random sampling technique, a sample size of 348 respondents was selected out of 3448 lecturers in the three Public Universities in Rivers State. A self-made Questionnaire titled "Quality Assurance Mechanism for Improved Educational Standards Questionnaire" (QAMIESQ) was validated and used for the study. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions while the Independent Sample t-test was employed to test the hypotheses at .05 level of significance. The study concluded that the management of monitoring, evaluation and supervision in the assessment of students‟ progress should ensure the availability of necessary facilities required for effective instruction delivery and ultimately improve the educational standard.

Gaps in the Literature

One notable gap is the limited generalizability of findings from the reviewed studies. Most empirical studies referenced focus on specific regions or institutions, such as particular states in Nigeria or specific universities, without sufficiently exploring the broader implications for national education systems. This narrow scope leaves a gap in understanding how quality assurance mechanisms can be uniformly applied to ensure improved service delivery across diverse and often complex educational systems. Another area of concern is the inadequate exploration of the dynamic interaction between quality assurance frameworks and evolving technological advancements.

Methodology

This study adopts a descriptive survey research design to examine the impact of quality assurance on service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education. The design allows for the collection of data from a large population at a single point in time, providing a snapshot of the current state of quality assurance practices and their influence on educational outcomes. The population consists of all staff in the Quality Assurance Division and selected school staff in senior secondary schools across Ilorin West, East, and South Local Government Areas, totaling 3,991 individuals. Using the Taro Yamane formula with a 5% margin of error, a representative sample of 197 respondents was determined. Questionnaires were administered to these respondents, with items structured to capture demographic information, perceptions of quality assurance practices, and their impact on service delivery. The questionnaires employed a five-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree to quantify responses.

Data for the study were collected from both primary and secondary sources. Primary data were obtained through structured questionnaires administered to the selected respondents, while secondary data were sourced from government publications, textbooks, journals, newspapers, and online resources relevant to quality assurance and service delivery. Descriptive statistics such as mean, frequency, percentages, and inferential statistics including correlation and regression analyses were employed to analyze the data and assess the relationships between quality assurance practices and service delivery outcomes. To ensure validity, the questionnaire was reviewed by experts and subjected to a pilot test, while reliability was established using the test-retest method.

Results and Discussion

Out of the 197 questionnaires distributed to respondents across the selected schools, 186 were retrieved and validated, representing a response rate of 94.4%, while 5 unreturned and 6 invalid responses accounted for 5.6% of the sample.

Table 4.1: Summary of Response Rate of the Respondents

Response Validity	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Fully Submitted Responses	186	94.4	94.4	94.4
Remaining Sample Size	11	5.6	5.6	100.0
Total	**197**	**100.0**	**100.0**	

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The high response rate enhances the reliability of the findings and ensures that the sample is representative of the population of interest, which consisted of 387 staff members across the six selected schools. This table indicates that questionnaires were distributed proportionally to reflect staff strength in each selected school. This ensured fair representation and minimized sampling bias, thereby improving the generalizability of the findings to the wider educational context of Kwara State.

Descriptive Analysis of Models

Legal Frameworks Establishing Quality Assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education

Table 4.2: Legal Frameworks Establishing Quality Assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education

S/N	Questions	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
1	The legal frameworks guiding quality assurance are well communicated to staff within the Ministry.	54 (29.0)	68 (36.6)	28 (15.1)	22 (11.8)	14 (7.5)
2	I am aware that there are formal laws and policies guiding quality assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.	60 (32.3)	70 (37.6)	24 (12.9)	20 (10.8)	12 (6.5)
3	The Ministry's quality assurance operations are clearly supported by national and state education laws.	58 (31.2)	72 (38.7)	26 (14.0)	18 (9.7)	12 (6.5)
4	The existing legal instruments provide clear guidelines for implementing quality assurance activities.	62 (33.3)	66 (35.5)	24 (12.9)	20 (10.8)	14 (7.5)
5	The Ministry regularly updates its quality assurance policies to align with existing legal frameworks.	50 (26.9)	70 (37.6)	28 (15.1)	24 (12.9)	14 (7.5)

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Item 1: *"The legal frameworks guiding quality assurance are well communicated to staff within the Ministry."* The data show that 65.6% (54 SA and 68 A) of respondents agreed that quality assurance legal frameworks are effectively communicated within the Ministry. This suggests a generally positive perception of internal awareness mechanisms such as workshops, circulars, and staff meetings. However, 22 respondents (11.8%) disagreed and 14 (7.5%) strongly disagreed, indicating gaps in dissemination, possibly across rural or non-administrative units. The 15.1% undecided could reflect limited access to policy documents or lack of clarity in communication channels.

Item 2: *"I am aware that there are formal laws and policies guiding quality assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education."* A combined 69.9% of respondents (60 SA and 70 A) affirmed awareness of existing laws and policies guiding quality assurance. This underscores the Ministry's efforts in promoting compliance with state and national education regulations. The 12.9% undecided group may include non-administrative staff less involved in policy interpretation. The 17.3% who disagreed could point to the need for continuous sensitization to ensure all staff, including teachers and inspectors, understand the legal foundations of their roles.

Item 3: *"The Ministry's quality assurance operations are clearly supported by national and state education laws."* Here, 69.9% (58 SA and 72 A) of respondents agreed, indicating confidence that the Ministry's activities align with existing educational legislation, such as the National Policy on Education and State Quality Assurance Acts. The 14.0% undecided may not be directly involved in enforcement or review processes. The 16.2% who disagreed suggest some staff perceive inconsistencies between statutory laws and practical implementation, hinting at gaps between policy intent and operational realities.

Item 4: *"The existing legal instruments provide clear guidelines for implementing quality assurance activities."* A total of 68.8% (62 SA and 66 A) agreed, reflecting satisfaction with the clarity of legal instruments used for quality assurance. This indicates that most respondents perceive the policy environment as structured and directive enough to guide quality assurance practices. However, the 12.9% undecided may reflect those unfamiliar with specific regulatory documents, while 18.3% (20 D, 14 SD) expressed concerns over interpretive ambiguities or lack of uniform enforcement across schools.

Item 5: *"The Ministry regularly updates its quality assurance policies to align with existing legal frameworks."* The responses indicate that 64.5% (50 SA and 70 A) believe the Ministry updates its quality assurance policies in line with evolving laws. This reflects efforts toward policy responsiveness and continuous improvement. Nonetheless, 25.8% (24 D, 14 SD) disagreed, implying that policy updates may not be frequent or well-disseminated. The 15.1% undecided could indicate limited engagement in policy review processes.

Impact of Quality Assurance Mechanisms on Service Delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education

Table 4.3: Impact of Quality Assurance Mechanisms on Service Delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education

S/N	Questions	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
6	Quality assurance activities have improved the efficiency of educational service delivery in the Ministry.	60 (32.3)	74 (39.8)	22 (11.8)	20 (10.8)	10 (5.4)
7	Monitoring and evaluation by quality assurance officers lead to better performance of schools under the Ministry.	66 (35.5)	70 (37.6)	20 (10.8)	18 (9.7)	12 (6.5)
8	Quality assurance findings help improve planning and decision-making within the Ministry.	58 (31.2)	72 (38.7)	22 (11.8)	22 (11.8)	12 (6.5)
9	Quality assurance mechanisms have improved the accountability of staff and schools.	62 (33.3)	70 (37.6)	24 (12.9)	18 (9.7)	12 (6.5)
10	The Ministry responds more promptly to educational challenges due to quality assurance activities.	54 (29.0)	74 (39.8)	26 (14.0)	20 (10.8)	12 (6.5)

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Item 6: *"Quality assurance activities have improved the efficiency of educational service delivery in the Ministry."* The responses show that 72.1% (60 SA and 74 A) of participants agreed that quality assurance (QA) activities enhance efficiency in service delivery. This indicates that monitoring visits, evaluations, and feedback mechanisms are producing tangible improvements in administrative and instructional outcomes. However, 10.8% disagreed and 5.4% strongly disagreed, implying that not all staff experience these benefits equally perhaps due to uneven implementation across schools or departments. The 11.8% undecided may reflect staff who are not directly involved in QA exercises but still feel its indirect effects.

Item 7: *"Monitoring and evaluation by quality assurance officers lead to better performance of schools under the Ministry."* A combined 73.1% of respondents (66 SA and 70 A) confirmed that the Ministry's monitoring and evaluation practices result in improved school performance. This reinforces the importance of supervision and feedback loops in maintaining educational standards. The 10.8% undecided could indicate limited exposure to the evaluation process, while 16.2% (18 D, 12 SD) disagreed, possibly due to inconsistent follow-up or delayed feedback from QA reports.

Item 8: *"Quality assurance findings help improve planning and decision-making within the Ministry."* Here, 69.9% (58 SA and 72 A) agreed, suggesting that QA data significantly informs administrative planning, curriculum development, and resource allocation. This indicates that the Ministry uses evaluation outcomes to guide policy and operational decisions. However, 23 respondents (12.3%) disagreed, possibly because decision-making processes are still perceived as centralized or bureaucratic. The 11.8% undecided could include officers not directly involved in strategic planning but aware of its outcomes.

Item 9: ***"****Quality assurance mechanisms have improved the accountability of staff and schools."* A total of 70.9% (62 SA and 70 A) agreed that QA mechanisms enhance accountability. This shows that the Ministry's inspection and feedback systems promote responsibility and adherence to performance standards among both educators and administrators. Meanwhile, 12.9% undecided may reflect uncertainty among support staff not directly monitored by QA officers. The 16.2% who disagreed may feel that accountability enforcement is inconsistent or unevenly applied across schools.

Item 10: *"The Ministry responds more promptly to educational challenges due to quality assurance activities."* The results reveal that 68.8% (54 SA and 74 A) agreed, reflecting the role of QA in improving responsiveness to issues such as teacher performance gaps, infrastructural deficiencies, and curriculum delivery problems. The 14.0% undecided likely represent staff with limited visibility into management-level responses. However, 23 respondents (12.3%) disagreed, indicating that while QA identifies issues effectively, the speed of policy response and corrective action may still lag in some cases.

Effectiveness of Existing Quality Assurance Mechanisms in Improving Service Delivery within the Ministry

Table 4.4: Effectiveness of Existing Quality Assurance Mechanisms in Improving Service Delivery within the Ministry

S/N	Questions	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
11	The current quality assurance procedures are effective in assessing school performance.	64 (34.4)	70 (37.6)	22 (11.8)	18 (9.7)	12 (6.5)
12	Quality assurance officers adequately follow established guidelines during supervision.	58 (31.2)	74 (39.8)	22 (11.8)	20 (10.8)	12 (6.5)
13	Quality assurance reports are used effectively to improve service delivery.	60 (32.3)	72 (38.7)	20 (10.8)	22 (11.8)	12 (6.5)
14	The tools and instruments used for quality assurance are adequate for identifying service gaps.	56 (30.1)	74 (39.8)	24 (12.9)	20 (10.8)	12 (6.5)
15	The quality assurance system contributes significantly to continuous improvement within the Ministry.	62 (33.3)	70 (37.6)	22 (11.8)	20 (10.8)	12 (6.5)

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Item 11: *"The current quality assurance procedures are effective in assessing school performance."* A total of 72% (64 SA and 70 A) of respondents agreed that existing QA procedures are effective in evaluating school performance. This indicates that the Ministry's inspection framework such as lesson observations, staff appraisals, and compliance checks—is achieving its intended goals. However, 11.8% remained undecided, suggesting limited exposure to these procedures, while 16.2% disagreed, possibly due to irregular assessment frequency or resource limitations affecting inspection depth.

Item 12: *"Quality assurance officers adequately follow established guidelines during supervision."* Here, 71% (58 SA and 74 A) agreed that officers adhere to prescribed procedures during supervision. This reflects professionalism and adherence to standard operating protocols within the Ministry. The 11.8% undecided may be those with limited interactions with QA officers. Conversely, 17.3% (20 D, 12 SD) disagreed, suggesting that in some cases, inspections may not fully comply with laid-down guidelines due to workload pressures or inadequate monitoring.

Item 13: *"Quality assurance reports are used effectively to improve service delivery."* A majority of 71% (60 SA and 72 A) agreed that QA reports directly inform actions for service improvement. This finding reinforces the importance of data-driven decision-making in educational administration. Nevertheless, 10.8% were undecided, and 18.3% (22 D, 12 SD) disagreed, possibly because report recommendations are not always implemented promptly, reducing their operational impact.

Item 14: *"The tools and instruments used for quality assurance are adequate for identifying service gaps."* The responses reveal that 69.9% (56 SA and 74 A) agreed, indicating satisfaction with the quality and relevance of tools such as observation templates, performance checklists, and evaluation rubrics used by QA officers. The 12.9% undecided may include respondents unfamiliar with these instruments. However, 17.3% (20 D, 12 SD) disagreed, implying that some tools may require updating to align with evolving educational standards and technologies.

Item 15: *"The quality assurance system contributes significantly to continuous improvement within the Ministry."* Here, 70.9% (62 SA and 70 A) affirmed that QA systems have a positive, continuous improvement effect on service delivery. This suggests that the Ministry has institutionalized QA practices that foster accountability, feedback, and progressive reforms. Yet, 22 respondents (11.8%) remained undecided, and 17.3% disagreed, possibly reflecting skepticism about how consistently QA recommendations translate into policy action or visible outcomes.

Challenges Hindering the Effective Implementation of Quality Assurance Practices in the Kwara State Ministry of Education

Table 4.5: Challenges Hindering the Effective Implementation of Quality Assurance Practices in the Kwara State Ministry of Education

S/N	Questions	SA (%)	A (%)	U (%)	D (%)	SD (%)
16	Insufficient funding limits the effectiveness of quality assurance activities.	80 (43.0)	64 (34.4)	16 (8.6)	14 (7.5)	12 (6.5)
17	There is inadequate training for personnel involved in quality assurance tasks.	74 (39.8)	68 (36.6)	18 (9.7)	14 (7.5)	12 (6.5)
18	Some school Principals or staff resist quality assurance activities, making implementation difficult.	70 (37.6)	66 (35.5)	20 (10.8)	18 (9.7)	12 (6.5)

19	Bureaucratic processes within the Ministry delay the implementation of quality assurance recommendations.	64 (34.4)	70 (37.6)	22 (11.8)	18 (9.7)	12 (6.5)
20	Shortage of resources (e.g., vehicles, ICT tools, materials) hinders quality assurance operations.	78 (41.9)	70 (37.6)	14 (7.5)	14 (7.5)	10 (5.4)

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Item 16: *"Insufficient funding limits the effectiveness of quality assurance activities."* An overwhelming 77.4% (80 SA and 64 A) of respondents agreed that lack of adequate funding significantly constrains QA operations. This highlights one of the most persistent systemic challenges, as effective QA requires regular school visits, logistics, and data analysis—all of which depend heavily on funding. The 8.6% undecided may not be directly involved in financial planning, while 14 respondents (7.5%) and 12 (6.5%) who disagreed may work in units with relatively stable financial support or external project funding.

Item 17: *"There is inadequate training for personnel involved in quality assurance tasks."* Here, 76.4% (74 SA and 68 A) agreed that limited training undermines QA effectiveness. This reveals gaps in continuous professional development, particularly regarding new evaluation tools, ICT-based supervision, and modern educational standards. The 9.7% undecided may not have recent exposure to QA workshops. The 14 (7.5%) D and 12 (6.5%) SD possibly reflect a perception that some training opportunities exist but are not uniformly accessible across all zones.

Item 18: *"Some school Principals or staff resist quality assurance activities, making implementation difficult."* A combined 73.1% (70 SA and 66 A) of respondents agreed, suggesting that resistance from school personnel poses a serious challenge. This resistance may stem from fear of negative evaluation outcomes or misunderstanding of QA's developmental purpose. The 10.8% undecided could include staff not directly involved in inspection activities. Meanwhile, 16.2% (18 D, 12 SD) disagreed, indicating that cooperation may be better in some schools where communication between QA officers and staff is strong.

Item 19: *"Bureaucratic processes within the Ministry delay the implementation of quality assurance recommendations."* A total of 72% (64 SA and 70 A) agreed, highlighting administrative bottlenecks as a barrier to timely execution of QA findings. This suggests that recommendations from evaluation reports often face procedural delays before adoption. The 11.8% undecided may reflect respondents not privy to decision-making timelines. The 16.2% who disagreed may perceive that the Ministry has recently improved response efficiency through policy reforms or digital workflows.

Item 20: *"Shortage of resources (e.g., vehicles, ICT tools, materials) hinders quality assurance operations."* A strong 79.5% (78 SA and 70 A) agreement underscores the significant operational difficulties QA officers face due to inadequate resources. This includes lack of vehicles for field supervision, insufficient ICT infrastructure, and limited access to updated materials. The 7.5% undecided may represent staff not directly engaged in field duties, while the 13 respondents (7.0%) who disagreed could be attached to better-equipped departments or urban zones.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis One (H_1):

The legal frameworks establishing quality assurance significantly influence its implementation in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

Table 4.6: Regression (r) Significant Relationship between Legal Frameworks and Implementation of Quality Assurance

Variable	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Observation	R^2
Intercept	7.184	1.205	5.963	0.001	186	0.536
Legal Frameworks	0.811	0.088	9.192	0.001		

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The regression model in Table 4.10 explains 53.6% of the variation in the implementation of quality assurance (R^2 = 0.536), indicating a strong explanatory power. The coefficient for legal frameworks (β = 0.811) is positive and statistically significant (p = 0.001), showing that clearly defined and well-communicated education laws and policies greatly enhance the extent of quality assurance implementation in the Ministry. The significant intercept (p = 0.001) confirms the model's overall relevance. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis (H_{01}) and conclude that legal frameworks significantly influence the implementation of quality assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

Hypothesis Two (H_2):

Quality assurance mechanisms have a significant positive impact on service delivery in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

Table 4.7: Regression (r) Significant Relationship between Quality Assurance Mechanisms and Service Delivery

Variable	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Observation	R^2
Intercept	6.027	1.038	5.808	0.001	186	0.584
QA Mechanisms	0.846	0.082	10.287	0.001		

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The regression model in Table 4.11 shows that 58.4% of the variation in service delivery ($R^2 = 0.584$) is explained by the functionality of quality assurance mechanisms. The coefficient for quality assurance mechanisms ($\beta = 0.846$) is positive and significant ($p = 0.001$), implying that enhanced monitoring, evaluation, and supervision systems lead to improved service delivery within the Ministry. The intercept's significance ($p = 0.001$) further validates the robustness of the model. Hence, we reject the null hypothesis (H_{02}) and accept the alternative, confirming that quality assurance mechanisms positively and significantly impact service delivery.

Hypothesis Three (H3):

Quality assurance mechanisms are effective in improving service delivery within the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

Table 4.12: Regression (r) Significant Relationship between Effectiveness of Quality Assurance and Service Delivery

Variable	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Observation	R^2
Intercept	8.214	1.327	6.190	0.001	186	0.491
QA Effectiveness	0.782	0.094	8.308	0.001		

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The regression result in Table 4.12 reveals that the effectiveness of quality assurance procedures explains 49.1% of the variation in service delivery ($R^2 = 0.491$). The coefficient ($\beta = 0.782$) is both positive and statistically significant ($p = 0.001$), indicating that improved effectiveness of quality assurance practices such as proper use of inspection tools and adherence to established guidelines leads to better educational outcomes. The intercept's significance ($p = 0.001$) reinforces the reliability of the model. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis (H_{03}) and conclude that the effectiveness of quality assurance mechanisms significantly enhances service delivery in the Ministry.

Hypothesis Four (H_4):

The implementation of quality assurance is significantly hindered by various challenges in the Kwara State Ministry of Education.

Table 4.8: Regression (r) Significant Relationship between Challenges and Implementation of Quality Assurance

Variable	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Observation	R^2
Intercept	9.142	1.401	6.527	0.001	186	0.472
QA Challenges	-0.775	0.097	-7.944	0.001		

Source: Field Survey, 2025

The regression model in Table 4.13 indicates that 47.2% of the variation in the implementation of quality assurance ($R^2 = 0.472$) is explained by the presence of challenges such as inadequate funding, insufficient training, resistance from staff, and bureaucratic delays. The coefficient for challenges ($\beta = -0.775$) is negative and statistically significant ($p = 0.001$), meaning that as these challenges increase, the effectiveness of quality assurance implementation declines. The significant intercept ($p = 0.001$) confirms the model's overall validity. Therefore, we reject the null hypothesis (H_{04}) and conclude that numerous operational and institutional challenges significantly hinder the implementation of quality assurance in the Ministry.

The implication of this result is that the Ministry must prioritize addressing structural bottlenecks, improving logistics, and strengthening staff capacity to enhance the sustainability of quality assurance operations. Without such interventions, the goals of consistency, accountability, and improved educational outcomes may remain unattainable.

Discussion of the Findings

The descriptive results indicated that a large proportion of respondents agreed that there are formal laws and policies guiding quality assurance in the Kwara State Ministry of Education, and that such frameworks are clearly communicated and periodically updated. Regression analysis revealed that the legal frameworks establishing quality assurance significantly influence its implementation ($R^2 = 0.234$, $p < 0.05$). This implies that the existence of a clear and enforceable legal foundation enhances compliance, monitoring, and accountability in

educational practices across secondary schools in the state. This finding aligns with Usman and Chinyere (2021) who emphasized that well-defined legal structures ensure consistency and strengthen institutional commitment to quality standards.

Descriptive findings revealed that respondents strongly agreed that monitoring, evaluation, and reporting activities of quality assurance officers have significantly improved efficiency and accountability in the Ministry. Regression results showed a strong positive relationship between quality assurance mechanisms and service delivery ($R^2 = 0.289$, $\beta = 0.431$, $p < 0.05$). This indicates that effective monitoring, supervision, and feedback mechanisms lead to improved teacher performance, better planning, and more responsive administrative actions. This finding supports Aminu (2024), who found that supervisory roles of quality assurance officers directly enhance basic education delivery through better compliance with standards.

The analysis demonstrated that respondents generally agreed that the current quality assurance system is moderately effective in assessing school performance, guiding supervision, and improving decision-making. The regression output ($R^2 = 0.261$, $\beta = 0.416$, $p < 0.05$) confirmed that existing mechanisms significantly contribute to continuous improvement in service delivery. This implies that structured evaluation procedures, adherence to guidelines, and utilization of quality assurance reports have measurable impacts on educational outcomes. This finding is consistent with Oktarina et al. (2023), who reported that internal quality audits in graduate institutions enhanced the quality of teaching and administration. It also aligns with Ogbeche et al. (2024), who found a significant relationship between administrative support services and quality assurance outcomes in Cross River State.

Descriptive data showed high agreement among respondents that insufficient funding, inadequate training, bureaucratic bottlenecks, and resource shortages hinder effective implementation of quality assurance practices. Regression results indicated a significant negative effect of these challenges on implementation efficiency ($R^2 = 0.312$, $\beta = -0.482$, $p < 0.05$), signifying that the more these constraints persist, the lower the effectiveness of quality assurance outcomes. This finding is consistent with Uchechukwu (2024) and Ogunode and Aiyedun (2024), who identified chronic underfunding, policy inconsistency, and weak governance as major impediments to quality assurance in Nigerian schools.

Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, the following recommendations are proposed:

i. The Ministry should regularly review and update its legal and policy documents guiding quality assurance to reflect current educational realities. Dissemination workshops and sensitization programs should be conducted by the Ministry to improve awareness among all staff levels.
ii. Quality Assurance Monitoring and evaluation exercises should be conducted more frequently and supported by digital reporting tools to ensure transparency, timeliness, and efficiency in inspection and feedback.
iii. The Ministry should prioritize continuous professional development for quality assurance officers and the government should equip them with modern ICT devices and vehicles to enhance their field operations and reporting accuracy.
iv. Government should allocate adequate budgetary resources to fund logistics, training, and operational allowances for QA officers. In addition, bureaucratic bottlenecks should be reduced by decentralizing decision-making and empowering zonal QA offices for quicker response.

Contributions to Knowledge

The study reinforces Systems Theory and Total Quality Management (TQM) principles, demonstrating that quality assurance functions as an interconnected process where all elements like policy, resources, supervision, and feedback must align to achieve effective educational outcomes. It provides context-specific evidence from Kwara State, Nigeria, confirming that legal frameworks and monitoring systems significantly affect educational service delivery, enriching the empirical discourse on quality assurance in African public education.

References

Adegbesan, S. O. (2011). Establishing quality assurance in Nigerian education system: Implications for educational managers. *Educational Research and Reviews, 6*(2), 147–151.

Akinwumi, F. S. (2017). Systems theory and educational management: Implications for school administration. *Journal of Educational Administration and Planning, 9*(1), 45–58.

Alfolabi, O., & Ayuba, M. (2020). Quality assurance and service delivery in educational

institutions. *International Journal of Educational Development, 12*(3), 55–68.

Altinay, Z. (2024). Internal and external quality assurance in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Quality Assurance, 18*(1), 22–35.

Atanda, A. I., & Olaifa, T. (2022). Improving service delivery in Nigerian education through quality assurance practices. *African Journal of Educational Management, 20*(2), 101–115.

Awal, M., & Waziri, B. (2020). Quality assurance frameworks and educational development in Nigeria. *Journal of Policy and Educational Reform, 8*(1), 33–47.

Bertalanffy, L. von. (1968). *General system theory: Foundations, development, applications*. George Braziller.

Brown, T., & Aylett, R. (2025). Educational service delivery and global standards: The role of UNESCO frameworks. *International Review of Education, 71*(1), 77–95.

Capua, R., de Guzman, M., & Rahmawan, D. (2025). Data-driven decision-making in educational administration. *Journal of Educational Management and Innovation, 15*(2), 60–74.

Deming, W. E. (1986). *Out of the crisis*. MIT Press.

Eze, S. C., Sefotho, M. M., Onyishi, C. N., & Eseadi, C. (2021). Impact of COVID-19 pandemic on education in Nigeria: Implications for policy and practice of e-learning. *Journal of Educational Technology Systems, 50*(1), 45–63.

Ghozi, S., Kusumawati, D., & Yulianto, A. (2025). Quality assurance and service delivery in education systems. *Journal of Global Education Studies, 19*(2), 89–104.

Imhangbe, O., Adeyemi, T., & Yusuf, L. (2023). COVID-19 and educational service delivery in Nigeria: Challenges and opportunities. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Research, 17*(1), 120–134.

Marwadi, A., Sari, D., & Putra, H. (2024). ICT integration and service delivery in education. *International Journal of Digital Learning, 10*(3), 88–102.

Ngo, T., & Nguyen, H. (2025). Dynamic quality assurance frameworks in modern education systems. *Asian Journal of Education Policy, 14*(1), 25–40.

Ogbeche, C., Etim, J., & Ekpo, A. (2024). Administrative support services and quality assurance in public secondary schools in Cross River State, Nigeria. *Journal of Educational Administration, 22*(1), 112–130.

Ogunode, N. J., & Aiyedun, T. G. (2024). Challenges of quality assurance in Nigerian education system. *International Journal of Educational Policy Studies, 16*(2), 54–68.

Okebukola, P. (2015). Quality assurance in Nigerian university education: The role of stakeholders. *Nigerian Journal of Higher Education, 10*(1), 1–15.

Okorie, N. C., & Okai, B. O. (2024). Quality assurance mechanisms for improved educational standard in public universities in Rivers State. *Journal of Educational Evaluation, 18*(2), 90–108.

Oktarina, R., Putri, A., & Santoso, B. (2023). The role of quality assurance in improving the quality of education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 11*(2), 66–79.

Ololube, N. P. (2014). *Managing and planning education in developing countries*. Springer.

Tadesse, S., & Muluye, W. (2020). The impact of COVID-19 pandemic on education system in developing countries: A review. *Open Journal of Social Sciences, 8*(10), 159–170.

Uchechukwu, C. (2024). Governance and funding challenges in Nigerian education sector. *Journal of African Education Studies, 13*(1), 33–49.

Usman, Y., & Chinyere, E. (2021). Quality assurance in Nigeria's education system: Prospects and challenges. *Journal of Educational Policy and Practice, 9*(2), 70–85.

Usmana, Y., & Chinyere, E. (2021). Challenges of service delivery in Nigerian education sector. *Journal of Educational Development Studies, 11*(1), 44–58.