UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.7;
https://unijerps.org
2021 Impact Factor: 5.641; 2020 Impact Factor: 5.355. January-June, 2021
Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363

ACADEMIC JOURNALS
expand your knowledge
http://www.academicjournals.org

BUILDING A CULTURE OF QUALITY IN COLLEGES OF EDUCATION IN DELTA STATE THROUGH EFFECTIVEQUALITY ASSURANCE MECHANISMS: AN EVALUATION

CHIME, GLADYS OZULUONYE
Mobile Line: 08033500483; E-Mail: begladinthelord0@gmail.com

OBINEME, PATIENCE OBIAGELI
Mobile Line: 08066124487; E-Mail: obinemepatience@gmail.com
AND
EKWEOGU, LOVELINE BENATAOKWU
Mobile Line: 08063498722; E-Mail: lb.ekweogu@unizik.edu.ng
Department of Educational Management and Policy
Faculty of Education
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State

Abstract
The devastating situation of many colleges of education (COEs) in Nigeria and Delta State inclusive which is becoming more alarming, creatingconcerns and doubts about the culture of quality for attainment of quality assurance of these teacher education institutions have warranted the present study. This study was therefore carried out to evaluate the importance of building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State through effective quality assurance mechanisms.Two research questions guided the study. The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. Population of the study comprised all the 1, 051 academic staff from four colleges of education in Delta State. Sample size of the study consisted of 526 academic staff of the COEs in Delta State selected at 50% using the stratified random sampling technique. A 36-item questionnaire designed by the researchers and titled: "Building Culture of Quality through Effective Quality Assurance Mechanisms Questionnaire (BCQEQAMQ)" was used for data collection. The research instrument was validated by three experts from the Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Reliability of the research instrument was established through a pilot-test conducted in Anambra State and scores obtained were measured using the Cronbach Alpha method. The mean score statistics rated at 2.50 and standard deviation were used to

analyze data. Findings of the study revealed among others; that the extent to which both the internal andexternal quality assurance mechanisms were mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State were to a low extent.From the findings, recommendations were proffered and among them included that:The statutory agency, that is, the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE) should work closely with the provosts of the COEs to ensure adequate mobilization and expansion of the internal quality assurance mechanisms which will help in building the culture of quality in the teacher education institutions.

Keywords: Evaluation, Building a Culture, Quality, Colleges of Education, Effective, Internal, External, Quality Assurance, Mechanisms

Introduction

The Nigerian colleges of education (COEs) are teacher education institutions established to train would-be or pre-service teachers for the Nigerian education system.They are academic preparatory institutions that offer professional training for teachers to acquire the Nigeria Certificate on Education (NCE). The Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2013) stated in the National Policy on Education (NPE) that teachers shall be professionally trained through teacher education institutions like the faculties of education in the universities and colleges of education (COEs). Teacher education institutions shall be structured in a way to equip teachers for the effective performance of their duties; and their programmes expanded to cater for the requirements of technical, vocational, businessand special education.Therefore, the goals of teacher education institutions in which the colleges of education in Delta State is inclusive as further indicated by the Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2013), are to: produce highly motivated, conscientious and efficient classroom teachers for all levels of the educational system; further encourage the spirit of enquiry and creativity in teachers; help teachers fit into the social life of the community and the society at large and enhance their commitment to national goals; provide teachers with the intellectual and professional background adequate for their assignment and to make them adequate adaptable to changing situations; and enhance teachers' commitment to the teaching profession (pg. 43).Given the above goals of teacher education institutions, teachers shall be regularly exposed to

innovations in the profession through continuous changes in methodology and in the curriculum. All this can effectively and functionally be actualized by building a culture of quality in the COEs. Quality as defined by Babalola, Adedeji and Erwat (2007) entailsfitness of purpose in relation to the user and customer's needs. Quality to these scholars can also be taken to mean that the product conforms to standards, specifications or requirements. Quality refers to the totality of features and characteristics of a product or service that bear on its ability to satisfy stated or implied needs. Babalola, Adedeji and Erwat went further to explain that the concept of quality has become an integral feature of the education system all over the world and in Nigeria. Quality in the tertiary education system like the COEs can be measured from various perspectives of the 'inputs', 'outputs' and 'educational processes'. It is however the inputs and educational processes that produces the outputs (Babalola, Adedeji &Erwat, 2007). Therefore, from the perspectives of the inputs and educational processes, the quality of educational programmes like teacher education can be gauged by a number of factors subjected towards building a culture of quality.

The importance of building a culture of quality was equally stressed in the NPE by the Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2013, p.45) which they highlighted that efforts towards the improvement of quality education at all levels should include appointment and retention of academically and professionally qualified persons as teachers and heads of institutions; putting in place a coherent national framework for teacher development and professional teaching standards; improvement and regulation of career-long professional development of teachers through a wide range of programmes and multiple pathways to provide serving teachers with regular opportunities for updating their knowledge and skills; provision of improved conditions of services and incentives to motivate teachers work; revamping teacher education curricula and training; setting professional standards for teacher educators; and improve teaching and learning through integration of information technology (IT). Building a culture of quality will demand appropriately putting in place certain quality assurance mechanisms, both the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms, which will enable the COEs attain their goals and objectives. Just as Poopola cited in

Ajuonuma (2007) opined that achieving quality in the school system will entail employing several strategies and frameworks like building a culture of quality. Culture as described within the context of this study refers all the practices or activities which determines that way of life of an educational institution. It is a social and collective phenomenon which refers to the ideas and values of a social group and is influencing their action without them noticing it explicitly (Morgan, 2002).A quality culture according to Malhi (2013) is a system of shared values, beliefs and norms that focuses on delighting customers and continuously improving the quality of products and services. In an organization with a quality culture, quality is deeply embedded in virtually every aspect of organizational life, including hiring and promotion, employee orientation and ongoing training, compensation, management style, decision making, organizational structure, work processes and office layout. Simply put, in a quality culture, "quality" is a way of life; quality principles are mirrored in organizational practices and behaviours. Successful and enduring organizations therefore, have a culture that creates and sustains a work environment that is conducive to long-lasting quality improvement (Malhi, 2013).Besides quality assurance according to Rugai and Agih (2007) meanssetting standards for the various processes and activities that lead to the production of graduates by the training institutions. For Rugai and Agih, these processes and activities which makes up both the internal and external quality mechanisms include: programme duration,course content, quality of teachers, standard of instructional infrastructure and facilities, school environment from a holistic perspective, examination, that is, quality of examination items, supervision, moderation of results, grading system, among others.Mbakwem and Okeke (2007) describes quality assurance as the fitness of an organization in accomplishing the goals for which it is set up, and also maintaining comparable standards. The term quality according to Mbakwem and Okeke could mean a grade of achievement or standard against which to judge others; a degree of excellence. Assurance on the other hand connotes feeling of certainty or confidence and fitness for purpose.

The overall essence of quality assurance is the ability of an educational institution or programme of study to realize its set objectives. From all these explanations, quality assurance in education therefore, is something that

concerns zero defects in the production of goods and services as highlighted by the Crosby theory of 1979 (Rugai&Agih, 2007). It equally entails building some credible quality frameworkwhich is focused towards the realization of productivity and excellence in the system.In the present study, building a culture of quality in the COEs will entail effective incorporation of both the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms. The internal quality assurance mechanisms according to Mbakwem and Okeke (2007) will involve attributes or things that are in-built for continuous quality improvement of programmes and institutions.At institutional level, this will consist of the following; academic assessment; provision of quality resources (both human and materials), self-evaluations of resources and activities in teaching and learning process, students' evaluation of teaching, self-accreditation, and students'/staff feedback, quality learning environment, quality context, quality teachers and learners, availability of the right tools, creating enabling environment and effective legal backing, pragmatic policy on recruitment and development of quality control officials, use of qualified inspectors and supervisors to monitor teaching, periodic audit of the operation of the system, effective quality management system, periodic audit of the operation of the system (Enakpoya& Collins, 2012; Endut, 2013).For Jimoh (2007) and Mbakwem and Okeke (2007), quality students' intake, teacher quality, student evaluation procedures, quality facilities, stable academic calendar, establishment of a central quality assurance unit/department, constant supervision of instructions, supervision of curriculum design, content and implementation, monitoring of students progression and achievements, active students' union, adequate class-size, periodic assessment of human and materials resources available to each programme, track-tracing of graduates for feedback information from employers, organizing workshops, conferences and seminars for academics, monitoring of the input, process and output of the system, control of examination malpractices and other misconducts, effective administrative recordsand the quality of academic programme have all become a routine process under internal QA mechanisms.

The external quality assurance mechanisms according to Endut (2013), Kis (2005) and Mbakwem and Okeke (2007) will include a list of other external or outside factors and attributes such as;adequate institutional funding by

government and other stakeholders, the process ofaccreditation of COEs programmes by statutoryagency - NCCE (National Commission for Colleges of Education), quality audit, ISO Standards (that is, International standards), peer reviews, use of external examiners and moderators to maintain academic standards, TETFundsupportand building collaborations and synergy withexternal stakeholders such as financial institutions, industries and private individuals,among others. All these internal and external quality assurance mechanisms when effectively mobilized or utilized will aid to build a culture of quality for the sustainability of the COEs, especially those colleges of education in Delta State. However, from the look of things and devastating situations or state of many COEs including those in Delta State, it seems as if majority of the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms are not sufficiently mobilized for quality process to be built in the institutions. Inadequate and poor mobilization of these internal and external quality assurance mechanisms have great negative consequences which makes it difficult and impossible towards building a culture of quality in the COEs for positive outcomes and effective attainment and achievement educational goals and objectives. Several studies such as those of Endut (2013),Ibara (2015),Kis (2005),Nzeneri, Chukwuma andObire (2012), Huisman, Rebora and Turri (n.d),andOfojebe, Nwogbo and Anachuna (2015), among others,have been conducted on quality assurance and they have their own mix and findings which differ from the present study. The deviation of all these previous studies have necessitated the present study to examine the essence of building a culture of quality in COEs in Delta State through effective quality assurance mechanisms.

Statement of the Problem

The notion of building a culture of quality in the colleges of education in Nigeria is raising growing interest. The relevance of any college of education depends on quality parameters or mechanisms infused into the system which should be specified, adhered to and sustained. However, the devastating situations of many colleges of education (COEs) in Nigeria and Delta State inclusive is becoming more alarming, creating worries and doubts about the culture of quality for attainment of quality assurance of these teacher education institutions. Most of the COEs in Delta State suffer a lot quality problems which create concerns for their

clients, education stakeholders and the researchers about the future existence and sustainability of many COEs throughout the country and in Delta State. Also, the difficulties in building the culture of quality in the COEs has made the attainment of quality assurance impossible in these institutions. On the other hand, if the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms were to be adequately and effectively mobilized in the COEs this will bring about the building of a culture of quality for positive outcomes and effective achievement of educational goals and objectives. But observations show that the difficulties in building a culture of quality in the COEs has made a lot of these institutions to lose their gloryand this has negative consequence or impact on the COEs. This have caused many students to reject the offer of being admitted in the colleges of education, rather they are more focused in pursuing their admissions in the universities and polytechnics. Only when they have been rejected and turned back severally by the universities and polytechnics, that they will have the mind to seek for admissions at the colleges of education. Supposing, the culture of quality is in-built and effectively imbedded into the COEs through mobilization and coordination of the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms, this will make the COEs the envy of all other cadres and institutions. The COEs as important teacher education institutions need to maintain an excellent degree of quality and high standards in the educational processes which must cover areas like the inputs, process and outputs. The issues and difficulties concerning building a culture of quality through the mobilization of all internal and external quality assurance mechanisms which seem to have been the problem of this present study, has equally created a gap that needs to be filled for quality education to be properly harnessed and triumph in the COEs. Therefore, the need to conduct an investigation through the evaluation of the importance of building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State through effective quality assurance mechanisms, has warranted the present study.

Research Questions

1. To what extent are the internal quality assurance mechanisms mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State?
2. To what extent are the external quality assurance mechanisms mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State?

Methodology

The study adopted a descriptive survey research design. The design was employed in order to enable the researchers to conduct a field investigation on a sample of academic staff of the colleges of education in Delta State selected from their population, after which the data gathered were analyzed using a statistical tool in order to draw conclusion based on the study which evaluated building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State through effective quality assurance mechanisms. Population of the study comprised all the 1, 051 academic staff from four colleges of education in Delta State. In Delta State, there are four COEs owned by the government and all of them were used for the study. Sample size of the study consisted of 526 academic staff of the COEs in Delta State selected at 50% using the stratified random sampling technique. In drawing the sample, the academic staff were stratified according to their COEs and thereafter, they were randomly selected at 50% making a total of 526 academic staff selected for sampling.A 36-item questionnaire designed by the researchers and titled: "Building Culture of Quality through Effective Quality Assurance Mechanisms Questionnaire (BCQEQAMQ)" was used for data collection.

Construction of the questionnaire was based on the purpose of the study and the two research questions. The instrument was organized into four clusters and structured on a 4-point scale of Very High Extent (VHE) – 4 points, High Extent (HE) – 3 points, Low Extent (LE) – 2points and Very Low Extent (VLE) – 1 point. The research instrument was validated by three experts from the Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka. Two of the experts came from the Department of Educational Management and Policy, and one of the experts was from the Department of Educational Foundations (Measurement & Evaluation expert), Faculty of Education, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State. These experts made useful corrections in order to determine both the face and content validity of the research instrument. Some items on the questionnaire were corrected and a few others restructured for appropriate validation. .Reliability of the research instrument was established through a pilot-test conducted in Anambra State on a sample of 22 academic staff of two COEs. The scores obtained from the pilot test were measured using the Cronbach Alpha

method which yielded coefficient reliability scores of 0.85 and 0.81 for each of the two clusters respectively and were added up to give an overall coefficient reliability score of 0.83. The result indicated that the research instrument was reliable in order to collect the necessary data for the study. The mean score statistics rated at 2.50 and standard deviation were used to analyze data. The decision rule was that any mean score which rated at 2.50 and above was considered as 'high extent' and was accepted; while the mean score which rated at 2.49 and below was considered as 'low extent' and was not accepted.

Results

Research Question 1: To what extent are the internal quality assurance mechanisms mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State?

UNIJERPS

UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.7;
https://unijerps.org
2021 Impact Factor: 5.641; 2020 Impact Factor: 5.355. January-June, 2021
Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363

ACADEMIC JOURNALS
expand your knowledge
http://www.academicjournals.org

Table 1: Mean Scores Ratings and SD of Academic Staff on the Extent to which the Internal Quality Assurance Mechanisms havebeenMobilized for Building a Culture of Quality in COEs in Delta State

N = 526 Academic Staff

S/N	Statements: Please show your agreement concerning the extent to which these internal quality assurance mechanisms have been mobilized for building a culture of quality in your institution	VHE	HE	LE	VLE	Mean	SD	Decision
1.	Utilization of quality facilities or educational resources in order to create an enabling learning environment in the college	66	110	217	133	2.21	0.96	**Low Extent**
2.	Constant supervision of lecturer's presentations in the lecture hall or classroom	54	167	140	165	2.21	1.00	**Low Extent**
3.	Supervision of the curriculum design, content and implementation by	153	227	103	43	2.93	0.90	**High**

	departmental heads							**Extent**
4.	Appropriate class-size in various course programmes	25	135	204	162	2.04	0.87	**Low Extent**
5.	Periodic assessment of human resources to determine their credibility	142	218	112	54	2.85	0.93	**High Extent**
6.	Effective self-evaluation of material resources utilized in teaching-learning in the institution	89	107	228	102	2.35	0.98	**Low Extent**
7.	Opportunities created for students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the college	71	160	160	135	2.32	1.00	**Low Extent**
8.	Effective feedback system for students/staff	102	108	124	192	2.23	1.14	**Low Extent**
9.	Quality student's intake during admissions	149	162	115	100	2.68	1.08	**High Extent**
10.	Stable academic calendar	134	153	120	119	2.57	1.10	**High Extent**
11.	Establishment of a viable central quality assurance department	93	103	172	158	2.25	1.07	**Low Extent**
12.	Establishment of	105	133	147	141	2.38	1.08	

UNIJERPS

	quality assurance committee							**Low Extent**
13.	Quality academic programmes	176	149	87	114	2.74	1.14	**High Extent**
14.	Effectiveness in control of examination malpractices coupled with other misconducts of staff and students	62	104	181	179	2.09	1.00	**Low Extent**
15.	Effective administrative records	179	186	66	95	2.85	1.08	**High Extent**
16.	Standard procedures for monitoring of students' assessments, progression and achievements	27	76	222	201	1.87	0.84	**Low Extent**
17.	Constant organization of workshops, conferences and seminars for academic staff	80	100	166	180	2.15	1.06	**Low Extent**
18.	Active students' union capable of monitoring academic programmes	134	161	115	116	2.60	1.09	**High Extent**
19.	Use of qualified inspectors or	120	157	123	126	2.52	1.09	

UNIJERPS

	supervisors to monitor academic programmes							**High Extent**
20.	Periodic internal audit of the operation of the system	51	163	152	160	2.20	0.98	**Low Extent**
21.	Track-tracing of graduates for feedback information from employers	105	121	169	131	2.38	1.06	**Low Extent**
22.	Consistency in conducting self-assessment or self-accreditation on academic programmes before accreditation	68	132	170	156	2.21	1.01	**Low Extent**
23.	Effective quality management system and leadership	109	128	150	139	2.39	1.09	**Low Extent**
24.	Pragmatic policy on staff recruitment	172	154	130	70	2.81	1.04	**High Extent**
	Overall Mean & SD	**=**				**2.41**	**1.07**	**Low Extent**

(Source: Computed from Field Work)

Data presented in Table 1 from the respondents' responses (that is, academic staff)indicated that only items 3, 5, 9–10, 13, 15, 18-19 and 24, were rated above 2.50 of the acceptable mean score by the academic staff of the colleges of education, thus, showing their agreement with these statements.

All other items from 1-2, 4, 6-8, 11-12, 14, 16-17 and 20-23 were rated below 2.50 of the acceptable mean score by the respondents, in order to disagreed with any of the statements. The overall mean score is 2.41 with SD of 1.07 which showcased closeness and less variations in the academic staff responses indicated that the extent to which the internal quality assurance mechanisms are mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State was to a low extent.

Research Question 2: To what extent are the external quality assurance mechanisms are mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State?

UNIJERPS

UNIJERPS
Unizik Journal of Educational Research and Policy Studies VOL.7;
https://unijerps.org
2021 Impact Factor: 5.641; 2020 Impact Factor: 5.355. January-June, 2021
Indexing and Impact Factor URL: http://sjifactor.com/passport.php?id=21363

ACADEMIC JOURNALS
expand your knowledge
http://www.academicjournals.org

Table 2: Mean Scores Ratings and SD of Academic Staff on the Extent to which the External Quality Assurance Mechanisms have been Mobilized for Building a Culture of Quality in COEs in Delta State

N = 526 Academic Staff

S/N	Statements: Please show your agreement concerning the extent to which these external quality assurance mechanisms have been mobilized for building a culture of quality in your institution	VHE	HE	LE	VLE	Mean	SD	Decision
25.	Adequate funding of the institution	100	105	122	199	2.20	1.14	**Low Extent**
26.	Consistency in accreditation of NCE programmes by the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE)	90	121	185	130	2.33	1.03	**Low Extent**
27.	Institution's effectiveness in implementation of accreditation reports/recommendations	110	103	151	162	2.31	1.12	**Low Extent**
28.	Coordination of quality audit system by external auditors	78	143	201	104	2.37	0.96	**Low Extent**
29.	Constant use of peer reviews for	139	166	105	116	2.62	1.10	**High Extent**

UNIJERPS

	assessments							
30.	Consistency in use of external examiners or moderators to maintain academic standards	155	152	111	108	2.67	1.10	**High Extent**
31.	Efficiency in the implementation of examiners or moderators report	87	111	204	124	2.31	1.01	**Low Extent**
32.	Mobilization of TETFund sponsorship to the institution	109	161	143	113	2.51	1.05	**High Extent**
33.	Financial institution's assistance to the institution	73	107	168	178	2.14	1.04	**Low Extent**
34.	Collaborations with the industries to promote academic programmes	106	99	192	129	2.35	1.06	**Low Extent**
35.	Efficiency in maintaining the guidelines of international quality standards (ISO)	103	119	129	175	2.29	1.12	**Low Extent**
36.	Private individual's support to the growth of the institution	99	105	138	184	2.23	1.12	**Low Extent**
	Overall Mean & SD	**=**				**2.36**	**1.08**	**Low Extent**

(Source: Computed from Field Work)

Data presented in Table 2from the respondents' responses (that is, academic staff) indicated that only items 29-30 and 32, were rated above 2.50 of the acceptable mean score by the academic staff of the colleges of education, thus, showing their agreement with these statements. All other items

UNIJERPS

from 25-28, 31 and 33-36 were rated below 2.50 of the acceptable mean score by the respondents, in order to disagreed with any of the statements. The overall mean score is 2.36 with SD of 1.08 which showcased closeness and less variations in the academic staff responses indicated that the extent to which the external quality assurance mechanisms are mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta Statewas to a low extent.

Discussions

Findings of the study showcased the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms that were mobilized in the colleges of education in Delta State. Although, the findings also indicated that the extent to which both the internal andexternalquality assurance mechanisms were mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta Statewere to a low extent. It was further discovered through the finding that that the extent to which the internal quality assurance mechanisms are mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State was to a low extent. This include that the internal quality assurance mechanisms which were necessary for building the culture of quality by way of;utilization of quality facilities or educational resources in order to create an enabling learning environment in the college, constant supervision of lecturer's presentations in the lecture hall or classroom, provisions for appropriate class-size in various course programmes, effective self-evaluation of material resources utilized in teaching-learning in the institution, opportunities created for students' evaluation of teaching effectiveness in the college, effective feedback system for students/staff, establishment of a viable central quality assurance department, establishment of quality assurance committee, standard procedures for monitoring of students' assessments, progression and achievements, constant organization of workshops, conferences and seminars for academic staff, effectiveness in control of examination malpractices coupled with other misconducts of staff and students, periodic internal audit of the operation of the system, track-tracing of graduates for feedback information from employers, consistency in conducting self-assessment or self-accreditation on academic programmes before accreditation and effective quality management system and leadership; were all mobilized to a low in the colleges of education.

The finding of this study corroborates and agrees with those of Endut (2013), Ibara (2015),Kis (2005) and Nzeneri, Chukwuma and Obire (2012), whose studies discovered that many of the internal quality assurance mechanisms were not adequately put in place in the educational institutions. Jimoh (2007) and Mbakwem and Okeke (2007) confirmed that most of the internal quality assurance mechanisms were not mobilized and were found wanting the educational institutions.The findings of Ofojebe, Nwogbo and Anachuna (2015) study which confirmed that the internal measures for quality assurance of student intake measures, evaluation of students' learning experience and teacher quality measures were not adequately used in both public and private universities in the South-East Geo-Political Zone of Nigeria forquality assurance, is also in line with that of the present study. Ofojebe, Nwogbo and Anachuna study further found out that there are deficiencies in the quality assurance measures most especially as it concerns students' intake processes. Therefore, the inadequate use of the internal measures towards achieving quality assurance in the universities to a great extent could be responsible for the sharp and continuous decline in the quality of university education in the South-East Zone of Nigeria and the consequent low ratings of universities in the South-East Geopolitical Zone of Nigeria among the comity of universities in the world, Africa and in Nigeria in the webmetric university rankings. However, to build the culture of quality, the above internal quality assurance mechanisms are crucial but when found wanting would make attainment of quality in the COEs difficult and which probably have negative consequences on achievement of educational goals and objectives. It was found out that efforts to mobilized most of the internal quality assurance mechanisms to a high extent in the COEs were only focused on; supervision of the curriculum design, content and implementation by departmental heads, providing periodic assessment of human resources to determine their credibility, ensuring quality student's intake during admissions, coordinating a stable academic calendar and quality academic programmes, promoting effective administrative records, mobilizing active students' union capable of monitoring academic programmes, use of qualified inspectors or supervisors to monitor academic programmes, and pragmatic policy on staff recruitment. With appropriate mobilization and coordination of a lot of these internal

quality assurance mechanisms, this will lead to building a culture of quality in the colleges of education in Delta State and beyond.

The finding of this study also revealed that that the extent to which the external quality assurance mechanisms are mobilized for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State was to a low extent. This included that the external quality assurance mechanisms which were necessary for building a culture of quality in the colleges of education, coordinated by way of adequate funding of the institution, consistency in accreditation of NCE programmes by the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE), institution's effectiveness in implementation of accreditation reports/recommendations, coordination of quality audit system by external auditors, efficiency in the implementation of examiners or moderators report, financial institution's assistance to the institution, collaborations with the industries to support and promote academic programmes, institution's efficiency in maintaining the guidelines of international quality standards (ISO), and private individual's support to the growth of the institution; were all mobilized to a low extent. The external quality assurance mechanisms which were necessary for building a culture of quality were mobilized to a high extent in the colleges of education by way of; constant use of peer reviews for assessments, consistency in use of external examiners or moderators to maintain academic standards, and mobilization of TETFund sponsorship to the institution; while all other external quality assurance mechanisms which were previous mentioned were mobilized to a low extent. The finding of this study corroborates and also agrees with those of Endut (2013), Ibara (2015), Kis (2005) and Nzeneri, Chukwuma and Obire (2012), whose findings indicated failure of many educational institutions towards effective mobilization of all the external quality assurance mechanisms that will improve their academic programmes, high standards and quality. The present study finding is in contrast with Malhi (2013) which confirmed that successful and enduring organizations have a quality culture that creates and sustains a work environment that is conducive to long lasting quality improvement. Failure to mobilize all the external quality assurance mechanisms, this will create difficulties in building the culture of quality in the COEs for attainment of educational goals and objectives. With appropriate

mobilization and coordination of a lot of these internal quality assurance mechanisms, this will lead to building a culture of quality in the colleges of education in Delta State and beyond. Thus, the issue concerning building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta State through effective quality assurance mechanisms should be made a serious matter of priority concern for all education stakeholders to enhance the sustain ability of the COEs.

Conclusion

The mobilization, deployment and expansion of both the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms to a great extent can help to improve the quality of colleges of education in Delta State and beyond. This will assist towards building and sustaining the culture of quality in order to bring about the positive results that will lead to the desired outcomes in the COEs. Building the culture of quality in the COEs will bring repute and respect for this teacher education system in thecountrybecause adequate mobilization of the internal and external quality assurance mechanisms can be a well-designed methodology to assess, improve and guarantee the desired outcomes in the educational process, academic programmes and services of the COEs. However, the inferences which is drawn from the findings of this study is that boththe internal andexternalquality assurance mechanisms for building a culture of quality in colleges of education in Delta Stateweremobilized to a low extent. One can then conclude that the inadequate mobilization of these internal and external quality assurance mechanisms could have been responsible for the sharp and continuous decline in the quality of the colleges of education in Delta State; thereby, making it difficult towards building the culture of quality in the institutions. So, this is high time for Nigeria to expand and implement those internal and external quality assurance mechanisms for building the culture of quality in the colleges of education.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study, recommendations were made and they include the following:

1. The statutory agency, that is, the National Commission for Colleges of Education (NCCE)should work closely with the provosts of the COEs to ensure adequate mobilization and expansion of the internal quality assurance mechanisms which will help in building the culture of quality in theteacher education institutions.

The Government (both Federal &State) who are owners of the colleges of education should also support the institutions through adequate funding and resource provisions to enable building of the culture of quality to be sustained in the COEs.

2. The Government through close monitoring by their representatives, also in collaboration with NCCE and provosts of the COEs, should ensure adequate mobilization of the external quality assurance mechanisms that will sustain building the culture of quality in the colleges of education. The provosts of the COEs should promote and improve their collaborations and synergy with the financial institutions, industries and private individuals in order to gain their trust and support towards sustaining building the culture of quality in the colleges of education.

References

Ajuonuma, J.O. (2007). Strategies for quality assurance in assessment of students' academic performance in Nigerian universities. In J.B. Babalola, G.O. Akpa, A.O. Ayeni & S.O. Adedeji (Eds.). *Access, equity and quality in higher education.* NAEAP Publication, pp. 256-262.

Babalola, J.B., Adedeji, S.O. &Erwat, E.A. (2007). Revitalizing quality higher education in Nigeria: Options and strategies. In J.B. Babalola, G.O. Akpa, A.O. Ayeni & S.O. Adedeji (Eds.). *Access, equity and quality in higher education.* NAEAP Publication, pp. 241-253.

Enakpoya, E. & Collins, O.O. (2012). *Quality assurance mechanisms in Nigeria tertiary institutions, the challenges and way forward in achieving vision 20:2020*. Retrieved from http://www.ciwmb.cagov.wikipedia, the free encyclopedia.

Endut, A.S. (2013). Enhancing internal quality assurance mechanism at higher education institutions through responsive programme evaluation. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences 123*, 5 – 11. Published by Elsevier Limited. Retrieved from www.sciencedirect.com/doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.1391.

Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN, 2013). *National policy on education*, 6th edition. Abuja: NERDC.

Huisman, J. Rebora, G. &Turri, M. (n.d). The effects of quality assurance in universities: Empirical evidence from three cases. Retrieved from https://www.eurashe.eu/library/quality-he/GS_III_5_Rebora_and_Turri.pdf.

Ibara, E.C. (2015). Developing quality assurance culture for sustainable university education in Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice, 6* (29), 142-147. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1081277.pdf.

Jimoh, B.O. (2007). The need for quality assurance in university education in Nigeria.In J.B. Babalola, G.O. Akpa, A.O. Ayeni & S.O. Adedeji (Eds.). *Access, equity and quality in higher education.* NAEAP Publication, pp. 335-342.

Kis, V. (2005). *Quality assurance in tertiary education: Current practices in OECD countries and a literature review on the potential effects.* Retrieved from https://www.oecd.org/education/skills-beyond-school/38006910.pdf.

Mbakwem, J.N. & Okeke, F.N. (2007). Enhancing internal and external quality assurance mechanisms in Nigerian universities through ICT compliance. In J.B. Babalola, G.O. Akpa, A.O. Ayeni & S.O. Adedeji (Eds.). *Access, equity and quality in higher education.* NAEAP Publication, pp. 307-315.

Malhi, R.G. (2013). Creating and sustaining: A quality culture. *Journal of Defense Management, 3* (2) 1-4. Retrieved from https://www.longdom.org/open-access/creating-and-sustaining-a-quality-culture-2167-0374.S3-002.pdf/.

Morgan, G. (2002), *Bilder der organisation*. Klett-Cotta.

Nzeneri, I.S., Chukwuma, E.T.C. &Obire, I.V. (2012). An assessment of quality assurance mechanism for effective management and administration of adult and non-formal education programmes in Anambra State. B.G. Nworgu& M.A. Bidmos (Eds.). *Journal of the Nigerian Academy of Education on Quality Assurance Mechanism in Nigerian Education,* pp.214-254.

Published by: University Trust Publishers, Nsukka.

Ofojebe,W.N., Nwogbo, V. N.&Anachuna, O.N. (2015).Comparativeanalysis of theuseofinternalmeasures for quality assuranceinpublicandprivate universities in South-East Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal, 11* (7), 110-135, ISSN: 1857 – 7881(Print) e - ISSN 1857- 7431.

Rugai, J. &Agih, A.A. (2007). A case for improving quality assurance of high education in Bayelsa State. In J.B. Babalola, G.O. Akpa, A.O. Ayeni & S.O. Adedeji (Eds.). *Access, equity and quality in higher education.* NAEAP Publication, pp. 272-278.

UNIJERPS