

Factor Responsible For Examination Malpractices As Expressed By Undergraduates of Osun State University, Nigeria

Dr. Yusuf, Florence Adeoti, Yinusa Rasheedat Olufunke and Bamgbose Oluwayemisi Ruth
Department of Arts and Social Science Education, Osun State University, Faculty of Education, Ipetu-Ijesa Campus.

Abstract

The study investigated perception of undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractices. The study is a descriptive study; a sample of two hundred (200) undergraduates formed the participants for the study. A questionnaire titled: "Factor responsible for examination malpractices was used for data collection. Data collected were analyzed using frequency counts, mean scores, t-test and ANOVA statistical analysis. The findings of the study revealed the poor study habit; poor concentration during lectures and peer influence are major factors responsible for examination malpractices; the findings also revealed that there is no significant difference on perception of undergraduates on the factors responsible for examination malpractices on the basis of gender and academic programme; while, there is significant difference on perception of undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractice on the basis of academic level. Base on the findings it was recommended that university management should establish a functioning counselling unit to cater for the needs of the students; and adequate punitive measure should be given to any students that get involve in examination malpractice.

Keywords: Responsible, Factors, Undergraduate, Examination Malpractice, Osun State University

1. Introduction

Examination malpractice is an unwholesome practice encapsulating different types of malicious means adopted by unserious students to cheat during examinations in order to score high marks and pass in the examinations. This assertion is in consonance with Sooze (2004) defined examination malpractices as all unaccepted means that students use to pass examination. Examination malpractices are one of the challenges facing educational system in Nigeria, and are known to have existed for some time in Nigeria. It is a problem that is affecting educational credibility at all levels and in various types of examinations, whether internal or external examination. Some Nigerian students cannot write examination without involving themselves in one form of examination malpractices or the other. The occurrences of examination malpractices had for long raised curiosity among the stakeholders in educational system in Nigeria.

Omotosho (1990) and Adeleke (1993) identified poor preparation for examination, low morality and poor school facilities as causes of examination malpractices. From another study, Josephson (1998) discovered among 20,829 middle and high school students that 70% of the students claimed that they cheated in examination. Ijaiya (1998) also found socio-economic factors to be major causes than institutional factors, while Ogunji (2011) noted that since 1991 to date in Nigeria, cheating in examinations has taken new and more sophisticated dimension in both secondary and tertiary educational institutions. In addition, Onyechere (2004) observed that most students have the tendency to cheat in the examination. In the same vein, Olugbile (2004) carried out a study that revealed high rate of examination malpractices in secondary schools certificate examination in Nigeria, thus further confirming the prevalence of this unwholesome practice.

The issue of examination malpractices has become such a worrisome phenomenon to all stakeholders in educational system to the extent that the Nigerian Government issued an Act 33 of 1999 referred to Examination Malpractices and Miscellaneous Offences Act, to curb this unwanted acts. The acts of examination malpractices that have become so widespread and a common feature in most tertiary institutions took their roots from secondary schools, which they often end up carrying into the qualifying examination preparatory to entering tertiary institutions. This claim is consistent with the observation made by Adenipekun (2004) that five major examination bodies (JAMB, WAEC, NECO, NABTEB and NTI) cancelled an average of 740,000 results on account of massive examination malpractices.

In Osun State University, there is sanction against any student that engages in examination malpractice, ranging from repeat or suspension from school for two or four semesters. Despite this punitive measure, students still engage in examination malpractices. Based on this premise the purpose of this study was to investigate factors responsible for examination malpractices as expressed by undergraduates of Osun State University.

1.2 Research Questions

One research questions were raised to guide the study:

1. What are the factors responsible for examination malpractices among undergraduates?

1.3 Hypotheses

1. There is no significant difference in the perception of male and female undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractices.
2. There is no significant difference in the perception of undergraduates from different academic level on factors responsible for examination.
3. There is no significant difference in the perception of undergraduates on factor responsible for examination malpractices on the basis of academic programme.

2. Methodology

The study is a descriptive study. Simple random sampling was used in selecting two hundred (200) undergraduates of Osun State University as participants for the study. Questionnaire titled "Factors Responsible for Examination Malpractices Questionnaire" (FREMPQ). Data collected was analyzed using mean scores, frequency counts and t-test analysis. The findings of the study will have implication for counselling in higher institution.

3. Results

Research Question 1: What are the factors responsible for examination malpractices among undergraduates?

Table 1: Factors Responsible for Examination Malpractices among Undergraduates

S/N	I t e m s	S	A	D	S D	M e a n	S . D
1	P o o r s t u d y h a b i t	1 0 4 52%	6 6 33%	2 1 10.5%	9 4.5%	3.325	. 8 3 8
2	P a r t i c i p a t i o n i n c u l t i s m	5 4 27%	7 1 35.5%	3 4 17%	4 1 20.5%	2.690	1.082
3	E n g a g e m e n t i n n i g h t o u t i n g	3 8 19%	7 7 38.5%	5 6 28%	2 9 14.5%	2.620	. 9 5 4
4	S u b s t a n c e a b u s e	4 1 20.5%	6 6 33%	6 5 32.3%	2 8 14%	2.600	. 9 6 7
5	I n d i s c i p l i n e a m o n g s t u d e n t s	4 9 24.5%	8 7 43.5%	3 2 16%	3 2 16%	2.765	. 9 9 7
6	Non-implementation of the examination malpractices sanction	3 8 19%	5 2 26%	6 1 30.5%	4 9 24.5%	2.395	1.056
7	P o o r c o n c e n t r a t i o n d u r i n g l e c t u r e s	6 7 33.5%	9 3 46.5%	3 1 15.5%	9 4.5%	3.090	. 8 1 6
8	F r e e d o m o f m o v e m e n t w i t h o u t r e s t r i c t i o n	2 5 12.5%	6 0 30%	6 9 34.5%	4 6 23%	2.320	.966
9	"Living couple's life (male and female students sharing a room together	5 0 25%	3 2 16%	6 6 33%	5 2 26%	2.400	1.125
1 0	P o o r a t t e n d a n c e o f l e c t u r e s	7 4 37%	7 5 37.5%	3 7 18.5%	1 4 7%	3.045	.915
1 1	I n a d e q u a t e p r e p a r a t i o n f o r t h e e x a m i n a t i o n a m o n g s t u d e n t s	1 0 9 54.5%	5 1 25.5%	3 3 16.5%	7 3.5%	3.310	.870
1 2	D e s i r e o f s t u d e n t s t o p a s s e x a m i n a t i o n b y a l l m e a n s	6 6 33%	7 9 39.5%	3 1 15.5%	2 4 12%	2.935	.983

1 3	Not spending reasonable time in school	4 8 24%	7 2 36%	5 8 29%	2 2 11%	2.730	.950
1 4	Leakages of question papers by lecturers	4 7 23.5%	5 4 27%	5 6 28%	4 3 21.5%	2.525	1.075
1 5	Leakages of question paper by examination officer for the department	4 5 22.5%	6 3 31.5%	4 9 24.5%	4 3 21.5%	2.550	1.065
1 6	Keeping bad company	8 2 41%	7 2 36%	2 5 12.5%	2 1 10.5%	3.075	.977
1 7	Staying away from school at will	7 5 37.5%	7 1 35.5%	3 1 15.5%	2 3 11.5%	2.990	.997
1 8	Poor assimilation of concept been taught	7 6 38%	7 4 37%	3 6 18%	1 4 7%	3.060	.917
1 9	Poor infrastructural facilities in the school	6 3 31.5%	5 4 27%	6 3 31.5%	2 0 10%	2.800	.997
2 0	Lack of teacher's commitment	6 4 32%	6 5 32.5%	5 3 26.5%	1 8 9%	2.875	.966
2 1	Unstable school calendar	6 8 34%	5 3 26.5%	5 5 27.5%	2 4 12%	2.825	1.034
2 2	Inadequate teaching hours by lecturers	5 6 28%	6 7 33.5%	5 6 28%	2 1 10.5%	2.790	.970
2 3	Poor teaching method by lecturers	5 3 26.5%	7 4 37%	5 4 27%	1 9 9.5%	2.805	.939
2 4	Sitting arrangement during the examination	4 4 22%	4 5 22.5%	6 7 33.5%	4 4 22%	2.445	1.064
2 5	Insufficient hours to use the school library	3 4 17%	3 6 18%	7 7 38.5%	5 3 26.5%	2.255	1.032
2 6	Power failure during the examination period	4 8 24%	3 9 19.5%	5 9 29.5%	5 4 27%	2.405	1.126
2 7	Lack of proper guidance for students	4 5 22.5%	7 3 36.5%	6 4 32%	1 8 9%	2.725	.913
2 8	Lack of effective supervision during the examination	5 9 29.5%	5 3 26.5%	4 8 24%	4 0 20%	2.655	1.105
2 9	Aiding and abetting by invigilators in the examination hall	5 2 26%	5 3 26.5%	7 2 36%	2 2 11.5%	2.670	.988
3 0	Peer pressure	7 9 39.5%	7 3 36.5%	2 7 13.5%	2 1 10.5%	3.050	.976

Table 1 shows the analysis of research question 1 (What are the factors responsible for examination malpractices among undergraduates?). It can be seen that 85% of the students agreed that poor study habit is responsible for examination malpractices among undergraduates while 80% believed that poor concentration during lectures and inadequate preparation for the examination would lead to examination malpractices among students. The table also reveals that 73% of the respondents perceived that staying away from school at will is responsible for examination malpractices among students. It can also be seen from the table that 76% of the respondents agreed that peer pressure is responsible for examination malpractices among the undergraduate students.

Hypothesis 1: There is no significant difference between the male and female students on factors responsible for examination malpractices.

Table 2: Summary of t-test Analysis on the difference between the Male and Female Students on factors responsible for Examination Malpractices

Gender	N	X	SD	DF	T	Sig.	Remark
Male	94	79.947	15.038	198	2.569*	.011	Significant
Female	106	85.189	13.812				

*Denote significance at $P < 0.05$

Table 2 shows the result of the difference between the male and female undergraduate students on factors responsible for examination malpractices. The result reveals that there is a significant difference between the male and female students on factors responsible for examination malpractices ($t = 2.569$, $df = 198$, $p < 0.05$). This implied that the perception of male students on factors responsible for examination malpractices is significantly differed from that of their female counterpart. Therefore, the null hypothesis 1 is rejected.

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant difference among undergraduates from different academic level on factors responsible for examination malpractices.

Table 3: Summary of t-test Analysis on the difference among Undergraduates from different Academic Level on the factors responsible for Examination Malpractices

Academic Level	N	X	SD	DF	t	Sig.	Remark
100 level	106	82.906	14.452	198	.185	.753	Not Significant
200 level	94	82.521	14.845				

*Denote significance at $P < 0.05$

Table 3 reveals the result of the difference between among undergraduates from different academic level on factors responsible for examination malpractices. The result shows that there is no significant difference among undergraduates from different academic level on factors responsible for examination malpractices ($t = 0.185$, $df = 198$, $p > 0.05$). This implied that the perception of 100 level students on the factors responsible for examination malpractices is not significantly differed from that of their 400 level counterparts. Hence, the null hypothesis 2 is not rejected.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference among undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractice on the basis of academic programmes.

Table 4: Summary of Analysis of Variance on the significant difference among Undergraduates on factors responsible for Examination Malpractices on the basis of Academic Programmes

Source	Sum of Square	DF	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Remark
Academic Programme						
Between Group	3431.227	5	686.245	3.414**	.006	Significant
Within Group	39000.648	194	201.034			
Total	42431.875	199				

**Denote significance at $P < 0.001$

Table 4 shows the result of the difference among undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractice on the basis of academic programmes. The result reveals that there is a significant difference among

undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractice on the basis of academic programmes ($F_{(5,194)} = 3.414, p < 0.001$). This implied that the perception of undergraduates on the factors responsible for examination malpractices is significantly differed based on their academic programmes. Therefore, the null hypothesis 3 is rejected.

4. Discussion of Findings

One of the findings of this study is that there was a significant difference between male and female students on factors responsible for examination malpractices. This implied that the perception of male students on factors responsible for examination malpractices is significantly differed from that of their female counterpart. This finding may be due to the fact that female are always afraid to get involve in any illegal acts than their male counterparts.

Another finding of this study is that there was no significant difference among undergraduates from different academic level on factors responsible for examination malpractices. This means that the perception of 100 level students on the factors responsible for examination malpractices is not significantly differed from that of their 400 level counterparts. This finding is in agreement with Onyechere(2004)noted that it is almost a routine for students to cheat in examination.

Further, the result of this study also revealed that there was a significant difference among undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractice on the basis of academic programmes. This implied that the perception of undergraduates on the factors responsible for examination malpractices is significantly differed based on their academic programmes.

5. Implication for Counselling

This study revealed that there is need to give proper guidance to students for them to cope with challenges non-residential campus system may pose to them. This would help the students to develop good behaviours that will enhance their academic performance and moral upright. There is also a need to set up functioning counselling units and employ full time and adequate number of counsellors in the universities to help students live a healthy life and behave in an acceptable manner to both the school and the community.

Counsellors should be organising orientation programme for new students on how to live successfully in the university and to cope and manage their new freedom of leaving alone without anybody to control their in and out movement counsellors should be providing to students important means of resolving problems and difficulties in a confidential and supportive manner. Counsellors should be organizing moral talk to undergraduates from time to time. This will help undergraduate to develop good study habit, to progress academically, to develop morally and to have self dignity.

Counsellors should create awareness among undergraduates on the need to come for counselling to resolved any behavioural or academic progress. Counsellor can do this by distributing posters, leaflet or giving talk on guidance counselling. This is necessary because undergraduates need to understand the counselling is helping relationship that can help them is solving their problem and make them to live a fulfil life in and outside the school for them to maximally develop their potentials.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this study the following conclusions were drawn.

Poor study habit, Poor concentration during lectures; inadequate preparation for lectures; inadequate preparation for examination and peer pressure are the major factors responsible for examination malpractices. Significant difference was revealed on the perception of undergraduate the factors responsible for examination malpractice on the basis of gender and academic programmes. However, there was no significant difference on the perception of undergraduates on factors responsible for examination malpractices on the basis of academic level. It is therefore, recommended from the findings of this study that functioning counselling units should be established in tertiary institutions to provide guidance to students on educational issues and other related problems. The school management should give strong punitive measure to any students that engage in examination malpractices.

References

- Adekale, A. (1993) .Incidence and causes of examination malpractices among students Nigerian Journal of Educational Foundations, 4, (1), 18-4 1.
- Adenipekun, O. (2004 March 4). Examination Malpractices and multibillion naira business Vanguard Retrieved July 19, 2009 from website: <http://www.sdnetwork.kabissa.org>.
- Josephson, M., 1998. Report card on the ethics of American youths; Los Angeles, CA: Josephson
- Ogunji, A. A. (2011). Examination Management and Examination Malpractice: The Nexus. National Seminar Paper on Crisis and Conflict Management in Higher Institutions of Learning, Akure, Ondo State.
- Olugbile, S., 2004. Exam malpractice rocks Zamfara. (Retrieved, June, 2007)]. Lagos: Punch Education, The Punch 17 (19166)
- Omosho, H.M(1990). The face of examination malpractices in Nigeria. WAEC News,4(3), 3-5
- Onyechere, I. (2004, March 4): Cheating: A world-wide problem. In 'Comes in at Least 33 ways' All Africa.com.
- Ijaiya, N.Y., 2000. Failing schools' and national development: Time for reappraisal of school effectiveness in Nigeria. Nigerian J. Educational Research and Evaluation, 2(2): 42.
- Sooze, S. (2004, May 29). Way out of examination malpractices. Daily Times, 7-8.