

Incidence of Academic Dishonesty among Post-graduate Students in Federal Universities in South South Nigeria

Emmanuel Etta Ekuri^[1]

Julius Michael Egbai^[2]

Abstract:

This study sought to provide empirical data on rampant academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students of Federal Universities in South-South Zone of Nigeria; and also to find out the underlying factors associated with such academic dishonest behaviours. This study adopted the survey design to collect data from Post-graduate students from 3 Universities in South South zone. The sample for this study consisted of nine hundred and thirty (930) post graduate students of three federal universities in South-South zone of Nigeria (440 males and 490 females), with age range of 20 and 50 years, and a mean age of 38.35 from the Universities of Calabar, Port-Harcourt, and Benin. The sample was selected through stratified random sampling technique.

A valid and reliable 61 item scale (Academic Dishonest Behaviour Questionnaire), with a Cronbach Alpha reliability of .68, was used to measure the frequency of occurrence of each type of dishonest behaviour identified among students. The final version of the questionnaire was administered to graduate students in the respective Universities with the help of four trained research assistants. Frequencies and percentages count of rampant academic dishonest behaviour was calculated, while factor analysis technique was used to isolate the underlying factors associated with academic dishonesty among the target group. The summary of the findings indicates that: Students tended to have been greatly involved in most aspects of academic dishonest behaviours including examination and non examination cheating behaviours. Generally, the underlying factors of academic dishonest behaviours include; impersonation, plagiarism, unruly behaviour, concoction, copying, and colluding.

Key words.: Academic dishonesty, Cheating Behaviour, Impersonation, Plagiarism, Unruly behaviour, Copying, Colluding, graduate students

Article History: Received: 15th June 2018, Revised: 20th June 2018, Accepted: 25th June 2018, Published: 30th June 2018.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over time academic dishonesty has negatively affected students' outcome, teachers, schools and the society at large. Today in Nigeria, there is a general apathy about the unemployable status of Nigerian graduates. Some of the reasons are attributable to the inability of the graduates to defend the certificate they hold. There have been reported incidences of collapsed high rise buildings in some major cities in Nigeria especially in Lagos, Lagos State. These are buildings built by certified and supposedly qualified civil engineers, qualified surveyors, architects who are seen to have obtained requisite qualifications in their various fields of specializations. Also observed are the performances of most trained and qualified teachers who cannot teach as expected of them.

We have incidences where trained and certified chartered accountants and auditors cannot turn out meaningful audit reports of an establishment. The medical field is not left out. It has been alleged that most deaths recorded in the hospitals occur as a result of incompetence of medical personnels. Most of our mechanical engineers cannot be said or termed to be perfect for they have nothing to show of their training. Most lawyers cannot even write briefs, the list is endless. Sequel to the highlighted observations, one is tempted to believe that these poor performances are due to academic dishonest behaviours the students engaged in during their

schooling. Could these be due to the emphasis placed on paper qualification, that today many people struggle to gain admission into tertiary institutions to obtain a certificate? Since the labour market is flooded with first degree holders, the need for additional qualifications becomes pertinent even when one knows that one does not have the requisite knowledge for post graduate studies. The only hope of such a student is to indulge in academic dishonest behaviours both in examination and non examination situations.

One can conveniently say that some of the dishonest behaviours today seen in the society and workplace come as a result of academic dishonesty. Those who engage in it in school are more likely to engage in such behaviours in the future, potentially putting them on a road to a life of dishonesty. Indeed, Swift and Sarath, (2001) found that students who are dishonest in class are more likely to engage in fraud and theft on the job when they enter the workplace. Unfortunately, teachers are being accused of not living up to standard regarding their instructional ability. Perhaps, they have done their best but the students refused to justify such efforts in terms of effective learning. Some universities or institutions of higher learning today have been associated with academic dishonest behaviours due to actions of these categories of students.

^[1]Department of Educational Foundations, University of Calaba, Email: dr.ekuri@gmail.com

^[2]Department of Educational Foundations, University of Calaba

Academic dishonesty may cause negative impacts on individual perpetrators, the educational institutions and the society at large. For lecturers as educators, academic dishonesty misleads the process and results of educational assessments become invalid. Students who commit academic dishonest behaviours also cause disadvantage for students who have academic integrity. This is seen when during the process of selection of job opportunities after completing his or her education at the university, they are considered for better jobs due to their fake class of degrees against the genuine ones. (Bushweller, 1999, cited in Mason, 2006). Grade point average (GPA) which is owned by the student-perpetrators of academic dishonesty is invalid despite the high value. For educational institutions, cheating can lead to decreased invalidity of the quality of degrees at the institution in the midst of other educational institutions.

A careful look at the educational system in Nigeria posits that the system is in a state of mess and disarray as a result of corrupt practices (known as academic dishonesty) that have eaten deep into the fabric of all levels of the educational enterprise in the country. Anyebe and Anyebe (2008) lamented that cheating behaviour had become a very serious menace that is threatening the Nigerian educational system. Akem (2005) says cheating has often been partly blamed on the inability of graduate students to demonstrate the skills they were taught and examined in.

By virtue of Nigerian law, academic dishonesty is a criminal offence. Despite this legal fact, available research evidence (e.g. Adebayo, 2011) indicates that offenders abound in the nation's educational institutions at all levels neither unapprehended by the law enforcement agencies nor prosecuted in the ordinary court of law. In most cases, educational institutions have devised extra-judicial means of punishing offenders without recourse to the law. This, however, has not acted as a strong deterrence, and so the tendency for increased incidence of academic cheating at all levels of our school system.

In Nigeria, emphasis has been on academic dishonesty that takes place during examinations while dishonesty in other important assessment activities outside examinations are ignored. This is in spite of the fact that all forms of assessment before, during and after examination (formative and summative) have far reaching implications on decisions made about the student learning and progress and the performance of the entire school system. For instance, if such decisions are based on invalid and unreliable data, such decisions will therefore be very misleading. Academic dishonesty negatively impacts on validity and reliability of assessment results, and thus poses a serious threat to the school system. There is therefore the need to eradicate this menace or possibly reduce it to the barest level. One of the ways this can be achieved is through empirically documenting the various forms that these behaviours occur, so that specific strategies could be devised to address the challenge.

Available literature focusing on 943 students from 19 academic disciplines of a large English University, (Newstead, Franklyn-Stokes & Armstaed, 1996), revealed among other things that "paraphrasing material from another source without acknowledging the original author" was the

most frequently occurring cheating behaviour among students followed by "Inventing data", "allowing own course work to be copied", "fabricating references" and "copying materials for course work from a book without a source" in that order. The findings also revealed that, most frequently occurring reasons for cheating behaviour among the sample were "time pressure", "cheating to increase marks" and "fear of failure" in that order. Least frequently occurring cheating behaviours were "attempting to obtain special consideration by offering or receiving favour through bribery, seduction and corruption" and "taking examination for someone else or having someone else to take an examination for you". Newstead et al (1996) also found out that reasons for dishonesty were related to the nature of the particular academic cheating behaviour engaged in and that sex and age of subject were influencing factors.

However, previous studies in this area have focused more on common academic dishonest behaviours during examinations and the influence of moral development, and home environmental variables on academic dishonesty. Lacking in such studies are researches related to how sex and age influences academic dishonest behaviour before or outside the examination. In addition, studies that focused on how post graduate students other than self concept are engaged in such dishonest behaviours are scarce. It was on this basis that the present study was conceived. The study sought to provide empirical data on rampant academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students of Federal Universities in South-South Zone of Nigeria; and also to find out the underlying factors associated with such academic dishonest behaviours.

Research questions

1. What are the rampant academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students' of Federal Universities in South-South Nigeria?
2. What are the underlying factors associated with such academic dishonest behaviours?

II. METHODOLOGY

Research design

This study adopted the survey design. Survey design was chosen because it is a research approach specifically designed to systematically collect data about a group of individuals, who have same characteristics, through the use of written, questionnaires etc. There was no manipulation of variables since they had already manifested in the population before the study and it is an efficient means of collecting data from a large number of respondents, representing the entire population.

Sample

The sample for this study consisted of nine hundred and thirty (930) post graduate students of three federal universities in South-South zone of Nigeria (440 males and 490 females), with age range of 20 and 50 years, and a mean age of 38.35 from the Universities of Calabar, Port-Harcourt, and Benin. The sample was selected through stratified random sampling technique.

Instrumentation

Academic Dishonest Behaviour Questionnaire (ADBQ) was used to measure the frequency of occurrence of each type of dishonest behaviour identified among students. The questionnaire contained 61 identified dishonest behaviours that students engage in both inside and outside examination halls. It has two major sections. Section A focuses on students' characteristics: university, faculty, programme of study, sex and age. Section B is made of the academic dishonest behaviours which includes among others; paraphrasing material without acknowledging source, inventing data in doing research work, among others. The sub scales were designed on a five point rating scale in which subjects indicated their responses such as; Never, Once, 2times, 3times and more than 3times. The items were designed from study of literature on academic dishonest behaviours after careful scrutiny by the supervisors.

In order to estimate the validity of the instruments, the draft version of the questionnaire was given to five research experts in the field of measurement and evaluation and educational counsellors to give it face validity. In order to estimate reliability of the instruments, the draft version of the questionnaire was trial-tested on 68 post graduate students in three faculties from the Cross River University of Technology, Calabar who were not part of the final study sample. Cronbach coefficient alpha of 0.83 was obtained as estimate of internal consistency reliability for the instrument of "Academic Dishonest Behaviour Questionnaire" (ADBQ).

Procedure for data collection

The final version of the questionnaire was administered by the researcher after due permission has been obtained from the Dean of the various graduate schools to subjects in the respective Universities with the help of four trained research assistants. Lecturers in the universities cooperatively worked with the researcher to ensure maximum cooperation of subjects in their respective lecture halls. The researcher enveloped questionnaires and sent to students who leave off campus by hand delivery; and also visited the respondents in the hostels and other areas on campus where activities were being carried out like defence venues.

Procedure for data preparation and analysis

The responses on the instruments were manually scored. This provided the initial raw data for the study. Each response on the Academic Dishonest Behaviour Questionnaire (ADBQ) was measured on a weighted value of five through one (Never = 1; Once = 2; 2times = 3; 3times = 4; More than 3times = 5). Frequencies and percentages count of rampant academic dishonest behaviour was calculated, while factor analysis technique was used to isolate the underlying factors associated with academic dishonesty among the target group.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Results

Research question 1

What are the rampant academic dishonest behaviours among

post graduate students' of Federal Universities in South-South, Nigeria?

To provide answer to this research question, frequencies and percentages (descriptive statistics) were used to summarise the data. Their responses on extend of perceived involvement in academic dishonest behaviours were collapsed into 2 (been involved and never been involved), that is all responses connoting involvement from once to more than three times were collapsed into one. This way, the number of subjects who had at one time or the other been involved and those who never were involved was determined. Based on this, their corresponding frequencies were converted to percentages. The result is presented on table 1. The result on table 1 presents the general pattern of academic dishonest behaviours.

The result shows that a greater proportion of students who participated in this study (67 percent) tend to have been involved in the following aspects of academic dishonest behaviours: paraphrasing material without acknowledging source, permitting your own coursework to be copied by another student, fabricating references, falsifying references. Altering data collected through fieldwork, inventing data in doing research work, mishelving library materials for easy access to you, collaborative generous marking of coursework, submitting joint work as a personal work, paraphrasing material without acknowledging source, permitting your own coursework to be copied by another student, fabricating references, falsifying references. Altering data collected through fieldwork, inventing data in doing research work, mishelving library materials for easy access to you, collaborative generous marking of coursework, submitting joint work as a personal work,

Table 1: General pattern of academic dishonest behaviours

S/N	Behaviours	Been involved	Never been involved
1	Paraphrasing material without acknowledging source	843(90.8)	87(9.2)
2	Permitting your own coursework to be copied by another student	721(77.7)	209(22.3)
3	Fabricating references	791(85.1)	139(14.9)
4	Falsifying references	729(78.4)	201(21.6)
5	Altering data collected through fieldwork	702(75.5)	228(24.5)
6	Inventing data in doing research work	634(68.2)	296(31.8)
7	Mishelving library materials for easy access to yourself	696(74.8)	234(25.2)
8	Collaborative generous marking of coursework	679(73.1)	251(26.9)
9	Submitting joint work as a personal work	589(63.3)	341(36.7)
10	Doing coursework for another student	681(73.2)	249(26.8)
11	Medically lying to secure extension of deadline	719(77.3)	211(22.7)
12	Taking illicit materials into the exam	616(66.3)	313(33.7)
13	Illicit procurement of information on exam paper's content	492(53.0)	437(47.0)
14	Submitting answer script written from outside the exam hall	213(22.8)	717(77.2)
15	Taking examination for another student	215(23.0)	715(77.0)
16	Collusion with another students to communicate answers	730(78.5)	200(21.5)
17	Leakage of question papers	276(30.6)	654(69.4)
18	Buying of question papers	209(22.4)	721(77.6)
19	Assaulting or attempting to assault the invigilator	241(25.8)	689(74.2)
20	Inducement of examiners such as begging and appealing for marks	623(67.0)	307(33.0)
21	Leaving examination hall without permission	375(40.3)	555(59.7)
22	Press lecturers for areas of concentration	839(90.2)	91(9.8)
23	Pre meditate collusion between two or more	844(90.7)	86(9.3)
24	Prearrange to sit together to collude	823(88.5)	107(11.5)
25	Smuggle out question paper to a helper outside the hall	342(36.7)	588(63.3)
26	Exchange question papers on which notes have been made	578(62.1)	352(37.9)
27	Take excuse to go to the toilet to look for answer	406(43.6)	524(56.4)
28	Tell colleagues answers to question verbally	785(84.4)	145(15.6)
29	Hide prepared notes or answers in pants and bring them out during exams	291(31.2)	639(68.8)
30	Refuse to submit examination script after the examination	92(9.8)	838(90.2)
31	Continue writing answers after time is up	728(78.3)	202(21.7)
32	Fail to expose known examination cheats	700(75.2)	230(24.8)
33	Cause any form of disturbance in the examination hall	644(69.2)	286(30.8)
34	Go through friends / relations of the examiner for marks/other forms of favour	683(73.4)	247(26.6)
35	Use coded or sign language to indicate answers to question	832(89.5)	98(10.5)
36	Offering gift to invigilator to allow for copying in examination	583(62.6)	347(37.4)
37	Substitute answer sheet with the one answered for you outside the hall	232(24.9)	698(75.1)
38	Refusal to submit answer script	157(16.8)	773(83.2)

39	Refusal to be searched by invigilators for clearance	276(29.6)	654(70.4)
40	Offering gifts to examination officer before the examination	497(53.4)	433(46.6)
41	Offering gift to examination officer after the examination	497(53.4)	433(46.6)
42	Offering gift to course lecturer before the examination	565(60.7)	365(39.3)
43	Offering gift to course lecturer after the examination	651(70.0)	279(30.0)
44	writing on tables	511(54.9)	419(45.1)
45	writing on lockers	284(30.5)	646(69.5)
46	writing on clothes	197(21.1)	733(78.9)
47	writing on walls	120(12.8)	810(87.2)
48	writing on part of the body	184(19.7)	746(80.3)
49	writing outside the examination hall	140(15.0)	790(85.0)
50	writing on hand kerchief	348(37.4)	582(62.6)
51	writing on jacket lining	344(36.9)	586(63.1)
52	Bringing into the exam hall papers with examinable information on them	682(73.3)	248(26.7)
53	Bringing into the hall books with examinable information on them	543(58.3)	387(41.7)
54	Bringing into the hall cell phones with examinable information on them	541(58.1)	389(41.9)
55	Bringing into the hall programmable calculators with examinable info on them	477(51.2)	453(48.8)
56	Bringing into the hall other materials with examinable information on them	675(72.6)	255(27.4)
57	Copying from another student in the exam without consent	692(74.4)	238(25.6)
58	Copying from another student in the exam with consent	690(74.2)	240(25.8)
59	Copying another student's coursework without consent	586(63.0)	344(37.0)
60	Copying another student's coursework with consent	642(69.0)	288(31.0)
61	Copying materials without acknowledging source	469(50.4)	461(49.6)

Percentages are in parenthesis

The behaviours also includes doing coursework for another student, medically lying to secure extension of deadline, taking illicit materials into the exam, collusion with another student to communicate answers, inducement of examiners such as begging and appealing for marks. Press lecturers for areas of concentration, pre-meditate collusion between two or more, pre-arrange to sit together to collude, exchange question papers on which notes have been made, tell colleagues answers to question verbally.

Continue writing answers after time is up, fail to expose known examination cheats, cause any form of disturbance in the examination hall. Go through friends and relations of the examiner for marks or other forms of favour, use coded or sign language to indicate answers to question, offering gift to invigilator to allow for copying in examination. Offering gifts money or materials to course lecturer before the examination, offering gifts money or materials to course lecturer after the examination, writing on tables, bringing into the exam hall papers with examinable information on them. Bringing into the exam hall books with examinable information on them, bringing into the exam hall cell phones with examinable information on them. Bringing into the exam hall other materials with examinable information on them. Copying from another student in the exam without consent, copying from another student in the exam with consent, copying another student's coursework without consent, copying another student's coursework with consent.

On the other hand, the result shows that some students (33 percent) are not involved in academic dishonest behaviours in the following aspects: Submitting answer script written from outside the exam hall, taking examination for another student. Leakage of question papers, buying of question papers, assaulting or attempting to assault the invigilator. Leaving examination hall without consent, smuggle out question paper to a helper outside the hall, take excuse to go to the toilet to look for answer.

Hide prepared notes or answers in pants and bring them out during examination, refuse to submit examination script after the examination, substitute answer sheet with the one answered for you outside the hall, refusal to submit answer script, refusal to be searched by invigilators for clearance. Writing on lockers, writing on clothes, writing on walls, writing on part of the body, writing outside the examination hall, writing on handkerchief and writing on jacket lining.

Research question 2

What are the underlying factors associated with academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students of federal universities in South-South Nigeria?

To answer this research question, factor analysis statistical procedure was used. Scores in form of factor loadings were used. From table 6, factor analysis through Varimax rotation with Kaiser Normalization method was applied to the data yielding a six dimensional solution with factors loadings up to 0.4 and above considered for the analysis and interpretation of the result. The high value of about 85% (above 0.4) of the items as indicated on the communalities as shown in table 6 is an indication of the importance of the items selected for this study for its relevance and appropriateness.

The six factors which altogether accounted for 51.590% of the total variance in the 61 original items may be regarded as composite indicators defining dimensions of academic dishonest behaviours in the study area. Table 5 indicates the sums of squares loading (initial eigen value). The table shows the indices upon which the six factors were chosen. Similarly, table 7 shows the Rotated factor matrix for the dimension of academic dishonest behaviours and how the items loaded on the factors. Factor 1 accounted for 24.685% of the total variance and without doubt the most important factor. Of the 61 variables in the analysis, 20 of them loaded on this factor. However, two items, 26 and 54, loaded higher on another factor so they are dropped on this factor. The loaded items are; 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 25, 27, 29, 30, 37, 45, 46, 47, 49, 53, 55, 56. These items loaded positively and significantly on the factor. The loadings are those highlighted in bold. These variables show more on impersonation and were therefore named "impersonation factor"

Factor 2 accounted for 10.332% of total variance. 13 variables are associated with it which loaded positively. Item 1 loaded double and higher under factor 4 so it is dropped from factor 2. The variables here are; 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13. Since item 1 was dropped, the factor is left with 12 items. Due to the dominance of items that borders on plagiarism, the factor was named "plagiarism".

Factor 3 accounted for 5.521% of the total variance. 14 items loaded on this factor upon which 5 has double loading on other factors. Out of the 5 double loading, one item i.e. item 36 was retained since it has a higher value on factor 3. The whole items on the factor are; 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 52, 53, 54, 55 and 56. Factor 3 is left with 10 items having dropped items; 37, 53, 55 and 56. Since the items on this factor are dominated with unruly behaviour, the factor was subsequently named "unruly behaviour". Factor 4 accounted for 4.174% of the total variance. The items here were, 1, 2, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36 and 54. Of these items, four of them (1, 2, 36, 54) double loaded. However, item 1 was retained since it loaded higher on the factor while items, 2, 36 and 54 are dropped. Consequently, the items for this factor are; 1, 31, 32, 33, 35. The items on this factor concern more on concoction hence the factor was name "concoction".

Factor 5 accounted for 3.839% of the total variance of the 61 variables in the analysis. Six items of 48, 50, 57, 58, 59 and 60 loaded significantly without incidence of double loading. The items on this variable accounted mostly on copying so the factor was named "copying". Factor 6 accounted for 3.039%

of the total variance. Of the 61 items in the analysis, five items of, 16, 23, 24, 26 and 28 loaded significantly. Though item 26 double loaded, it was retained since it has a higher value under this factor. These items loaded considerably under items of colluding hence the factor were named “colluding”.

The result had shown those underlying factors associated with academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students in Federal universities in South-South, Nigeria to include; impersonation, plagiarism, unruly behaviour, concoction, copying, and colluding with the items that make up the factors. This is shown on table 8. Nevertheless, the following items do not have factor loading: Inducement of examiners such as begging and appealing for marks, Press lecturers for areas of concentration, Going through friends and relations of the examiner for marks or other forms of favour, Writing on jacket and copying materials without acknowledging source. These could be as a result of either due to signs of low loadings or sign of multi-dimensionality or being poorly responded to by the respondents. This situation is not uncommon in analysis of this nature as reported in literature where factor analysis has been applied.

Table 2: Sums of square loading (Initial Eigen Values)

Factors	Total	% of variance accounted for	% of variance accounted for
1.) Impersonation	15.058	24.685	24.685
2.) Plagiarism	6.303	10.332	35.017
3.) Unruly behaviour	3.368	5.521	40.538
4.) Concoction	2.546	4.174	44.712
5.) Copying	2.341	3.839	48.551
6.) Colluding	1.854	3.039	51.590

Table 3: Communalities of the items in the questionnaire

ITEMS	Initial	Extraction
item1	1.000	.457
item2	1.000	.570
item3	1.000	.524
item4	1.000	.510
item5	1.000	.542
item6	1.000	.567
item7	1.000	.502
item8	1.000	.522
item9	1.000	.571
item10	1.000	.490
item11	1.000	.431
item12	1.000	.513
item13	1.000	.477
item14	1.000	.607
item15	1.000	.549
item16	1.000	.419
item17	1.000	.501
item18	1.000	.537
item19	1.000	.513
item20	1.000	.393
item21	1.000	.474
item22	1.000	.347
item23	1.000	.561
item24	1.000	.584
item25	1.000	.458
item26	1.000	.566
item27	1.000	.446
item28	1.000	.497

item29	1.000	.382
item30	1.000	.286
item31	1.000	.589
item32	1.000	.619
item33	1.000	.635
item34	1.000	.438
item35	1.000	.470
item36	1.000	.589
item37	1.000	.663
item38	1.000	.447
item39	1.000	.317
item40	1.000	.665
item41	1.000	.725
item42	1.000	.648
item43	1.000	.630
item44	1.000	.569
item45	1.000	.593
item46	1.000	.489
item47	1.000	.483
item48	1.000	.381
item49	1.000	.349
item50	1.000	.285
item51	1.000	.192
item52	1.000	.466
item53	1.000	.604
item54	1.000	.740
item55	1.000	.731
item56	1.000	.616
item57	1.000	.539
item58	1.000	.657
item59	1.000	.637
item60	1.000	.628
item61	1.000	.299

Table 4: Rotated factor matrix for the dimension of academic dishonest behaviour

ITEMS	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
item1	.214	.409	.089	.476	-.037	.089
item2	.117	.589	.103	.414	.121	-.031
item3	.186	.610	.089	.268	.017	.193
item4	.102	.630	.109	.209	-.019	.217
item5	.134	.716	.080	.019	.065	.032
item6	.111	.691	.115	-.128	.177	-.127
item7	.122	.670	.053	.121	.045	.139
item8	.062	.697	.095	.137	.064	.016
item9	-.043	.659	.097	.220	.244	-.134
item10	-.073	.614	.004	.285	.148	.066
item11	.152	.582	.126	-.017	.124	.192
item12	.285	.523	.225	-.028	.259	.200
item13	.257	.532	.188	.016	.272	.137
item14	.633	.292	.255	.105	-.002	-.210
item15	.612	.303	.140	.025	-.045	-.246
item16	.173	.244	.013	.393	-.022	.417
item17	.659	.084	.082	.054	.116	.192
item18	.677	.000	.194	.079	.128	.135
item19	.691	.101	.072	.105	.092	.031
item20	.341	.204	.077	.286	.281	.263
item21	.672	.088	.013	-.104	.052	.014
item22	-.132	.258	-.193	.249	.289	.284
item23	-.088	.370	-.222	.372	.257	.403
item24	-.086	.318	-.117	.342	.236	.538
item25	.588	.300	.061	.109	-.008	.082
item26	.414	.067	.121	.027	-.167	.589
item27	.632	.127	.032	-.026	-.063	.157
item28	.007	.107	-.027	.062	-.036	.692
item29	.489	.151	.168	-.098	-.042	.284
item30	.404	.145	.238	.097	-.187	.011
item31	.015	.167	.082	.682	.291	.065
item32	.025	.165	.039	.750	.136	.089
item33	.029	.315	.263	.558	.359	-.162

item34	.258	.226	.251	.397	.307	.075
item35	.124	.183	.199	.456	.228	.348
item36	.232	.262	.440	.414	.280	.054
item37	.608	.091	.462	.173	.152	-.137
item38	.356	.051	.517	.038	-.018	-.221
item39	.098	.177	.497	.138	.037	-.096
item40	.164	.039	.776	.141	.124	.010
item41	.159	.140	.788	.201	.035	-.001
item42	.165	.149	.747	.085	.177	.054
item43	.132	.121	.753	-.054	.160	.052
item44	.386	.224	.462	.236	.159	-.274
item45	.576	.171	.362	.189	.033	-.253
item46	.548	.025	.249	.191	.250	-.164
item47	.530	-.145	.128	.217	.316	-.131
item48	.379	-.149	.090	.122	.434	.066
item49	.441	-.079	.060	.106	.366	.013
item50	.077	.093	.027	.086	.450	.245
item51	.088	.074	.092	.203	.347	.095
item52	.245	.029	.477	-.126	.121	.384
item53	.487	.157	.481	-.189	.152	.229
item54	.478	.068	.495	-.428	.122	.253
item55	.583	.015	.427	-.395	.050	.224
item56	.526	.071	.460	-.201	.092	.272
item57	.189	.210	.334	-.063	.585	.038
item58	-.016	.286	.164	.119	.725	-.097
item59	.096	.295	.159	.150	.692	-.119
item60	-.039	.294	.135	.173	.681	-.166
item61	.398	-.040	.241	-.058	.227	.163
Eigen value	15.058	6.303	3.368	2.546	2.342	1.854
Percentage variance	24.685	10.332	5.521	4.174	3.839	3.039
Cumulative%	24.685	35.017	40.538	44.712	48.551	51.590

IV. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The result of the study in respect to research question 1 suggests that incidences of academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students of federal universities in South-South, Nigeria show that a greater percentage of students who participated in this study are involved in one form or another of academic dishonest behaviours. By this percentage of academic dishonest behaviour exhibited by students, the problem is severe. The finding is in agreement to that of Bjorklund and Wenestam (1999), Cizek (1999), who enumerated different academic cheating behaviours that students embark upon. This finding is in further support of the findings of Rakouski and Levy (2007) who confirmed the existence of these behaviours and their consequences in the lives of perpetrators in work places. These researchers raised the issue of examination malpractice as widespread phenomena in schools that must be checked.

It appears from the result that the incidence of academic dishonest behaviours at the post graduate level is also rampant. This can be seen from the percentage of involvement. This is one of the few studies that have researched on post graduate students involvement on academic dishonest behaviours. Post graduates students are those admitted with higher grades in their first degrees on the assumption that they are the best brains. However from this study, it is of serious concern that academic dishonest behaviours are still very high at this level.

However, there is an aspect of hope in that about 33 percent of students who participated in this study do not get involved in some aspect of academic dishonest behaviours. There are therefore signs of hope that with concerted effort from stakeholders from the school system, academic dishonest behaviours could be eradicated. Suffice it to say that post graduate lecturers have greater in-depth capacity and facility to monitor students during their academic endeavours. Such

situation will reduce considerable incidences of academic dishonest behaviours through good invigilation and turnitin medium.

Findings shows that academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students in Federal universities in South-South, Nigeria as named by the researcher included impersonation, plagiarism, unruly behaviour, concoction, copying and colluding. A six factor extraction was obtained by the researcher based on the criteria of using at least five items to name a factor. The six factors which correspond to six dimensions are as named above. The result is really revealing in that five items of the questionnaire could not be loaded successfully under any of the dimensions due to signs of low loadings or sign of multi-dimensionality or being poorly responded to by the respondents. It can be perceived that the items may be intrinsically biased in favour of a unifactorial interpretation. Considering the theoretical and empirical shortcomings of the items of the instrument, the researcher perceives that respondents may have misunderstood the contents of the items consequently providing scores that serve as outliers in the study which perhaps have resulted in the outcome of this study.

Reviewed literature in this study do not show much works on the different dimensions of the enumerated factors of academic dishonest behaviour only but a few that mentioned plagiarism and collusion. Jordan (2001) sought to establish the assessment of cheaters and non cheaters based on two types of motivation (mastery and extrinsic) on perceived social norms regarding cheating. In that study, all the factors were significant predictors of cheating behaviours. The study is in total agreement to this finding. Similarly, Crown and Spiller (1998), Hardings et al (2004) with Miranda and Freire (2011) are all in agreement to the result of this study. Beyond the above cited works, studies with similar or dissimilar to this finding could not be compared by the researcher in terms of the naming of the factors. This could be because there had not been much work on post graduate studies or the aspects of factor analysis for loading corresponding items or variables of academic dishonest behaviours to similar factors are rare. This present study will therefore add to literature in this area.

V. CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH

The conclusion of incidences of academic dishonest behaviour among post graduate students of federal universities in South-South, Nigeria, shows that it is very obvious that there exist some levels of academic dishonest behaviours in the area of study. It is also of interest to note that there are some aspects of dishonest behaviours that the students in these universities do not engage in. In light of this study, the following recommendations will be useful in curbing academic dishonest behaviours among post graduate students of federal universities of South-South, Nigeria on one hand and indeed, the National and Global Educational System by extension:

- 1) Since it has been seen that academic dishonest behaviours exist, the university authorities should produce code of conduct to the students. If they already had, then its implementation should commence and drastic decisions melted to defaulters.

- 2) There should be synergy among stakeholders in the educational process to fight this ugly problem of impersonation starting from the point of admission by universities, the student should be made to know the consequences of getting involved in it.
- 3) Universities curriculum should include courses on academic dishonest behaviours with special focus on plagiarism. Also periodic workshops and seminars be organised to help in sensitising the students about these cankerworm in our school system.
- 4) Codes of conduct that stipulate academic dishonest behaviours should be made obvious in schools by pasting them all over. Defaulters should be severely dealt with while award be given to deserving students who keep to the moral standards of the codes.
- 5) Universities should create clear and firm academic regulations in anticipation of academic dishonest behaviours. The regulations under consideration should include procedure for examinations, use of software like turnitin, hidden cameras in examination halls etc to detect offenders.

VI. REFERENCES

- Adebayo, S.O. (2011). Common cheating behaviour among Nigerian University students: A case study of University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria. *Journal of Education*, 1(1), 64-73.
- Akem, J. A. (2005). Extraneous factors that influence students performance and achievement in examinations. *New trend in education. Issues and challenges*, 4(5), 232 –334.
- Anderman, E. M. & Murdock, T. B. (Eds) (2006). *Psychology of academic cheating*. Burnington, MA: Elsevier academic press.
- Anyebe, E. A & Anyebe, O. A. (2008). Causes, Consequences as a Possible Remedy of Examination Malpractice in the New Millennium. In Denga & Ekoja (Ed). *Education for the New Millennium*. Rapid Educational Publisher Limited, 5(2), 17-21.
- Becker, D., Connolly, J., Lentz, P. & Morrison, J. (2006). Using the business fraud triangle to predict academic dishonesty among business students. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 10(1), 37-52.
- Bjorklund, M. & Wenestam, C-G. (1999). Academic cheating: frequency, methods and causes. *Paper presented at the Educational Research*, Lahti, Finland, 22-25.
- Cizek, G. J. (1999). *Cheating on Tests: How to do it, Detect, and Prevent it*. Mahwah, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Crown, D. F., & Spiller, M. S. (1998). Learning from the literature on collegiate Cheating: A review of the empirical research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(2), 683-700.
- Jiya, J (2006). Understanding the problem of examination malpractice in Nigeria; The counseling dimension. In Ekoja & Chibieze (ed). *Journal of the Nigerian Society for Educational Psychologist*, 4(51), 77-82.
- Jordan, A. E. (2001). College student cheating: The role of motivation, perceived norms, attitudes, and knowledge of institutional policy. *Ethics & Behaviour*, 11(3), 233-247.
- Kolawole, S. A. & Adekeye, R. A. (2007). Counseling strategies for curbing Examination Malpractice among University Students. In Ugodulunwa & Mgboro (ed). *Journal of the Nigerian Society for Educational Psychologist*, 2(4), 165-171.
- Miranda, S. M. & Freire, C. (2011). Academic dishonesty- understanding how undergraduate students think and act. E paper presented at the ISATT 2011 Conference held between 4th-8th July; 2011 at the University of Minho, Braga, Portugal.
- Newstead, S.E., Franklyn–Stokes, A. & Armstead, P. (1996). Individual differences in student cheating. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 88(2), 229-141.
- Nnodum, B. I. & Nzoka, N. (2007). Psycho-social factors that influence students attitude towards cheating in Examination. In Ugodulunwa & Mgboro (ed). *Journal of the Nigerian Society for Educational Psychologist*. 67(12), 127– 130.
- Rakovski, C. & Levy, E. (2007). Academic dishonesty: Perceptions of business students. *College Students Journal*, 41(2), 466-481.
- Swift, C. O. & Sarath, N. (2001). An examination of the Relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty. *Journal of Business Education*, 77(2), 69-77.