

Inspection and Quality Audit as Quality Assurance Mechanisms in the Management of Mission Secondary Schools of Service Delivery in Rivers State

By

Ordu, Chinyere Uchenna

&

Prof. Nath M. Abraham

**Department of Educational Management,
Faculty of Education, University of Port Harcourt**

Abstract

The study investigated inspection and quality audit as quality assurance mechanisms in the management of mission schools for service delivery in Rivers State. The study adopted the correlation research design. Two research questions and two corresponding hypotheses guided the study. The population of the study comprised all the 133 Anglican Mission Schools Education Board members and 260 teachers in Anglican Mission Secondary Schools in seven (7) Local Government Areas (Obio-Akpor, Okrika, Ikwerre, Etche, Khana, PHALGA, Akuku-Toru) in Rivers State. The sample consisted of 393 respondents (133 Anglican Mission Schools Education Board members and 260 teachers in Anglican Mission Secondary Schools) from 7 Local Government Areas in Rivers State (Obio-Akpor, Okrika, Ikwerre, Etche, Khana, PHALGA, Akuku-Toru). They were selected for the study using the simple random sampling technique. Two instruments (questionnaire) were used for data collection, they are: Quality Assurance Mechanisms Inventory (QAMI) and Management of Mission Schools' Service Delivery Questionnaire (MMSSDQ). The face and content validity of the instrument were ensured. The reliability of the instruments Quality Assurance Mechanisms Inventory (QAMI) and Management of Mission Schools' Service Delivery Questionnaire (MMSSDQ) were determined using the Cronbach alpha method of internal consistency. The reliability coefficients obtained for the various clusters of the instruments were 0.71 and 0.81. The research questions were answered using simple regression while hypotheses were tested with t-test associated with simple regression statistics at 0.05 Alpha level of significance. The finding of the study shows that inspection and quality audit relate significantly to the management of mission schools for service delivery in Rivers State. Based on the findings, it was recommended among others that, Since inspection relates significantly to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery, it is important that periodic inspection be carried out by the management of mission secondary schools in order to achieve the goals and objectives of mission secondary schools in delivering quality education in Rivers State.

Keywords: Inspection, Quality Audit and Management of Mission Secondary Schools

Introduction

There is no doubt that education is an excellent and dynamic instrument for effecting national development and a tool geared towards acquisition of values, knowledge and skills by the recipients by equipping them to contribute meaningfully towards economic growth and national development. This position informs government and private investment in education as well as deregulating the provision and management of education service delivery at all levels in Nigeria. Clearly, every educational institution is established for the purpose of teaching and learning. However, to effectively achieve this purpose requires certain measures to be put in place for ensuring standard in the education system for quality service delivery. In other words, certain quality assurance mechanisms are required for the management of schools for effective service delivery. Quality assurance is any systematic process of checking to ensure that a product or service being provided is meeting specific requirements. Quality assurance in education refers to the provision of the processes required to achieve education of such high quality to address the economic needs of our fast-growing society (Asuquo, Ekpoh & Eton, 2018). It involves the process of monitoring, assessing and evaluating as objectively as possible, all aspects of school life and communicating the outcome to all concerned with a view to improving standards (Education Quality Assurance Handbook for Nigeria, 2010).

In this study, quality assurance entails the actions taken by mission secondary school administrators to maintain minimum and comparable standard in order to forestall problems encountered in the educational system and its products in the world of work. It is also refers to the deliberate efforts in ensuring that educational facilities, equipment, human and financial resources, school programmes and activities (teaching and learning), general administration as well as the end products/outcome (graduates) fit for purposes they are meant for. It takes both internal and external efforts directed at ensuring that school programmes, activities and the resources used in facilitating school processes or operations do not compromise the desired expected results. Quality assurance is thus used to carry out quality management and is a method in making sure that certain quality standards are fulfilled. Quality assurance can be particularly important to ensure that a school develops and performs in line with the curriculum and standards in place. These standards can be assessed both internally and externally to ensure that mission secondary schools follow quality assurance guidelines. Okeke (2013) stressed that quality assurance is important for schools, as it help schools in maintaining and improving their efficiency, leadership and students' progress both by internal and external assessments. He added that when the management of a school work towards achieving quality assurance standards, the management will ensure that both staff and students support high-quality inclusive teaching and learning.

On the other hand, quality assurance mechanisms are methods providing and maintaining the conditions determined to guarantee a high standard of the outcomes and product of education, as well as the management of the school (Osuji & Etuketu, 2019). Emmanuel and Okposio (2012) explains quality assurance mechanisms as the various ways or means of ensuring quality control, performance of school services and maintenance of standards in the management of a school. Quality assurance mechanisms are those measures put in place to guarantee the confidence and certainty that standards and quality are being maintained and

enhanced in a school (Asuquo & Emeribe, 2019). According to Ikpe (2011), quality assurance mechanisms entail actions taken by secondary school administrators to maintain minimum and comparable standard in order to forestall problems associated with educational system. It is also a deliberate efforts to ensure that educational facilities, equipment, human and financial resources, school programmes and activities (teaching and learning), general administration as well as the end products/outcome (graduates) fit for purposes meant for (Adegbesan, 2011). Adegbesan (2011) further stressed that quality assurance mechanisms such as inspection and quality audit are essential for the management of schools for service delivery. Therefore, this study will examine inspection and quality audit as quality assurance mechanisms in the management of Mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Inspection is conceptualized as a general examination of an organizational unit, issue or practice to ascertain the extent it adheres to normative standards, good practices or other criteria and to make recommendations for improvement or corrective action. It is often performed when there is a perceived risk of non-compliance. Wanzare (2002) asserted that inspection in school is conducted to offer a purposeful and constructive advice for the purpose of improving the quality of teaching and learning in schools. Davis and White (2001) stated that school inspection is more of a quality assurance mechanism to ensure accountability to the government, the taxpayers and parents for the education provided to their children most especially it is all about school development and the raising of standards. School inspection aims at providing public assurance through providing accurate, comprehensive and reliable information, intelligence and data about the quality of education in individual schools and across the world (Wilcox, 2000). This information is aimed at benefiting parents, and members of the counties who have a right to know about the quality of education provided by the schools since concerned parties have a right to see education standards and get satisfaction. Leeuw (2002) believes that school inspection is conducted to help teachers improve the quality of their teaching., which according to Ofsted (2012) school inspection raises expectations by setting standards of performance and increase the effectiveness of teachers by providing challenges and the impetus for action where the improvement of teaching and learning is required and by identifying the strengths and weaknesses and setting recommendation for improvement. In support of raising teachers' effectiveness, Nkinyangi (2006) suggests that school inspectors need to conduct continuous assessment, monitoring, and reviewing the performance and progress of pupils as well as reviewing methods of instruction delivery to yield desired impact on school improvement. This therefore suggests that school inspectors need to provide continuous professional support to teachers in order to ensure that teachers have knowledge, skills and confidence to encourage pupils to be independent and creative learners. Similarly, teachers need to have ability of monitoring and assessing their effectiveness that can improve lesson delivery (Nkinyangi, 2006).

Quality audit is the process of systematic examination of a quality system carried out by an internal or external quality auditor or an audit team. Quality audits are typically performed at predefined time intervals and ensure that the institution has clearly defined internal system monitoring procedures linked to effective action. This can help determine if the organization

(school) complies with the defined quality system processes and can involve procedural or results-based assessment criteria. Audits are an essential management tool to be used for verifying objective evidence of processes, to assess how successfully processes have been implemented, for judging the effectiveness of achieving any defined target levels, to provide evidence concerning reduction and elimination of problem areas. For the benefit of the school, quality auditing should not only report non-conformances and corrective actions, but also highlight areas of good practice. In this way other departments in the school may share information and amend working practices as a result, also contributing to continual improvement. Teshome (2014) stressed that for schools to effectively sustain the quality of education service delivery, there is need for periodic quality audit. Supporting this view, Aswathapa (2002) explained that quality audit as a quality assurance mechanism is essential in determining the lines of responsibility, the procedures, the processes and the resources used to manage the quality of education for effective service delivery.

It has been observed that the non-implementation of quality assurance mechanisms (inspection and quality audit) by the management of mission secondary schools has resulted in administrative negligence, teachers' nonchalant behaviour toward teaching, low morale of students in learning, truancy, poor academic achievement, examination malpractices and increased school drop-out. The situation is so critical that some parents are now pulling out children from mission secondary schools in Rivers State and other parts of Nigeria, and sending children abroad to study. Therefore, it is against this background that this study is interested in examining inspection and quality audit as quality assurance mechanisms in the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State, Nigeria.

Aim and Objectives of the Study

The study examined inspection and quality audit as quality assurance mechanisms in the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State, Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to achieve the following objectives:

1. determine the extent inspection relates to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.
2. ascertain the extent quality audit relates to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. To what extent does inspection relate to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State?
2. To what extent does quality audit relates to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State?

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses tested at 0.05 level of significance guided the study:

1. There is no significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

2. There is no significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Methodology

The study adopted the correlation research design. The population of the study comprised all the 133 Anglican Mission Schools Education Board members and 260 teachers in Anglican Mission Secondary Schools in seven (7) Local Government Areas (Obio-Akpor, Okrika, Ikwerre, Etche, Khana, PHALGA, Akuku-Toru) in Rivers State. The sample consisted of 393 respondents (133 Anglican Mission Schools Education Board members and 260 teachers in Anglican Mission Secondary Schools) from 7 Local Government Areas in Rivers State (Obio-Akpor, Okrika, Ikwerre, Etche, Khana, PHALGA, Akuku-Toru). They were selected for the study using the simple random sampling technique. Two instruments (questionnaire) were used for data collection, they are: Quality Assurance Mechanisms Inventory (QAMI) and Management of Mission Schools' Service Delivery Questionnaire (MMSSDQ). The face and content validity of the instrument were ensured. The reliability of the instruments Quality Assurance Mechanisms Inventory (QAMI) and Management of Mission Schools' Service Delivery Questionnaire (MMSSDQ) were determined using the Cronbach alpha method of internal consistency. The reliability coefficients obtained for the various clusters of the instruments were 0.71 and 0.81. The research questions were answered using simple regression while hypotheses were tested with t-test associated with simple regression statistics at 0.05 Alpha level of significance.

Results and Discussion

Research Question One: To what extent does inspection relate to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State?

Table 1: Simple Regression Analysis on the extent inspection relate to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.856 ^a	.733	.732	2.68203	.733	1071.594	1	391	.000

Table 1 revealed that the regression coefficient R was calculated to be 0.856 while the regression squared value was computed to be 0.733. This shows that management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State is positively and highly predicted by inspection. Judging by the coefficient of determination, it shows that 73.3% change in management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State can be predicted by inspection, while 26.7% was accounted by other variables not considered in this study.

Research Question Two: To what extent does quality audit relate to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State?

Table 2: Simple Regression Analysis on the extent quality audit relate to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State

Model	R	R Squared	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. Change
1	.891 ^a	.794	.794	2.35185	.794	1511.097	1	391	.000	

Table 2 revealed that the regression coefficient R was calculated to be 0.891 while the regression squared value was computed to be 0.794. This shows that management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State is positively and highly predicted by quality audit. Judging by the coefficient of determination, it shows that 79.4% change in management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State can be predicted by quality audit, while 21.6% was accounted by other variables not considered in this study.

The null hypotheses formulated for the study were tested using t-test associated with simple regression, which is a relationship.

Hypothesis One: There is no significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Table 3: t-test associated with simple Regression on the relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficient	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		
	B	Std. Error	Beta		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1 (Constant)	4.060	.811		5.009	.000	2.467	5.654
Inspection	.879	.027	.856	32.735	.000	.826	.932

Table 3 revealed that inspection is related with management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State by 0.856. The t-test value 32.735 associated with linear regression was statistically significant at 0.000 when subjected to 0.05 alpha level of

significance. By implication, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery was rejected. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Table 4: t-test associated with simple Regression on the relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient	T	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	2.778	.716		3.879	.000	1.370	4.185
	Audit Quality	.915	.024	.891	38.873	.000	.869	.962

Table 4 revealed that quality audit is related with management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State by 0.891. The t-test value 38.873 associated with linear regression was statistically significant at 0.000 when subjected to 0.05 alpha level of significance. By implication, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery was rejected. Therefore, there is a significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Summary of Findings

The findings of this study are summarized as follows:

1. 73.3% change in management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State can be predicted by inspection, while 26.7% was accounted by other variables not considered in this study.
2. 79.4% change in management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State can be predicted by quality audit, while 21.6% was accounted by other variables not considered in this study.
3. There is a significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.
4. There is a significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Discussion of the Findings

Inspection and Management of Mission Secondary Schools for Service Delivery

The result of this study showed that there is a significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State. The null hypothesis of no significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State was rejected in favour of the alternative that there is a significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State. The findings of the present study is in agreement with that of Ehren et al (2013) who found out that there is significant relationship between inspection and the management of mission schools for service delivery, and that inspection is assess schools with respect to the standards within the quality framework and point out on the strong and weak points of schools based on performance. MacBeath and Martimore (2001) also found out that there exist a significant relationship between inspection and the management of schools for service delivery, and that inspection as a quality assurance mechanism is presumed to be an evaluation of schools' performances against the minimum academic standard and qualities of certain status upon which schools can be managed effectively.

The reason why the finding of the present study stands correct is based on the fact that inspection as a quality assurance mechanism is a routine assessment of whether schools meet the threshold standard for education service delivery.

Quality Audit and Management of Mission Schools for Service Delivery

The result of this study showed that there is a significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State. The null hypothesis of no significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State was rejected in favour of the alternative that there is a significant relationship between quality audit and the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery in Rivers State. The findings of the present study is in agreement with that of Teshome (2014) who found out that there is a significant relationship between quality audit and the management of schools for service delivery, and that for schools to effectively sustain the quality of education service delivery, there is need for periodic quality audit. Kifordu and Igweh (2021) also found out that there exist a significant relationship between quality audit and the management of secondary schools for service delivery and that quality audit should be encourage by school management for effective education service delivery in schools.

The reason why the finding of the present study stands correct is based on the fact that quality audit as a quality assurance mechanism is essential in determining the lines of responsibility, the procedures, the processes and the resources used to manage the quality of education for effective service delivery is schools.

Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it was gathered that poor education service delivery of most mission secondary schools in Rivers State has been attributed to the lack and non-implementation of quality assurance mechanisms. It was also gathered that inspection and quality audit relate significantly to the management of mission schools for service delivery in Rivers State.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following are recommended;

1. Since inspection relates significantly to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery, it is important that periodic inspection be carried out by the management of mission secondary schools in order to achieve the goals and objectives of mission secondary schools in delivering quality education in Rivers State.
2. Since quality audit relates significantly to the management of mission secondary schools for service delivery, there is need for the management of mission secondary schools to continually carry out quality audit to ensure that the lines of responsibility, the procedures, the processes and the resources used in managing the quality of education in mission schools are tailored towards effective service delivery.

References

- Adegbesan, S. O. (2011). Establishing quality assurance in Nigerian education system: Implication for Educational Managers. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 6 (2), 147-151
- Asuquo, M. E. & Emeribe, K. V.(2019). School Administrators' Quality Assurance Mechanisms and Attainment of Secondary Education Objectives in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning*, Vol. 19, No 2, 248-262.
- Asuquo, M. E., Ekpoh, U. I., & Eton, I. C. (2018). Quality control techniques and secondary school goal attainment in Calabar Metropolis of Cross River State, Nigeria. *Journal of Faculty of Education*, University of Calabar, Calabar-Nigeria, 14(1), 99-106.
- Aswathapa, K. (2002). Human resource and personnel management, text cases. New Delhi: Tata McGraw Hill.
- Education Quality Assurance Handbook for Nigeria (2010). Federal Ministry of Education, Federal Inspectorate Service, Revised Edition.
- Ehren, M. C. M., Altrichter, H., McNamara, G. & O'Hara, J. (2013). Impact of school inspections on improvement of schools describing assumptions on causal mechanisms in six European countries: *Educational Assessment Evaluation Accounting*, 25, 3-43
- Ikpe, U. N. (2011). *Fundamentals of administrative management*. Calabar: Johnskil Printers.
- Kifordu, A. A., & Igweh, K. F. (2021). Quality assurance measures and examination management: perspectives from colleges of education in Edo and Delta States, Nigeria. *Nigerian Academy of Management Journal* 16 (1), 56-69

- Okeke, O. J. (2013). Quality assurance in teaching and learning in tertiary institutions in Nigeria. *Journal of Public Administration and Policy Research* (2) 93-99
- Osuji, C. & Etuketu, E.L.(2019). School administrators' quality assurance strategies for the implementation of curriculum in junior secondary school in Owerri Municipal, Imo State. *International Journal of Innovative Education Research* 7(3):101-119
- Teshome, A.S., 2014. Facts and Steps in Quality Assurance. Kampala: Kalpex Educational Publishers.
- Wanzare, Z. O. (2002). Rethinking school inspection in the third world: The case of Kenya. *Educational Management, Administration & Leadership*, 30(2), 213-229.