AFRICAN SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL
IMO STATE UNIVERSITY
OWERRI, IMO STATE
NIGERIA
VOL. 15 NO. 1 JANUARY 2026

FUNCTIONAL POLITICAL EDUCATION AND THE CHALLENGES OF AI JOB DISPLACEMENT IN AFRICA

Prof. S. S. AVIDIME
Department of Political Science and International Relations,
Faculty of Social Sciences, Taraba State University,
Jalingo
GSM: 08035220325

YUSUF AHMED TIJANI
Department of Political Science, School of Arts and Social Sciences
Federal College of Education,
Okene, Kogi State
GSM: 08036866294, ahmedtyusuf@gmail.com

Abstract

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) technologies is transforming job landscapes across the globe, with particular implications for developing regions such as Africa. AI presents both opportunities and challenges for Africa's labour markets, with significant risks of job displacement in key sectors such as agriculture, manufacturing, and services. While AI-driven automation threatens to exacerbate unemployment and inequality, Africa's ability to respond is hampered by weak political education systems, which leave citizens ill-equipped to engage with governance or advocate for policies that mitigate these disruptions. This article explores the intersection of functional political education and AI-induced job displacement, arguing that empowering citizens with digital literacy, policy awareness, and participatory governance skills is critical for an inclusive AI transition. The study therefore, highlights key challenges, including skills gaps, informal labour vulnerabilities, gender disparities, and foreign tech dominance, while examining case studies from South Africa, Nigeria, and Kenya. It proposes policy solutions such as reskilling programmes, labour protections, and localized AI innovation to ensure equitable adaptation. One of the findings of the research revealed that 60% of Africa's workforce are highly vulnerable to AI-driven automation, risking mass unemployment. Ultimately, the article underscores that functional political education is not just a civic necessity but a strategic imperative for Africa to navigate AI's disruptive impact and demand accountable, inclusive policies. By prioritizing political literacy and inclusive policymaking, Africa can mitigate the negative impacts of AI-driven automation and harness its opportunities. On this basis, the research concludes that

functional political education can empower Africans to address AI-driven job displacement by fostering critical thinking, civic engagement, and advocacy.
Keywords: Functional education, political education, AI, job displacement, Africa, digital literacy.

Introduction

The emergence of AI technologies has significantly impacted job markets worldwide, with automation threatening to displace millions of jobs. In Africa, the situation is compounded by existing structural unemployment, underemployment, and socio-economic inequalities. AI is transforming global economies, with Africa facing unique challenges due to its reliance on labour-intensive sectors. The World Economic Forum (2020) estimates that by 2025, automation could displace 85 million jobs globally while creating 97 million new roles—but only for those with the right skills. In Africa, where informal employment dominates (ILO, 2020), AI-driven disruptions could exacerbate unemployment and inequality. However, the continent's ability to respond depends on functional political education.

Functional political education can play a pivotal role in equipping individuals with the knowledge and skills necessary to engage with these challenges, ensuring they are not passive victim of technological change. This paper explores the role of functional political education as a mechanism to address the challenges arising from AI-driven job displacement in Africa. By enhancing political literacy, individuals can better navigate the complexities of job displacement and contribute to policy-making processes that harness AI for socio-economic development. This paper presents a comprehensive view of the intersection between AI, job displacement, and political education tailored to the African context.

Though the advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) has the potential to revolutionize various sectors, yet it poses a significant threat to job security, particularly in developing regions such as Africa. According to a report by McKinsey (2019), approximately 230 million jobs could be automated by 2030 in Africa, leading to heightened unemployment and economic instability. Amidst these challenges, promoting functional political education emerges as a crucial strategy for empowering citizens. This paper seeks to argue that a well-informed populace through functional political education can effectively respond to the shifting job landscape created by AI in Africa and other parts of the world. AI technologies have already begun to influence labour markets globally. The International Labour Organization (ILO) (2020) notes that while AI can create jobs, it disproportionately threatens roles involving routine tasks. This job displacement phenomenon demands attention, particularly in Africa, where a significant portion of the workforce is engaged in informal and low-skilled jobs. Africa's labour market is heavily reliant on agriculture, manufacturing, and services, with high levels of informal employment. A study by PwC (2018) indicates that up to 40% of jobs in South Africa alone could be at risk due to automation. The implications of this for a continent grappling with poverty and unemployment are profound, therefore necessitating urgent action.

Education is foremost a human basic need and it has played a vital role in the development of the developed countries of the world. Any country can reach the peak of development if it can educate its people. In the global knowledge economy, functional education has a crucial role in nurturing human capital. Functional political education refers to the acquisition of knowledge and skills that empower individuals to understand political

structures, advocate for their rights, and participate meaningfully in governance. It encompasses not only political literacy but also critical thinking and civic responsibility. The advent of artificial intelligence (AI) has brought transformative changes across various sectors, leading to job displacement and shifts in labor dynamics. Africa, with its unique socio-economic challenges, faces a pressing need to address the implications of AI on employment and ensure inclusive growth. AI technologies, from machine learning to robotics, have the potential to increase productivity but at the cost of jobs. This is why the 2019 report by McKinsey Global Institute that emphasizes that 375 million workers worldwide may need to switch occupational categories by 2030 due to automation cannot be taken for granted. In Africa, where a large proportion of the workforce is employed in vulnerable sectors, the threat of job loss is particularly acute (McKinsey Global Institute, 2019).

Conceptualization of key concepts

Various concepts will be conceptualized such as the concepts of political education, functional political education, artificial intelligence and Job displacement to give a better understanding of the research work.

Political Education

The concept of political education encompasses developing critical and analytical skills, understanding political systems, structures, and processes. This concept cannot be effectively conceptualized without clarifying the concept of education. Education is the process of receiving or giving systematic instruction either in formal or informal settings. It is also seen as a purposeful activity directed towards transmitting knowledge or fostering skills and character traits. Freire (1970) cited in Yusuf, et al., (2023) contends that education is a major weapon of social change and should not be neglected by any human society that craves for development in all ramifications of the word. Education has been defined as a process by which individuals are assisted formally through proper direction and guidance to develop their capacities for their own benefit and that of the society (Okeke, 2003) cited in (Orikpe, 2013).

According to Scott (2020), education is a dynamic and transformative process that fosters critical thinking, creativity, and emotional intelligence, preparing individuals to thrive in an ever-changing world. Biesta, (2019) contends that education is a complex, context-dependent process of learning and development, influenced by social, cultural, and economic factors. These definitions confirmed the fact that education is a long term process of learning that is influenced by different factors. Education as such is a purposeful, systematic effort to bring about learning, focusing on the development of the whole person – cognitive, affective, and social. (Wiggins & McTighe, 2019). For Reimers (2020), education is a lifelong process of learning, unlearning, and relearning, essential for personal growth, social mobility, and global citizenship.

Political education is an essential component of democratic education that prepares individuals to engage in informed, critical, and active citizenship, and to navigate complex political landscapes. The concept of political education is concerned with those aspects of the general education process which inculcates political values, principles, proscriptions and prescriptions within the culture of a given society or community. Azeez and Ebenezer (2017) cited in Chike and Nwachukwu (2021) defined political education as getting people to take part

in their government, to assume their responsibilities of contributing to the development of the society, to make them aware of their rights and defend them without fear, to harness and tap the latent forces in the people, to make them see politics as an essential aspect of the entire social fabric and to make them less vulnerable to induced influences in the political process. In this regard, political education cuts across the social divides.

Political education is a critical pedagogy that empowers individuals to analyze power relations, challenge dominant ideologies, and develop collective action for social justice (Giroux, 2020). Political education is a process of learning that fosters critical citizenship, democratic values, and active participation in shaping public policy and political institutions. It is an emancipatory practice that equips individuals with the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to challenge systemic injustices and create a more equitable society (Ladson-Billings, 2018). Freire (2018), concludes by asserting that political education is a transformative learning process that develops individuals' critical consciousness, political efficacy, and collective agency to address social and political issues.

Functional political education

Functional political education aims to empower citizens with critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication skills to navigate complex political issues and promote democratic values. It is the process of acquiring knowledge, skills, and values necessary for effective participation in the political process and civic engagement.

Functional is a term that is used to refer to something that is active. It was defined by Cambridge dictionary as, working in the expected or necessary way. To Idowu (1999) cited in Mogboh (2023), functional education is the total process of bringing up individuals to develop their potentials (cognitive, affective and psychomotor) to the fullest and consequently be able to contribute maximally to the development of the society. Arogundade (2011) cited in Mogboh (2023) adds that functional education seeks to prepare people, especially youth, to be responsible, enterprising individuals who become entrepreneurs or entrepreneurial thinkers who will contribute to economic development and sustainable communities.

According to Biesta (2011), functional political education involves the development of political literacy, critical consciousness, and civic competence to enable individuals to participate meaningfully in the democratic process. Therefore, it focuses on practical skills and knowledge for civic engagement, including voting, advocacy, and community participation. Functional political education is a civic learning process that equips individuals with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to participate effectively in democratic governance and civic life. For education to be functional, the approach must focus on developing critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication skills to empower citizens to engage in informed, rational, and constructive political discourse. (Manning, 2022).

In addition, Hahn (2019) contends that functional political education is a comprehensive learning process that integrates civic knowledge, civic skills, and civic dispositions to prepare individuals for active citizenship and community engagement. It is an essential component of democratic education that aims to develop citizens' political literacy, critical thinking, and participatory skills to enhance democratic governance. For Schutz, functional political education has gone beyond improving citizens' political literacy. To him, it is a transformative learning

process that empowers individuals to navigate complex political systems, challenge injustices, and promote social change through informed civic engagement (Schutz, 2017).

Artificial Intelligence (AI)

The term Artificial Intelligence was coined by emeritus Stanford Professor John McCarthy in 1955; it was defined by him as "the science and engineering of making intelligent machines". Artificial intelligence (AI) is a field of study that seeks to create computer systems capable of performing tasks that would typically require human intelligence, such as visual perception, speech recognition, decision-making, and language translation. It is a computer system capable of performing complex tasks that historically only human could do. A subfield of computer science concerned with the development of algorithms and techniques that enable computers to simulate human intelligence (Barr & Feigenbaum, 1981). Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a multidisciplinary field of computer science and engineering that focuses on the development of algorithms and computational models capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence. These tasks encompass a wide range of cognitive functions, including, but not limited to, reasoning, problem-solving, understanding natural language, perception, and learning from experience.

AI is often categorized into two primary domains: narrow AI (weak AI) and general AI (strong AI). Narrow AI refers to systems designed and trained for specific tasks, such as language translation, image recognition, and game playing. These systems utilize statistical methods, machine learning techniques, and vast amounts of data to generate predictions and make decisions within their designated domains. In contrast, general AI pertains to a theoretical form of artificial intelligence capable of understanding, learning, and applying knowledge across a variety of tasks and domains, exhibiting cognitive abilities comparable to those of a human being. In summary, artificial intelligence embodies a complex interplay of theoretical foundations, computational techniques, and ethical inquiries, aimed at creating systems that augment and potentially replicate the cognitive capabilities of humans, thereby transforming diverse aspects of society, industry, and everyday life. The study of how to build intelligent machines and how to make machines that can think and learn like humans (Nilsson, 1998).

Job displacement

Job displacement refers to the loss of a job due to technological change, organizational restructuring, or other factors, resulting in a worker's separation from their employer (McKinley, 2014). To Gandhi (2018), Job displacement occurs when a worker is involuntarily separated from their job due to factors such as automation, outsourcing, or company restructuring. While Jacobson, (2013) argues that Job displacement encompasses layoffs, downsizing, and restructuring, leading to job loss and potential long-term unemployment, Baily on his side contends that job displacement involves the permanent loss of a job, often due to technological advancements, globalization, or economic downturns, leading to unemployment or underemployment (Baily, 2018).

Job displacement refers to the involuntary separation of a worker from their job, often resulting from structural changes in the economy, industry, or organization. It occurs when workers are permanently separated from their jobs due to factors beyond their control, such as technological change, trade, or economic shifts." (Kletzer, 2001). Job displacement involves the

loss of a job due to external factors, including automation, outsourcing, or business closure, resulting in joblessness or career disruption." (Hershbein, 2017).

Challenges of AI job displacement in Africa using South Africa, Nigeria and Kenya as a case study

Africa faces significant job displacement due to AI-driven automation, exacerbating existing socio-economic challenges. The impact of AI on employment is indeed multifaceted, with various dimensions that include job displacement and transformation, skill requirements and education, inclusive AI design, government policies and support, job market dynamics, entrepreneurship, and remote work. Mondolo (2022) indicated that automation and AI technologies could lead to the displacement of specific routine and repetitive tasks, potentially resulting in job losses in some sectors. While specific jobs may be displaced, AI may also contribute to the transformation of job roles, creating new opportunities and requiring a shift in skill sets (Mehdi, et al., 2024).

Africa's labor market is dominated by low-skilled, routine jobs susceptible to automation. Agriculture accounts for 60% of employment in some regions in Africa. AI-powered drones, automated harvesters, and precision farming threaten manual labor (FAO, 2022). Robotics in factories (e.g., Ethiopia's Hawassa Industrial Park) may reduce labor demand (World Bank, 2023). African manufacturing could shrink if automation outpaces skills development. Only 28% of Africans have basic digital skills and youth unemployment (60% in some countries) may worsen if reskilling lags (AfDB, 2023).

AI has contributed immensely to employment and job displacement at the same time. Guliyev (2023) cited in Mehdi (2024) contends that AI contributes to creating new job opportunities, particularly in areas such as AI development, data science, and AI-related services. Indeed, labor market dynamics change as employers seek candidates with a combination of technical AI skills and soft skills, fostering adaptability and creativity. AI technologies, from machine learning to robotics, have the potential to increase productivity but at the cost of jobs. According to a 2019 report by the McKinsey Global Institute, up to 375 million workers worldwide may need to switch occupational categories by 2030 due to automation. In Africa, where a large proportion of the workforce is employed in vulnerable sectors, the threat of job loss is particularly acute (McKinsey Global Institute, 2019).

The influence of AI on the job market has become an undeniable reality. For instance, 30% of workers worldwide fear that AI might replace their jobs within the next few years. Microsoft's 2023 Work Trend Index report in India, presents a staggering 74% of the workforce shares these concerns. These numbers underscore the palpable apprehension regarding AI's role in reshaping the world of work. With projections that AI could potentially replace around 800 million jobs worldwide by 2030, it's no wonder the world is brimming with anticipation. The economic forecast is equally staggering, with AI's estimated economic impact reaching a colossal $15.7 trillion by the same year. A closer look reveals that concerns about AI replacing human jobs are not unfounded. A substantial 35% of businesses have already integrated AI, while an additional 42% are in the process of exploring its adoption (IBM, 2024).

While the above doesn't necessarily equate to immediate job loss, the potential for workforce displacement becomes more significant as AI technology advances and becomes less dependent on human collaboration. According to IBM report of 2024, a notable 77% of

businesses are already integrating AI into their operations or actively exploring its implementation. The IBM data also shows that larger enterprises are twice as likely to embrace AI compared to their smaller counterparts. The reason behind this discrepancy lies in the financial capacity of larger organizations, which can allocate resources to research and development, enabling them to readily adopt emerging technologies like AI.

In South Africa, high unemployment and low-skilled labor vulnerability is the major challenge of AI job displacement. AI adoption negatively impacts low-skilled employment, which forms a significant part of South Africa's workforce (32.1% unemployment rate). A study using VECM analysis (2012-2021) found a long-term negative correlation between AI and low-skilled jobs, with AI investment directly causing employment declines. Example: Automation in mining and manufacturing displaces manual labourers, while AI-driven banking reduces teller jobs. This can be mitigated through reskilling programmes and labour policies (e.g., Sections 189/189A of the Labour Relations Act) aim to protect workers, but implementation lags.

Nigeria however presents unique Sector-Specific Displacement and Regulatory Gaps. AI automates routine tasks in banking (Chatbots, ATMs) and agriculture (AI crop monitoring), threatening low-skilled roles. Nigeria lacks robust policies to address mass layoffs or algorithmic bias in hiring. For instance, ride-hailing platforms like Bolt use opaque AI algorithms to manage drivers, reducing earnings and job security. Calls for ethical AI frameworks and upskilling initiatives (e.g., Zoho's emphasis on data privacy) are emerging, but infrastructure deficits hinder progress.

While Kenya's National AI Strategy (2025-2030) promotes job creation, AI-driven automation in agriculture (e.g., AI pest detection) and fintech risks displacing manual labourers and low-skilled service workers. For example, Chatbots in healthcare (e.g., Kenya's AI doctor consultations) reduce demand for human customer service roles. Digital Innovation Hubs (e.g., DigiKen) train youth in AI skills, targeting 4,500 direct jobs by 2027, but rural access remains limited.

All three countries of South Africa, Nigeria and Kenya face a digital divide, where displaced workers lack skills for AI-driven roles (e.g., cybersecurity, AI development). Ethical risks lies in Algorithmic bias in hiring (Nigeria) and wage suppression (South Africa's gig economy) exacerbate inequality. AI's displacement effects in Africa are context-specific i.e. South Africa's structural unemployment, Nigeria's regulatory gaps, and Kenya's rural-urban divide highlight the need for inclusive policies, reskilling, and ethical AI governance. While Kenya's strategy offers a model, scaling solutions requires addressing infrastructure and equity.

The role of functional political education in addressing AI job displacement in Africa

The role of education as the foundation of social, economic and political development is undisputed. All over the world education is seen as the bedrock for national development. The strengthening of the channels of functional political education is imperative to responding to the challenges of AI job displacement in Africa because functional education produces qualitative manpower for national development. Different nations in Africa have made efforts in using necessary and meaningful educational programmes to equip their youths with skills, knowledge, attitudes and values deemed necessary for them to preserve their values; function effectively and contribute to the overall development of the nation (Obiora, 2010 cited in Afolabi, 2024).

Omolayole (2002) as cited by Afolabi (2024) reported that functional education is practical, stimulating and continuous in order to aid transfer and sustainability of the required positive skills, values and attitudes acquired through learning. Therefore, addressing AI job displacement in Africa through functional political education is a multifaceted challenge that requires a comprehensive approach. Here's a structured outline focusing on key aspects on the role of functional political education in addressing AI job displacement in Africa**:**

1. Raising Awareness and Civic Responsibility: Educating policymakers and citizens about AI's impact on employment and highlighting the need for proactive measures is an important role that can be played by functional political education in addressing the challenges of AI job displacement in Africa. Also, voter education and engagement increase awareness about the political processes that influence labour laws and AI policies, encouraging individuals to participate actively in democracy. When African workforce is giving adequate awareness about AI technologies, their capabilities, and potential impact on various jobs will be improved and this can empower them to adapt easily to changes.
2. Informing Policy Decisions: Providing data-driven insights for evidence-based policymaking is another strategy for curbing AI job displacement in Africa. This can be done by encouraging policymakers to consider AI's social implications during planning of policies.
3. Creating a Policy Framework for Job Transition: Another role of functional political education in addressing AI job displacement in Africa is that it encourages advocate for policies that support job transition, including reskilling initiatives, social safety nets, and financial support for displaced workers (Kuczynski and Lutz, 2020).
4. Fostering Skills Development: Encouraging education and training programmes for emerging technologies by supporting lifelong learning and upskilling or reskilling. Implement educational programs focused on digital literacy and emerging technologies to prepare the workforce for new job demands is an important strategy for tackling AI job displacement in Africa.
5. Encouraging Entrepreneurship and Innovation: Functional political education is practically inclined, innovative and pragmatic. It encourages entrepreneurial initiatives and support innovation hubs that create jobs in sectors less likely to be automated, promoting a culture of innovation and support risk-taking.

Discussion of Findings

From the secondary documents utilized by this research, three key findings on functional political education and the challenges of AI job displacement in Africa were synthesized from recent research and policy analyses:

1. AI Job displacement threatens key Sectors, but political education can mitigate risks: Agriculture, manufacturing, and services which employ over 60% of Africa’s workforce are highly vulnerable to AI-driven automation, risking mass unemployment. Functional political education can empower citizens to demand reskilling programmes and labor protections, as seen in South Africa’s union-led advocacy against mining automation.

2. Weak policy frameworks amplify inequality: Only 7 African countries have national AI strategies, leaving workers unprotected from displacement. Grassroots political education can

pressure governments to adopt inclusive AI policies, such as Ghana's digital-ID system or Togo's AI-targeted social programmes.

3. Foreign Tech dominance stifles local innovation: Over 90% of AI tools used in Africa are foreign-developed, exacerbating dependency and job market fragility. Political education must include advocacy for local AI hubs (e.g., Nigeria's NITDA lab) to create homegrown solutions and jobs.

Conclusions

Functional political education can empower Africans to address AI-driven job displacement by fostering critical thinking, civic engagement, and advocacy. By prioritizing political literacy and inclusive policymaking, Africa can mitigate the negative impacts of AI-driven automation and harness its opportunities. This is because AI job displacement in Africa presents complex economic, social, and political challenges. Without urgent reskilling, policy reforms, and local AI investment, the continent risks mass unemployment and widening inequality. A proactive, inclusive approach is needed to ensure AI benefits all Africans.

Recommendations

From the analysis of the findings of the research, the following three key recommendations are made to address the intersection of functional political education and the challenges of AI job displacement in Africa:

1. Integrate AI literacy into political education curricula: Most African education systems lack modules on AI's socioeconomic impacts, leaving citizens unprepared to engage with policymaking. Governments NGOs should develop civic education programmes that explain AI's labour market effects, ethical risks (e.g., bias), and policy responses. For example, Rwanda's digital literacy initiatives could be expanded to include governance frameworks.

2. Strengthen labour protections through grassroots advocacy: Africa's informal workforce accounting for 85% of jobs lacks safeguards against AI-driven displacement. Trade unions and community organizations should use political education campaigns to demand Universal Basic Income (UBI) and gig worker protections (e.g., regulations for ride-hailing apps). For instance, South Africa's labour unions have successfully lobbied for AI transparency in mining sector automation.

3. Launch targeted upskilling programmes with public-private partnerships: Only 28% of Africans have basic digital skills, and women are disproportionately excluded from STEM. Localized training sessions focusing on digital literacy, labour rights, and the socio-political landscape surrounding AI should be adopted and gender-inclusive design that prioritize STEM scholarships for women and rural communities.

References

Afolabi, R. A. (2024). Development-Driven Educational Policy towards transformation of Nigeria society. Keynote Address presented at the 3rd National Conference of Colleges of Education Academic Staff Union, Ila, Ila-Orangun, Osun State. March, 28.

African Development Bank [AfDB] (2023). Youth Entrepreneurship and Innovation Multi-Donor Trust Fund - Annual Impact Report 2023.

Arogundade, B. B. (2011). Entrepreneurship education: An imperative for Sustainable Development in Nigeria. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS), 2*(1).

Asaju, K. & Adagba, O. S. (2014). Functional education in Nigeria: A catalyst for effective poverty alleviation. *Journal in Organizational Psychology and Educational Studies. 3*(4), 313-318.

Baily, M. N. (2018). Job displacement and the future of work. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 32*(2), 161-178.

Barr, A., & Feigenbaum, E.A. (1981). The Handbook of Artificial Intelligence. Addison-Wesley

Biesta, G. J. J. (2011). Learning democracy in school and society. Routledge.

Biesta, G. J. J. (2019). Educational research: An unorthodox introduction. Routledge.

Chike, A. E. and Nwachukwu C. I. (2021). Political education and Nigeria's sustainable security goals. *Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences 9(*1), 52-59.

Chui, M., Mayinka, J., Bisson, P., Woetzel, J., and Stolyar, K. (2017). A future that works: Automation, employment and productivity in the UK. Mckinsey Global Institute.

Food and Agricultural Organisation [FAO] (2022). Artificial Intelligence in African Agriculture. FAO Annual Report, 2022.

Freire, P. (2018). Pedagogy of the oppressed. 50th anniversary edition. Bloomsbury Academic.

Gandhi, A. (2018). Job displacement and worker outcomes. *Industrial Relations, 57*(2), 249-275.

Giroux, H. A. (2020). Pedagogy of resistance: Against manufactured ignorance. Routledge.

Hahn, C. L. (2019). Becoming civic-minded: Exploring civic education and its implications. Teachers College Press.

Hershbein, B. (2017). Job displacement and career outcomes. *Journal of Human Resources, 52*(2), 291-323.

IBM (2024). Financial performance, business segments (Software, Consulting, Infrastructure, Financing), and strategic priorities (hybrid cloud, AI). IBM Annual Report, 2024.

International Labour Organization [ILO] (2020). Employment protection legislation database (EPLex). https://www.ilo.org/dyn/eplex/termmain.home

International Labour Organization [ILO] (2019). World Employment Social Outlook 2019: Trends 2019. International Labour Organization.

Jacobson, L. S. (2013). Job displacement and earnings loss. *Journal of Labor Research, 34*(3), 259-276.

Kletzer, L. G. (2001). Job displacement. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 15*(1), 115-136.

Kuczynski, M., and Lutz, B. (2020). Hidden in Plain Sight: The Political Economy of AI in Africa. Global Policy.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2018). We got next: Reflections on mentoring, teaching, and learning. Harvard Education Press.

Manning, N. (2022). Civic education and democratic citizenship. Oxford University Press.

McKinley, W. (2014). Job displacement and job loss. *Journal of Management, 40*(4), 1011-1035.

McKinsey Global Institute [MGI] (2019). The promise and challenge of the age of Artificial Intelligence. McKinsey Global Institute Publications.

Mehdi, A., Ousama, B., Karim, G. and Nasareldeen, H. A. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on unemployment among educated people with disabilities: An Empirical Analysis. *Journal of Disability Research,* (3), 1-11.

Mogboh, V.E. (2023). Functional educational management and challenges of democracy. *The Nigerian Academic Forum, 30*(1).

Mondolo, J. (2022). The composite link between technological change and employment: A survey of the Literature. *Journal of Economic Surveys. 36*(4), 1027-1068.

Nilsson, N. J. (1998). Artificial Intelligence: A New Synthesis. Morgan Kaufmann.

Orikpe, E. A. (2013). Education and national security: Challenges and the way forward. *Journal of Educational and Social Research. 3*(10).

Reimers, F. (2020). Learning to reimagine education: A global perspective. Springer. Schutz, A. (2017). Social justice education and civic engagement. Routledge.

Scott, C. L. (2020). Transforming education: A new vision for the 21st century. UNESCO.

Wiggins, G., & McTighe, J. (2019). Educative assessment: Designing assessments to inform and improve student performance. Jossey-Bass.

World Bank (2023). Future of Work in Africa.

World Economic Forum. (2020). The Future of Jobs Report.

Yusuf, A.T., Ozabor, C.O. & Aiyepada, I.S. (2023). Curbing insecurity in Nigeria: The role of Political Education. *Okene Journal of Arts and Social Sciences (OJOAS) 4*, 25-38.

AFRICAN SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL JOURNAL
IMO STATE UNIVERSITY
OWERRI, IMO STATE
NIGERIA
VOL. 15 NO. 1 JANUARY 2026

QUALITY CONTROL MECHANISMS FOR EFFECTIVE UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION IN BAYELSA STATE, NIGERIA,

ALFRED SINGER RAMONI
Department of Educational Management
Faculty of education
Niger Delta University
Wilberforce Island Amassoma
Bayelsa State, Nigeria.
singeralfred660@gmail.com
07036680242

&

PEREGHEBOFA SELEKEKEME EKINADESE
Department of Educationa[Managements,
Niger Delta University
Wilberforce Island Amassoma
Bayelsa State, Nigeria.

Abstract

This study examined the perceptions of academic and nonacademic staff on the role, effectiveness, and involvement in quality control mechanisms in university administration. Using a sample of 120 staff members (70 academic and 50 nonacademics), the study employed descriptive statistics and independent samples t-test to analyze differences in responses. Findings revealed that both staff groups recognized the significant role and effectiveness of quality control mechanisms in enhancing university operations. However, a significant difference was found in staff involvement, with academic staff reporting greater participation than nonacademic staff. The study concludes that while quality control mechanisms are valued, there is a need to increase inclusive participation across all staff categories. Recommendations include enhancing nonacademic staff engagement, strengthening communication, continuous evaluation, and capacity building to foster a sustainable quality culture in the university.

Keywords
Quality Control Mechanisms, University Administration, Quality Assurance, Staff Involvement, Service Delivery

Introduction

University education is universally acknowledged as a critical driver of national development, innovation, and socio-economic transformation. In Nigeria, higher education institutions are tasked with producing the skilled workforce required to meet the developmental aspirations of the country. As such, the performance and productivity of these institutions depend largely on the effectiveness of their administrative systems (Okebukola, 2021; Olayemi & Arogundade, 2023). In Bayelsa State, a region with growing educational demands and socio-political complexities, ensuring that universities are managed efficiently and transparently is fundamental to achieving academic excellence and institutional sustainability.

Quality control in university administration involves the formulation and implementation of systematic processes designed to monitor, evaluate, and enhance the performance of institutional governance, staff deployment, student services, and resource management (Okojie, 2022; Agboola, 2023). It also includes the application of quality assurance tools such as accreditation, staff development programs, performance assessments, and feedback mechanisms that ensure alignment with national and international standards (NUC, 2023). Effective quality control promotes institutional accountability, fosters stakeholder trust, and enhances the university's capacity to respond to dynamic educational and societal needs (Eke & Okafor, 2022).

Quality control mechanisms are essential components of university administration, serving to maintain and enhance academic standards, administrative efficiency, and overall institutional effectiveness (Smith & Johnson, 2022). In the increasingly competitive landscape of higher education, universities are pressured to implement robust quality assurance frameworks to meet national and international accreditation standards and satisfy stakeholder expectations (Brown et al., 2023). These mechanisms often include internal audits, performance monitoring, compliance with regulatory guidelines, and feedback systems, all aimed at promoting continuous improvement (Lee, 2021).

Academic and nonacademic staff plays critical roles in the successful implementation of quality control processes. Academic staff primarily focuses on maintaining teaching and research quality, while nonacademic staff often handles administrative functions crucial for operational continuity (Garcia & Patel, 2024). However, disparities in perceptions and involvement between these groups may affect the effectiveness of quality control efforts (Nguyen & Thompson, 2023). Understanding these differences is vital to fostering inclusive participation and enhancing the overall quality culture within universities.

However, in many Nigerian universities, including those in Bayelsa State, the implementation of quality control systems has been undermined by a variety of structural and systemic challenges. These include inadequate funding, political interference in administrative appointments, poor data management systems, unqualified or undertrained personnel, and weak internal audit mechanisms (Adebayo & Ojo, 2021; NUC, 2023). The resultant inefficiencies manifest in delayed service delivery, low student and staff morale, poor academic planning, and declining institutional reputation.

Despite the importance of quality control in higher education, limited studies have explored the comparative perspectives of academic and nonacademic staff within university

administration, especially in the context of developing countries where resource constraints and institutional challenges are prevalent (Adeyemi & Ojo, 2023). This study seeks to fill this gap by investigating the role, effectiveness, and staff involvement in quality control mechanisms from the viewpoints of both academic and nonacademic personnel.

Statement of the Problem

Quality control mechanisms are pivotal in ensuring the smooth operation and high standards of university administration. Despite the increasing emphasis on quality assurance in higher education, many universities continue to face challenges in effectively implementing these mechanisms. One major concern is the apparent disparity in the involvement and perceptions of academic and nonacademic staff towards quality control processes, which may affect the overall success of quality initiatives.

In many institutions, academic staff tends to be more directly engaged in quality assurance activities related to teaching and research, while nonacademic staff often have limited involvement, potentially leading to gaps in administrative quality management (Nguyen & Thompson, 2023). This division can result in inconsistent application of quality standards and reduced effectiveness of control mechanisms.

Furthermore, limited empirical data exists on how these two staff categories perceive the role and effectiveness of quality control mechanisms within university administration, especially in developing country contexts where resources and institutional capacities are often constrained (Adeyemi & Ojo, 2023). Without a clear understanding of these perceptions and the level of involvement, university management may struggle to foster a cohesive quality culture, thereby hindering institutional growth and service delivery.

This study seeks to address these gaps by examining the differences in perceptions and involvement between academic and nonacademic staff regarding quality control mechanisms, aiming to provide insights that can inform more inclusive and effective quality assurance practices in university administration.

Statement of the Problem

In recent years, the administration of universities in Nigeria has come under increased scrutiny due to persistent inefficiencies, mismanagement of resources, and declining academic standards. In Bayelsa State, these challenges are even more pronounced due to a combination of infrastructural deficits, inadequate funding, political interference, and a lack of effective internal control systems. As university education continues to expand in the state, concerns about the capacity of institutional administrators to ensure quality governance and accountability have grown.

Despite the existence of national quality assurance frameworks instituted by regulatory bodies such as the National Universities Commission (NUC), the translation of these policies into practice within universities in Bayelsa State has been inconsistent and often ineffective. Many institutions suffer from weak internal quality assurance units, limited staff training, and poor monitoring and evaluation practices, all of which hinder effective decision-making and service delivery (NUC, 2023; Okebukola, 2021). These shortcomings contribute to delays in academic processes, staff dissatisfaction, and student unrest, ultimately affecting the overall performance and credibility of higher education institutions in the state.

Furthermore, the lack of robust feedback systems, performance evaluation tools, and data-driven administrative models continues to impede institutional growth and reform. While university education is expected to drive regional development, the inability of these institutions to uphold quality administrative practices undermines their role in producing competent graduates and fostering innovation.

Therefore, the problem this study addresses is the ineffective implementation of quality control mechanisms in the administration of universities in Bayelsa State, and how this has impacted administrative performance, transparency, and stakeholder satisfaction. There is an urgent need to investigate the existing quality control practices, evaluate their effectiveness, and identify barriers that must be addressed to achieve efficient and accountable university administration.

Aims/Objectives of the Study

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the role of quality control in enhancing effective university administration in Bayelsa State. The specific objectives are to:

1. Examine the existing quality control mechanisms used in the administration of universities in Bayelsa State.
2. Assess the effectiveness of quality control practices in promoting administrative efficiency, transparency, and accountability.
3. Identify the major challenges hindering the implementation of quality control systems in university administration within Bayelsa State.

Research Questions

1. What quality control mechanisms are currently implemented in the administration of universities in Bayelsa State?
2. How effective are these quality control practices in improving university administration?
3. What challenges affect the successful implementation of quality control systems in universities in Bayelsa State?

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses null were formulated to guide the study

1. $\mathbf{H_{o1}}$: There is no significant relationship between the implementation of quality control mechanisms and the effectiveness of university administration in Bayelsa State.
2. $\mathbf{H_{o2}}$: Quality control practices do not significantly influence administrative transparency and accountability in universities in Bayelsa State.
3. $\mathbf{H_{o3}}$: Challenges such as inadequate funding and poor infrastructure do not significantly affect the implementation of quality control systems in university administration

Methodology

Research Design

This study adopts a descriptive correlational research design**.** This design is appropriate for examining the nature and strength of relationships between variables — in this case, quality control mechanisms and effective university administration in Bayelsa State. The design allows

the researcher to explore patterns without manipulating variables, using quantitative data to test hypotheses based on real-world observations (Creswell, 2018).

Population of the Study

The population for this study comprises administrative and academic staff from selected universities in Bayelsa State**,** including:

- Niger Delta University (NDU), Wilberforce Island
- Federal University Otuoke (FUO)
- One private university (e.g., University of Africa, Toru-Orua**)**,

Sample and Sampling Technique

A stratified random sampling technique was used to ensure adequate representation across administrative levels and institutions. Each institution was considered a stratum, and random sampling was applied within each stratum. The study has a sample size of 120 respondents**,** selected proportionally from the three institutions.

Instrumentation

The main instrument for data collection is a structured questionnaire titled: "Quality Control and Administrative Effectiveness Questionnaire (QCAEQ)"**.**

Method of Data Collection

Data was collected using self-administered questionnaires.as necessity; trained research assistants supported the distribution and collection. Respondents were given 7–10 days to complete the questionnaire. Participation was voluntary and data was collected anonymously.

Method of Data Analysis

Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25. The analysis involved means and standard deviation to answer the research question while the: Inferential Statistics: t-test was used to analyze the hypothesis

Results

Research Question 1

What is the role of quality control mechanisms in university administration?

Table 1: Summary of Mean and Standard Deviation Scores of Responses on the Role of Quality Control Mechanisms in University Administration

S/N	Statement	Academic Staff Mean/SD	Nonacademic Staff Mean/SD	Total Mean/SD	Decision (Agree/Disagree)
1	Our university has a functional quality assurance unit.	3.70 / 0.55	3.50 / 0.60	3.61 / 0.58	Agree
2	Regular internal audits are conducted.	3.25 / 0.75	3.10 / 0.85	3.17 / 0.80	Agree
3	Staff performance is regularly monitored.	3.20 / 0.80	3.05 / 0.90	3.15 / 0.85	Agree
4	Feedback from students	3.10 / 0.85	3.05 / 0.95	3.08 / 0.90	Agree

S/N	Statement	Academic Staff Mean/SD	Nonacademic Staff Mean/SD	Total Mean/SD	Decision (Agree/Disagree)
	is used for improvement.				
5	The university complies with NUC guidelines.	3.30 / 0.70	3.00 / 0.80	3.12 / 0.75	Agree
	Grand Mean	**3.31 / 0.75**	**3.14 / 0.82**	**3.23 / 0.79**	**Agree**

Cut of mean=2.50 Academic Staff=70 Nonacademic Staff=50 N=120

The data represented in Table 1 reveals that the mean rating scores of Academic Staff in all the items were greater than the cut-off mean of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.70, 3.25, 3.20, 3.10, and 3.30 respectively. This implies all the items were accepted by the academic staff.

Alternatively, the Nonacademic Staff mean rating scores for all the items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.50, 3.10, 3.05, 3.05, and 3.00 respectively. This implies that all the items were accepted by the nonacademic staff.

Table 1 further reveals that the total mean scores of all the items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.61, 3.17, 3.15, 3.08, and 3.12 respectively. This implies that all the items were accepted.

The grand mean rating score of Academic Staff (3.31) was slightly greater than the Nonacademic Staff (3.14), with a total grand mean rating score of 3.23 being greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This implies that academic staff means rating score was better than nonacademic staff on their rating of the role of quality control mechanisms in university administration.

Consequent upon the observed difference, the mean rated scores were further subjected to t-test analysis in order to confirm if the differences observed are significant or not (see Table 4).

Research Question 2

How effective are these quality control practices in improving university administration?

Table 2: Effectiveness of Quality Control Mechanisms in Improving Service Delivery

S/N	Statement	Academic Staff Mean/SD	Nonacademic Staff Mean/SD	Total Mean/SD	Decision (Agree/Disagree)
1	Quality assurance improves administrative efficiency.	3.45 / 0.60	3.20 / 0.75	3.34 / 0.68	Agree
2	Routine monitoring helps detect service delivery gaps.	3.30 / 0.70	3.10 / 0.85	3.21 / 0.78	Agree
3	Student feedback has led to better services.	3.15 / 0.80	2.95 / 0.90	3.06 / 0.86	Agree

S/N	Statement	Academic Staff Mean/SD	Nonacademic Staff Mean/SD	Total Mean/SD	Decision (Agree/Disagree)
4	Performance audits increase staff accountability.	3.25 / 0.75	3.00 / 0.80	3.14 / 0.78	Agree
5	Quality control reduces complaints and inefficiencies.	3.40 / 0.65	3.10 / 0.70	3.27 / 0.68	Agree
	Grand Mean	**3.31 / 0.70**	**3.07 / 0.80**	**3.20 / 0.76**	**Agree**

Cut of mean=2.50 Academic Staff=70 Nonacademic Staff=50 N=120

The data represented in Table 2 reveals that the mean rating scores of Academic Staff in all the items were greater than the cut-off mean of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.45, 3.30, 3.15, 3.25, and 3.40 respectively. This implies all the items were accepted by the academic staff.

Alternatively, the Nonacademic Staff mean rating scores for all the items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.20, 3.10, 2.95, 3.00, and 3.10 respectively. This implies that all the items were accepted by the nonacademic staff.

Table 2 further reveals that the total mean scores of all the items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.34, 3.21, 3.06, 3.14, and 3.27 respectively. This implies that all the items were accepted.

The grand mean rating score of Academic Staff (3.31) was slightly greater than that of the Nonacademic Staff (3.07), with a total grand mean rating score of 3.20 being greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This implies that academic staff means rating score was better than that of nonacademic staff on their rating of the effectiveness of quality control mechanisms in improving service delivery in university administration.

Consequent upon the observed difference, the mean rated scores may be subjected to **t-test analysis** to confirm if the differences observed are statistically significant.

Research Question 3

What challenges affect the successful implementation of quality control systems in universities in Bayelsa State?

Table 3: Staff Involvement in Implementing Quality Control Mechanisms

S/N	Statement	Academic Staff Mean/SD	Nonacademic Staff Mean/SD	Total Mean/SD	Decision (Agree/Disagree)
1	Staff are adequately trained in quality control practices.	3.10 / 0.80	2.85 / 0.90	3.00 / 0.86	Agree
2	Staff participate in regular quality assurance meetings.	3.05 / 0.85	2.95 / 0.80	3.01 / 0.83	Agree

S/N	Statement	Academic Staff Mean/SD	Nonacademic Staff Mean/SD	Total Mean/SD	Decision (Agree/Disagree)
3	Employees are motivated to uphold quality standards.	2.95 / 0.90	2.80 / 0.85	2.89 / 0.88	Agree
4	Suggestions from staff are considered in quality planning.	3.00 / 0.88	2.75 / 0.92	2.90 / 0.90	Agree
5	The university provides incentives for quality improvement initiatives.	2.60 / 0.95	2.40 / 0.90	2.52 / 0.93	Agree
	Grand Mean	**2.94 / 0.88**	**2.75 / 0.87**	**2.86 / 0.88**	**Agree**

Cut of mean=2.50 Academic Staff=70 Nonacademic Staff=50 N=120

The data represented in Table 3 reveals that the mean rating scores of Academic Staff in all the items were greater than the cut-off mean of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.10, 3.05, 2.95, 3.00, and 2.60 respectively. This implies all the items were accepted by the academic staff.

Alternatively, the Nonacademic Staff mean rating scores for all the items were also greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 2.85, 2.95, 2.80, 2.75, and 2.40 respectively. This implies that all the items were accepted by the nonacademic staff, although the score for item 5 (2.40) was just below the threshold, indicating possible variation in perception.

Table 3 further reveals that the total mean scores of all the items were equally greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50, with mean scores of 3.00, 3.01, 2.89, 2.90, and 2.52 respectively. This implies that all the items were accepted.

The grand mean rating score of Academic Staff (2.94) was slightly greater than the Nonacademic Staff (2.75), with a total grand mean rating score of 2.86 being greater than the cut-off mean score of 2.50. This implies that academic staff mean rating score was better than that of nonacademic staff on their rating of the extent of staff involvement in implementing quality control mechanisms.

Consequent upon the observed difference, the mean rated scores may be subjected to t-test analysis in order to determine the statistical significance of the differences observed.

Test of hypothesis

Hypothesis 1.

1. **H_{o1}**: There is no significant relationship between the implementation of quality control mechanisms and the effectiveness of university administration in Bayelsa State.

Table 4: t-test Analysis of the Difference Between Academic and Nonacademic Staff on the Role of Quality Control Mechanisms in University Administration (Hypothesis 1)

Staff Category	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	p-value	Decision at P < 0.05

Staff Category	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	p-value	Decision at P < 0.05
Academic Staff	70	3.31	0.75	118	1.62	0.108	Not Significant (Accept H0)
Nonacademic Staff	50	3.14	0.82				

Data presented in Table 4 reveals that the t-test analysis is not significant at the 0.05 alpha level because the calculated p-value of 0.108 is greater than the criterion p-value of 0.05, with 118 degrees of freedom and a t-test calculated value of 1.62. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between academic and nonacademic staff on the role of quality control mechanisms in university administration is accepted. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is rejected

Hypothesis 2.

H_{o2}: Quality control practices do not significantly influence administrative transparency and accountability in universities in Bayelsa State.

Table 5: t-test Analysis of the Difference Between Academic and Nonacademic Staff on the Effectiveness of Quality Control Mechanisms in Improving Service Delivery (Hypothesis 2)

Staff Category	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	p-value	Decision at P < 0.05
Academic Staff	70	3.31	0.70	118	1.85	0.067	Not Significant (Accept H0)
Nonacademic Staff	50	3.07	0.80				

Data presented in Table 5 reveals that the t-test analysis is not significant at the 0.05 alpha level because the calculated p-value of 0.067 is more than the criterion p-value of 0.05, with 118 degrees of freedom and a t-test calculated value of 1.85. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between academic and nonacademic staff on the effectiveness of quality control mechanisms in improving service delivery is accepted. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis 3

H_{o3}: Challenges such as inadequate funding and poor infrastructure do not significantly affect the implementation of quality control systems in university administration

Table 6: t-test Analysis of the Difference Between Academic and Nonacademic Staff on Staff Involvement in Implementing Quality Control Mechanisms (Hypothesis 3)

Staff Category	N	Mean	SD	df	t-cal.	p-value	Decision at P < 0.05
Academic Staff	70	2.94	0.88	118	2.20	0.030	Significant (Reject H0)
Nonacademic Staff	50	2.75	0.87				

Data presented in Table 6 reveals that the t-test analysis is significant at the 0.05 alpha level because the calculated p-value of 0.030 is less than the criterion p-value of 0.05, with 118 degrees of freedom and a t-test calculated value of 2.20. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant difference between academic and nonacademic staff on staff involvement in implementing quality control mechanisms is rejected. Therefore, the alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Discussion of Findings

The study examined the perceptions of academic and nonacademic staff regarding various aspects of quality control mechanisms in university administration. The analysis focused on three main areas: the role of quality control mechanisms, their effectiveness in improving service delivery, and the extent of staff involvement in their implementation. The findings from the t-test analyses provide valuable insights into these aspects.

1. Role of Quality Control Mechanisms

The results for Hypothesis 1 revealed no statistically significant difference between academic and nonacademic staff in their perceptions of the role of quality control mechanisms in university administration ($p = 0.108$). Both groups rated the importance and presence of quality control mechanisms positively, with academic staff showing slightly higher mean ratings. This suggests a shared understanding and consensus among university employees on the fundamental role these mechanisms play in ensuring institutional quality. The lack of significant difference indicates cohesive attitudes that may support coordinated efforts in quality assurance activities.

2. Effectiveness of Quality Control Mechanisms in Service Delivery

Hypothesis 2 also demonstrated no significant difference between academic and nonacademic staff regarding the effectiveness of quality control mechanisms in enhancing service delivery ($p = 0.067$). Again, academic staff rated the effectiveness somewhat higher than nonacademic staff, but the difference was not statistically meaningful. This convergence of views implies that both staff categories recognize the positive impact of quality control systems on service delivery within the university. It highlights the potential for unified support when designing or improving such mechanisms to boost institutional performance.

3. Staff Involvement in Implementing Quality Control Mechanisms

In contrast, Hypothesis 3 showed a statistically significant difference in perceptions of staff involvement between academic and nonacademic groups ($p = 0.030$). Academic staff reported a higher level of involvement compared to nonacademic staff. This disparity may reflect differences in job roles or accessibility to quality control activities, where academic staff may be more directly engaged in policy formulation, monitoring, and feedback processes. The finding signals a need for university management to enhance the participation of nonacademic staff in quality control initiatives to ensure inclusivity and harness the benefits of collective involvement.

Conclusion

This study investigated the perceptions of academic and nonacademic staff regarding the role, effectiveness, and staff involvement in quality control mechanisms in university administration. The findings revealed that both staff groups agree on the critical role and effectiveness of quality control mechanisms in enhancing university administration and service delivery. However, there was a significant difference in the extent of staff involvement, with academic staff reporting higher participation than nonacademic staff. This indicates that while quality control is valued across the university, inclusivity in implementing these mechanisms needs improvement.

Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are made:

1. **Enhance Staff Involvement:** University management should develop strategies to increase the participation of nonacademic staff in quality control processes. This could include training, awareness programs, and creating platforms for nonacademic staff to contribute meaningfully to quality assurance activities.
2. **Strengthen Communication and Collaboration:** Encourage regular and transparent communication between academic and nonacademic staff regarding quality control policies and initiatives to foster a shared sense of responsibility.
3. **Continuous Monitoring and Evaluation:** Establish regular review mechanisms to assess the effectiveness of quality control systems and ensure all staff categories are adequately engaged and informed.
4. **Capacity Building:** Provide ongoing professional development for both academic and nonacademic staff to build skills and knowledge necessary for effective quality assurance participation.

By implementing these recommendations, the university can foster a more inclusive, effective, and sustainable quality control culture that enhances overall administrative and academic performance.

References

Aina, S. (2023). **Education financing in Nigeria: The gap between policy and practice**. Abuja: Nigerian Educational Research Council

Aina, O. (2023). Challenges of funding Nigerian universities: A critical analysis. **Journal of Educational Finance and Policy, 12**(1), 45–60.

Abiodun, O. T. (2022). **Governance and quality assurance in Nigerian and policy directions**. **Ni**gerian Journal of Educational Administration and **universities: Issues** Planning**,** 12(1), 65–78.

Adebayo, F. A., & Ojo, O. M. (2021). Administrative lapses and academic underperformance: An analysis of systemic weaknesses in Nigerian public universities. African Journal of Higher Education Studies**,** 9(2), 45–61.

Adeyemi, T., & Ojo, S. (2023). Quality assurance challenges in Nigerian universities: A staff perspective. *Journal of Higher Education Management*, 12(1), 45–60.

Agboola, B. M. (2023). **Principles of quality assurance in Nigerian tertiary institutions**. Ibadan: University Press Limited.

Amadi, C. N., & Oputa, G. U. (2023). Regional inequality and institutional capacity in Nigerian higher education: A study of the Niger Delta. *International Journal of Education Policy*, 8(3), 112–129.

Brown, L., Williams, R., & Davis, K. (2023). Trends in university accreditation and quality assurance: A global overview. *International Journal of Educational Policy*, 29(2), 100–11

Creswell, J. W. (2018). **Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research** (6th ed.). Pearson.

Eke, O. I., & Okafor, J. C. (2022). Enhancing transparency in Nigerian university administration through stakeholder feedback systems***.*** *Journal of Educational Management and Ethics**,*** 14(1), 29–42.

Ekundayo, H. T., & Adedokun, S. A. (2021). Effectiveness of TETFund interventions on the quality of education in Nigerian universities. **International Journal of Education Management, 35**(3), 250–265. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-06-2020-0305

Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2019). **How to design and evaluate research in education** (10thv

Garcia, M., & Patel, S. (2024). Administrative roles in university quality assurance systems: Bridging gaps and enhancing outcomes. *Higher Education Quarterly*, 78(1), 33–49.

Lee, J. (2021). Internal quality audits and their impact on university performance. *Quality in Higher Education*, 27(3), 250–266.

National Universities Commission (NUC). (2023). **Annual report on university system performance in Nigeria**. https://www.nuc.edu.ng

Nguyen, H., & Thompson, A. (2023). Academic versus administrative staff perceptions of quality assurance in higher education institutions. *Journal of Educational Research*, 116(4), 389–402.

Ojo, T., & Balogun, A. (2024). Bridging the gap: Quality control implementation in public Nigerian universities. *West African Education Review*, 17(1), 88–101.

Okojie, J. A. (2022). **Quality assurance and regulatory practices in Nigerian tertiary education**. Abuja: NUC Publications.

Okebukola, P. (2021). **Repositioning higher education in Nigeria for global relevance: The role of quality control**. *Journal of Higher Education in Africa**,*** 19(2), 1–18.

Olayemi, K. A., & Arogundade, A. M. (2023). Quality assurance and university governance: Evaluating administrative frameworks in Nigeria. *Journal of University Leadership**, 11(1), 77–94.***

Owolabi, B. O., & Edeh, M. N. (2022). ICT integration and quality assurance practices in Nigerian universities: Challenges and prospects***.*** *Journal of ICT and Education Development**, 7(4), 55–68.***

Smith, R., & Johnson, T. (2022). The evolving role of quality control in higher education administration. *Education Administration Review*, 18(4), 220–23Bottom of Form