

**ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND CONTROL MEASURES
AMONG POLYTECHNICS LECTURERS IN DELTA STATE**

ALIBERI Vivian

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION
AND POLICY STUDIES, DELTA STATE UNIVERSITY,
ABRAKA.**

OCTOBER, 2017

**ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND CONTROL MEASURES
AMONG POLYTECHNICS LECTURERS IN DELTA STATE**

**ALIBERI Vivian
PG/13/14/222619
B.Sc. (Ed), Abraka, 2007**

**A Dissertation Submitted to the Postgraduate School in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Award of the Degree of
Master of Education (M.Ed) in Educational Administration of the
Delta State University, Abraka.**

**Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies,
Delta State University, Abraka.**

October, 2017

DECLARATION

I declare that this research was carried-out by me, AliberiVivian in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, Delta State University Abraka.

AliberiVivian

Date

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation has been certified in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the award of Master Degree in Educational Administration, Delta State University, Abraka.

By

Prof. (Mrs.) E. J. Egwunyenga
Supervisor

Date

Dr (Mrs) R. N. Osakwe
Head of Department

Date

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my late father Mr. S. I. Aliberi

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher is thankful to the almighty God for his grace at all times particularly during this work. The researcher is most grateful to her supervisor Prof (Mrs.) E.J.Egwunyenga, who in spite of her tight schedule took time to go through the work, made constructive criticisms, corrections and suggestions.

In a special way, the researcher is also thankful to the Head of Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, Dr. (Mrs) R. N. Osakwe for her roles in my academic pursue. To her lecturers in the Department of Educational Administration and Policy Studies, Prof. E.P. Oghuvbu, (Dean Faculty of Education) Prof. D. Onoyase, Prof. P.O. Ikoya, Prof. N.E. Akpotu, Prof. E. D. Nakpodia. To all the scholars whose published works were cited for the purpose of this study the researcher remains indebted to you. The researcher is also thankful to her mother Mrs. S. Aliberi and siblings for their prayer, encouragement and financial support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	ii
DECLARATION	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iii
CERTIFICATION	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	iv
DEDICATION	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	vi
LIST OF TABLES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	xi
ABSTRACT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	xii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION										
Background to the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Statement of the Problem	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6
Research Questions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
Hypotheses	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8
Purpose of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Significance of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
Scope and Delimitation of the Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Definition of Terms	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE										
Theoretical Framework	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12
Concept of Academic Misconduct	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
Historical Background of Academic Misconduct in Nigeria	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
Empirical Evidence of Academic Misconduct in Nigeria Tertiary Institutions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25
Forms of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26
Causes of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31

Influence of Academic Misconduct on the Integrity of the Institution	-	38
Control Measures to Curb Academic Misconduct among Lecturers	-	40
Appraisal of Reviewed Literature	- - - - -	48

CHAPTER THREE: RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Research Design	- - - - -	51
Population of the Study	- - - - -	51
Sample and Sampling Technique	- - - - -	52
Research Instrument	- - - - -	53
Validity of the Instrument	- - - - -	53
Reliability of the Instrument	- - - - -	53
Method of Data Collection	- - - - -	54
Method of Data Analysis	- - - - -	54

CHAPTER FOUR: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic Variables	- - - - -	55
Research Questions	- - - - -	55
Hypotheses Testing	- - - - -	78
Discussion of Findings	- - - - -	81

CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary	- - - - -	88
Findings	- - - - -	89
Conclusion	- - - - -	90
Recommendations	- - - - -	90

Contribution to Knowledge	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91
Suggestion for Further Research Study	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	91
REFERENCES	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	92
APPENDIX A	Letter of Identification	-	-	-	-	-	-	99
APPENDIX B	Research Instrument-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100
APPENDIX C	Reliability Testing -	-	-	-	-	-	-	104

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Candidates involved in misconduct cases in WAEC SSCE (2005-2009) - - - - -	22
Table 2: Academic Misconduct in Nigerian Secondary Schools - -	23
Table 3: Population Distribution of Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics-	52
Table 4: A Summary of Sampled lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics-	52
Table 5: Distribution of Sampled Respondents According to Institutions-	55
Table 6: Mean and Standard Scores of Forms of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics - - - -	56
Table 7: Mean and Standard Scores of Causes of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics - - - -	59
Table 8: Mean and Standard Scores of Influence of Academic Misconduct on the Integrity of the Institution - - - - -	61
Table 9: Mean and Standard Scores of Control Measures to Curb Academic Misconduct among Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics- -	63
Table 10: Mean and Standard Scores of Differences Among the Three Polytechnics in Delta State on Forms of Academic Misconduct-	65
Table 11: Mean and Standard Scores of Difference among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Causes of Academic Misconduct-	69
Table 12: Mean and Standard Scores of Difference Among the Three Polytechnics in Delta State on Influence of Academic Misconduct-	73
Table 13: Mean and Standard Scores of Difference Among the Three Polytechnics in Delta State on Control Measures of Academic Misconduct - - - - -	76
Table 14: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Forms of Academic Misconduct-	79
Table 15: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Causes of Academic Misconduct-	79
Table 16: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on Influence of Academic Misconduct among the three Polytechnics in Delta State -	80

Table 17: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Difference on Control Measures to curb academic misconduct - - - - - - - -81

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to examine academic misconduct and control measures among polytechnics lecturers in Delta State. To guide the study eight research questions were raised and four hypotheses were formulated. Stratified random sampling technique was used to sample 178 lecturers from a population of 444 lecturers Polytechnics in Delta State. The instrument used for the study was a self-developed questionnaire titled “Academic Misconduct and Control Measures Questionnaire (AMCMQ)”, which was validated by the researcher’s supervisor. The reliability of the instrument was established using a split-half reliability test and a coefficient of 0.85 was obtained. The study employed mean scores to answer the research questions while ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses. Findings of the study revealed that allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision, arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, falsification of data/research finding, plagiarism/ use of students’ ideas, swapping of names for publication in order to take credit, are forms of academic misconduct among polytechnics lecturers. Stagnation in lecturers’ career, lack of research skill, lack of commitment to the profession, greed for money, lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity, living above income, are some causes of academic misconduct among polytechnics lecturers. Academic misconduct can be controlled through ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the teaching–learning facilities, appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers. The researcher recommended that there is a need for Nigerian tertiary institutions to develop an academic integrity policy that stipulates the professional norms or ethical codes which all academic staff are required to uphold.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Background to the Study

Nations of the world whether developed or developing have values and norms they seek to transmit to the next generation as well as aspirations to achieve greatness and become key players in the global economy. Formal education has been identified as a key instrument for the attainment of these goals. At the apex of the formal education hierarchy are tertiary institutions charged with the responsibility of developing the human capital required for the overall development of the nation. The critical role that higher educational institutions should play in the development of Nigeria is succinctly summarized in the Federal Government of Nigeria (2004) as: to contribute to the national development through relevant high-level manpower training, to develop and inculcate proper values for the survival of society, and to promote scholarship, Community Service, national unity and international understanding.

The extent of the realization of these noble goals is often dictated by factors both external and internal to the polytechnic institutions. Issues such as inadequate number of academic staff with the attendant poor staff-mix, brain drain, insufficient funding of education, un-conducive teaching/learning environment and incessant strikes have taken their toll on the quality of education delivery and the academic standard attained in Nigeria. This research

work is not intended to discuss challenges to education in Nigeria, but it is obvious that the realization of the objective of any endeavour depends to a large extent on the willingness and ability of the principal actors to effectively carry out their assigned responsibilities.

No group of persons plays a more critical role in the actualization of the goals of education than the academic staff. They are crucial to the endeavour of the knowledge industry. Societies rely on academic staff in polytechnicsto teach, carry out research and perform community services if necessary. In essence, nations depend on the knowledge generated by polytechnic institutions to propel them to the desired social, economic and technological development. Viewed from another perspective, this implies that a lot of confidence is reposed on academic staff by the society. An academic staff must therefore be a person of unquestionable character, one who is able to abide by the tenets of the higher institution, and willing to uphold the culture of integrity for which the ivory tower is known. In other words, an academic staff must of necessity be a self-disciplined individual with very high moral standards.

The quality and standard of any academic programme is a direct responsibility of the academic staff. In fact, it can be boldly stated that an academic staff is a principal custodian of standards in any educational institution. This assertion stems from the power to judge academic attainment that is vested on the academic staff. It is this cadre of staff that awards pass or

fail grades to students based on their performance. At the point of graduation students are said to have been found worthy in character and learning. This cannot be possible if the academic staff that have direct interaction with the students throughout their duration of study fail to serve as role models, or worse still participate in any form of academic misconduct that thwarts the purpose of the education enterprise.

Thus the role of an academic staff is to accomplish learning and direct learning to enable the students to achieve the set goals of education. But it is unfortunate that most academic staff apart from carrying out the assigned duty of teaching indulge in academic misconduct. Agbo (2013) stated that the forces behind academic misconduct are the lecturer's related factor. Most often gross un-commitment to duty, results in anxiety created by non-completion of course work. Some lecturers are incompetent and so do not give the students the right requirement for examination. Some lecturers pay little attention to class teaching, as such, the course work is never covered and at the end the students resort to cheating to meet up with those who have been taught adequately.

In most cases some lecturers who are assigned to supervise examination connive with students to cheat due to the level of poverty. The lecturers often demand that the students caught cheating during an examination should see him/her in the office after the examination. Students' involvement in academic misconduct is due to lecturer's encouragement. Also the patterns of the

examination questions set by the lecturers sometimes encourage some students' to engage in academic misconduct. This implies that questions that require reproduction of facts by students will make them to find the facts somewhere when they cannot draw immediately from their memory.

The disinclination of the lecturer to pursue evidences of cheating is may be based on sympathy, for students are trying to cope in a grade-oriented system. They sympathize with students by hiding incidence of cheating during examination. Lecturers teaching a class drawn from a low-achieving track deliberately leave the room for a few minutes during each test so that the students can swap answers. This action is rationalized on the bases that those students need 'all the help they can get'. Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) analyzed the results of 551 surveys of student test cheating at two public Universities in 12 separate classes taught by seven different lecturers in the 1993-1994 academic years. Of the nine variables found to be strongly correlated to students' cheating on tests, three of these were under the direct control of lecturers.

However, students who perceive lecturers to be concerned for students and actively involved in the learning process are less likely to engage in misconduct. If the lecturers feel indifferent or if the subject matter seems unimportant or uninteresting, students feel less moral obligation to avoid cheating. A number of studies have indicated that the environment within the

classroom or examination setting, as established by the lecturers, can have significant impacts on academic misconduct, (Ijeoma, 2012).

Furthermore, lecturers' attitudes and low vigilance tend to increase cheating, while higher vigilance, use of essay examinations and spacing of students apart tend to reduce cheating. Also, a study carried out by Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) on classroom setting revealed that higher number of test proctors, use of non-multiple choice examinations, and use of multiple version of an examination reduce cheating. Kohn(2007) affirmed that a de-emphasis on grades combined with frequent assessment using a variety of forms such as traditional tests and quizzes, homework, and observations, can relieve the grading pressures students experience that cause them to cheat in examination. Several other studies contended that examination content and structure as ordered by the lecturers is also important, as students are likely to cheat on tests perceived to be unfair or confusing. It is no longer news that academic misconduct remains one of the major challenges of the Nigerian education system. There is no disputing the fact the polytechnic system in Nigeria contemporarily is faced with the threat of unethical attributes.

Several factors may be responsible for academic misconduct among academic staff. These factors may range from stagnation in career and the need to get promoted. There are two dimensions to this promotion related factor. First is the fact that some academic staff have stayed at a particular level/rank for so

long owing to their inability to meet the requirements for promotion namely acquisition of higher degree and particularly publication of quality articles. The second dimension has to do with those that want to beat the system and get promoted by any means. Given this scenario, coupled with the lack of research skills by some academics.

However, Ijeoma (2012) suggested ethical re-orientation of academic staff in her study as a measure to solve the problem of academic misconduct. This apt is in view of the fact that high ethical standard is certainly expected of the institutions of learning given the crucial role it plays in the moulding of youths and the overall societal development. Equally, the polytechnics management should give due attention to the orientation of new academic staff on employment. The gains of orientation exercise and mentoring programme cannot be over emphasized particularly as orientation provides an avenue for letting new staff know the norms guiding conduct in the institution while mentoring provides a means of ensuring an all-round development of a staff. Bisong (2011) has urged the need for moral education or re-orientation to basic moral values. This in no small measure will help to ensure that academic staff cultivate and maintain the culture of academic integrity

Statement of Problem

Interactions with students of Delta Statepolytechnics have shown that the institution has been plagued by challenges such as inadequate funding, incessant

strikes by various unions in the system, dearth of academic staff to mention but a few. These challenges will certainly have contributed to the decline in the quality of education delivery as well as the quality of graduate output. While efforts have been directed at improving funding and welfare of staff, the challenges that has bedeviled the polytechnics is academic misconduct which is on the increase as observed by scholars. This is because studies have shown that the challenge is that it is not only the students that are perpetuating academic misconduct, there are clear indications of academic staff (lecturers) involvement as well. But the causes of this academic misconduct among polytechnic lecturers are not immediately clear to the researcher. Thus the researcher decided to conduct a research on academic misconduct and control measures among polytechnics lecturers in Delta state.

Research Questions

To guide this study therefore, the following research questions were raised.

1. What are the forms of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics?
2. What are the causes of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics?
3. What influence does academic misconduct have on the integrity of the institution?

4. What are the control measures to curb academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics?
5. What is the difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on forms of academic misconduct?
6. What is the difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on causes of academic misconduct?
7. What is the difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institutions?
8. What is the difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on control measures of academic misconduct?

Hypotheses

From the research questions raised, the following hypotheses were formulated.

1. There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on forms of academic misconduct.
2. There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on causes of academic misconduct.
3. There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institution.
4. There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on control measures of academic misconduct.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine academic misconduct and control measures among polytechnics lecturers in Delta State. Specifically, the study is set to:

1. Identify the forms of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics.
2. Examine the causes of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics.
3. Examine the influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institution.
4. Examine the control measures used to curb academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics.
5. Ascertain if differences exist among lecturers in the three polytechnics on the forms, causes, influence and control measures to academic misconduct.

Significance of the Study

This research is meant to benefit the academic/non-academic staff, students and those interested in carrying out similar studies.

To the academic/non-academic staff, it is believed that the study will enable them understand the forms of academic misconduct among polytechnics lecturers as well as the causes of this academic misconduct. It will equally help

to determine the perceptions of academics with respect to the ability of polytechnics to effectively deal with lecturers' academic misconduct.

To the students, it is believed that the study will enable them understand that they, are not the only ones guilty of academic misconduct in an institution of learning but the control measures of this study, if properly implemented will help to checkmate students' academic misconduct.

To all interested in carrying out similar study, it is believed the study will establish a deeper understanding of current academic misconduct in the higher institutions of learning.

Scope and Delimitation of the Study

The scope of this study was academic misconduct and control measures among polytechnics lecturers in Delta state. The study examined forms, causes, influence and control measures to academic misconduct.

The study was delimited to lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics (Oghara, Ogwushi-Uku and Ozoro).

Operational Definition of Terms

Academic Misconduct: is any type of misconduct that occurs in relation to a formal academic exercise. It can include plagiarism, fabrication or professional misconduct.

Control Measures: these refers to possible solutions to curb academic misconduct.

Polytechnic Lecturers:These are staff who teach, conduct research and lead research groups.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter deals with the review of related literature, both theoretically and empirically in the area of the study. The literature has been organized under the following headings:

- ❖ Theoretical Framework
- ❖ Concept of Academic Misconduct
- ❖ Historical Background of Academic Misconduct in Nigeria
- ❖ Empirical Evidence of Academic Misconduct in Nigeria Tertiary Institutions
- ❖ Forms of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers
- ❖ Causes of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers
- ❖ Influences of Academic Misconduct on the Integrity of the Institution
- ❖ Control Measures to Curb Academic Misconduct among Lecturers
- ❖ Appraisal of Reviewed Literature

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework for this study was based on theory of planned behaviour propounded by Ajzen (1991). In psychology, the theory of planned behaviour (abbreviated TPB) is a theory that links beliefs and behaviour. Theory of planned behaviour was to improve on the predictive power of the theory of reasoned action by including perceived behavioural control, (Ajzen,

1991). It is one of the most predictive persuasion theories. It has been applied to studies of the relations among beliefs, attitudes, behavioural intentions and behaviours in various fields such as advertising, public relations, education and healthcare.

The theory was developed from the theory of reasoned action, which was proposed by Martin Fishbein together with Icek Ajzen in 1975. The theory of reasoned action was in turn grounded in various theories of attitude such as learning theories, expectancy-value theories, consistency theories (such as Heider's Balance Theory, Osgood and Tannenbaum's Congruity Theory, and Festinger's Dissonance Theory) and attribution theory, (Fishbein, 1975). According to the theory of reasoned action, if people evaluate the suggested behaviour as positive (attitude), and if they think their significant others want them to perform the behaviour (subjective norm), this results in a higher intention (motivations) and they are more likely to do so. A high correlation of attitudes and subjective norms to behavioural intention, and subsequently to behaviour, has been confirmed in many studies, (Sheppard, Hartwick, & Warshaw, 1988).

The theory states that attitude toward behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control, together shape an individual's behavioural intentions and behaviours. A counter-argument against the high relationship between behavioural intention and actual behaviour has also been proposed, as

the results of some studies show that, because of circumstantial limitations, behavioural intention does not always lead to actual behaviour. Namely, since behavioural intention cannot be the exclusive determinant of behaviour where an individual's control over the behaviour is incomplete, Ajzen introduced the theory of planned behaviour by adding a new component, "perceived behavioural control." By this, he extended the theory of reasoned action to cover non-volitional behaviours for predicting behavioural intention and actual behaviour, (www.wikipedia.org).

In addition to attitudes and subjective norms (which make the theory of reasoned action), the theory of planned behaviour adds the concept of perceived behavioural control, which originates from self-efficacy theory (SET). Self-efficacy was proposed by Bandura (1977), which came from social cognitive theory. According to Bandura, expectations such as motivation, performance, and feelings of frustration associated with repeated failures determine influence and behavioural reactions. Bandura separated expectations into two distinct types: self-efficacy and outcome expectancy. Bandura (1977) defined self-efficacy as the conviction that one can successfully execute the behaviour required to produce the outcomes. The outcome expectancy refers to a person's estimation that a given behaviour will lead to certain outcomes. He states that self-efficacy is the most important precondition for behavioural change, since it determines the initiation of coping behaviour.

It was observed that previous investigations have shown that peoples' behaviour is strongly influenced by their confidence in their ability to perform that behaviour (Bandura, 1977). As the self-efficacy theory contributes to explaining various relationships between beliefs, attitudes, intentions, and behaviour, the set has been widely applied to health-related fields such as physical activity and mental health in preadolescents (Annesi, 2005) and exercise (Gyurcsik, & Brawley, 2000; Rodgers, & Brawley, 1996; Stanley, & Maddux, 1986). However, human behaviour is guided by three kinds of consideration, "behavioural beliefs," "normative beliefs," and "control beliefs." In their respective aggregates, "behavioural beliefs" produce a favourable or unfavourable "attitude toward the behaviour"; "normative beliefs" result in "subjective norm"; and "control beliefs" gives rise to "perceived behavioural control." In combination, "attitude toward the behaviour," "subjective norm," and "perceived behavioural control" lead to the formation of a "behavioural intention", (Ajzen, 2002).

In particular, "perceived behavioural control" is presumed to not only affect actual behaviour directly, but also affect it indirectly through behavioural intention, (Ajzen, & Fishbein, 1975). Ajzen, (2002) stated further that as a general rule, the more favourable the attitude toward behaviour and subjective norm, and the greater the perceived behavioural control, the stronger the person's intention to perform the behaviour in question should be. Finally, given

a sufficient degree of actual control over the behaviour, people are expected to carry out their intentions when the opportunity arises.

The researcher considered this theory appropriate for the study, since the theory of planned behaviour specifies the nature of relationships between beliefs and attitudes. People's evaluations of, or attitudes toward behaviour are determined by their accessible beliefs about the behaviour, where a belief is defined as the subjective probability that the behaviour will produce a certain outcome. Specifically, the evaluation of each outcome contributes to the attitude in direct proportion to the person's subjective possibility that the behaviour produces the outcome in question.

Concept of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is any type of cheating that occurs in relation to a formal academic exercise. It includes: plagiarism, fabrication, deception, cheating, bribery, sabotage, professional misconduct and impersonation. Academic misconduct has been documented in all levels of educational setting from elementary school to graduate school. Throughout history, academic misconduct has been met with varying degrees of approbation. Today, those who are part of an educated society tend to take a very negative view of academic misconduct, (www.wikipedia.org).

In antiquity, the notion of intellectual property did not exist. Ideas were the common property of the literate elite. Books were published by hand-copying them. Scholars freely made digests or commentaries on other works, which could contain as much or as little original material as the author desired. There was no standard system of citation, because printing and its resulting fixed paginis was in the future. Scholars were an elite and small group who knew and generally trusted each other. This system continued through the European Middle Ages. Education was in Latin and occasionally Greek. Some scholars were monks, who used much of their time copying manuscripts. Other scholars were in urban universities connected to the Roman Catholic Church.

Academic misconduct dates back to the first tests. Scholars note that cheating was prevalent on the Chinese civil service exams thousands of years ago, even when cheating carried the penalty of death for both examinee and examiner, (Bushway & Nash, 2007). Before the founding of the MLA and the APA at the end of the 19th century, there were no set rules on how to properly cite quotations from others' writings, which may have caused many cases of plagiarism out of ignorance.”, (Simmons, 2009).

In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, cheating was widespread at college campuses in the United States, and was not considered dishonourable among students, (Simmons, 2009). It has been estimated that as many as two-thirds of students cheated at some point of their college careers at the turn of the

20th century. Fraternities often operated so-called essay mills, where term papers were kept on file and could be resubmitted over and over again by different students, often with the only change being the name on the paper. As higher education in the U.S. trended towards meritocracy, however, a greater emphasis was put on anti-cheating policies, and the newly diverse student bodies tended to arrive with a more negative view of academic misconduct.

Academic misconduct is endemic in all levels of education. In the United States, studies show that 20% of students started cheating in the first grade, (Bushway & Nash, 2007). Similarly, other studies reveal that currently in the U.S., 56% of middle school students and 70% of high school students have cheated, (Wilfred, 2012). A large-scale study in Germany found that 75% of the university students admitted that they conducted at least one of seven types of academic misconduct (such as plagiarism or falsifying data) within the previous six months, (Patrzek, Sattler, Veen, Grunschel, & Fries, 2014).

Students are not the only ones to cheat in an academic setting. A study among North Carolina school teachers found that some 35% of respondents said they had witnessed their colleagues cheating in one form or another. The rise of high-stakes testing and the consequences of the results on the teacher are cited as a reason why a teacher might want to inflate the results of their students, (Brian & Steven, 2013).

Justin, (2007) quoted that the first scholarly studies in the 1960s of academic misconduct in higher education found that nationally in the U.S., somewhere between 50%-70% of college students had cheated at least once. While nationally, these rates of cheating in the U.S. remain stable today, there are large disparities between different schools, depending on the size, selectivity, and anti-cheating policies of the school. Generally, the smaller and more selective the college, the less cheating occurs there. For instance, the number of students who have engaged in academic misconduct at small elite liberal arts colleges can be as low as 15%-20%, while cheating at large public universities can be as high as 75%, (Maclean, 2009). Moreover, researchers have found that students who attend a school with an honour code are less likely to cheat than students at schools with other ways of enforcing academic integrity, (Donald & Linda, 2011). As for graduate education, a recent study found that 56% of MBA students admitted cheating, along with 54% of graduate students in engineering, 48% in education, and 45% in law, (Justin, 2007).

There is also a great difference in students' perceptions and the reality of their own ethical behaviour. In a 2008 survey of 30,000 students in high school carried out by the Josephson Institute for Youth Ethics, 62 percent of students polled said they "copied another's homework two or more times in the past year." Yet, on the same survey, 92 percent said they were "satisfied with their

personal ethics and character.” (The Ethics of American Youth: 2008). Hence, there is generally a discrepancy between actual behaviour and self-image of high school students' character.

Moreover, there are online services that offer to prepare any kind of homework of high school and college level and take online tests for students. While administrators are often aware of such websites, they have been unsuccessful in curbing cheating in homework and non-proctored online tests, resorting to a recommendation by the Ohio Mathematics Association to derive at least 80% of the grade of online classes from proctored tests, (Maclean, 2009). While research on academic misconduct in other countries is less extensive, anecdotal evidence suggests cheating could be even more common in countries like Japan.

A typology of academic misconduct has been devised by Perry (2010). Perry's typology presents a two dimensional model of academic misconduct with one dimension measuring the degree to which rules are understood and the other dimension measuring how closely these rules are followed. According to the typology only those students who understand the rules but fail to adhere to the rules are classified as 'cheats'.

Historical background of Academic Misconduct in Nigeria

History has it that academic misconduct in Nigeria is as old as the country. Maduemezia in Solomon (2014) reported that the first academic misconduct in Nigeria occurred in 1914 during the Senior Cambridge Local Examination papers which were leaked before the scheduled date of examination. Thus, academic misconduct which started at a low trend became more pronounced in 1970, involving persons other than the candidates. Since then academic misconduct became more advanced and sophisticated. However, 1977 marked a watershed in the history of academic misconduct as there was an outcry in Nigeria on the credibility of West African Examination Council (WAEC), which was the only organ saddled with the responsibility of conducting public examination in Nigeria. Consequently, a Judicial Commission of enquiry headed by Justice Sogbetun was set up to look into the affairs of the WAEC in relation to the problems of efficient conduct of examinations and prompt release of results, (Solomon (2014). The report acknowledged the excessive workload of WAEC and recommended reduction of its workload by establishing other examination bodies to take over some of its examinations.

Over the years, the conduct of examinations by WAEC, NECO, and JAMB have been trailed with complaints of academic misconducts and various organizational, administrative and bureaucratic irregularities. These problems have become perennial and institutionalized and reflect a gradual decline on the

quality of Nigeria’s educational system. In fact, academic misconduct has attained a frightening, sophisticated proportion and has become so widespread that there is virtually no examination anywhere at all levels within and outside the formal school system that has not experienced one form of misconduct or the other. The incidences of academic misconduct are common everywhere and every examination season witnesses the emergence of new ingenious way of cheating.

The former Minister of Education, Prof. Ruqqayatu Ahmed Rufai, at her keynote address delivered at the National Examination Summit held in Abuja on the 24th May, 2010 presented an increasing trend in cases of academic misconduct in WAEC SSCE between 2005-2009 (Table 1). In addition, she reported that NECO in its 2009 Nov./Dec. Examination recorded misconduct cases of over 263,000 and over one million cases in the 2009 June/July schools’ examination, (Solomon, 2014).

Table 1: Candidates involved in misconduct cases in WAEC SSCE (2005-2009)

YEAR	NO. OF CANDIDATES INVOLVED	%
2005	73,050	6.86
2006	82,941	7.19
2007	74,734	5.97
2008	100,428	7.88
2009	118,608	8.74

Sources:*Ruqqayatu, (2010)*

Furthermore, WAEC in 2011 withheld 39,066 results of candidates who wrote November/December West African Senior School Certificate

Examination (WASSCE) while in 2012, 47,289 results were withheld as a result of misconducts. In 2006, the Federal Ministry of Education (FME) blacklisted and derecognized 324 secondary schools across the nation as centres for conducting public examination from 2007 to 2010(Table 2).

Table 2: Academic Misconduct in Nigerian Secondary Schools

GEO-POLITICAL ZONE	NO. OF SCHOOLS INVOLVED	%
North-Central	54	16.6
North –East	08	2.5
North –West	12	3.6
South-East	48	14.8
South-South	116	36.0
South-West	86	26.5
Total	324	100.00

Source: *Weekend Times (2007)*

The statistics above revealed that those involved in academic misconduct have increased over the years compared to the record of previous years.

With respect to academic misconduct in Nigerian tertiary institutions of learning, it is always sarcastic and flabbergasting to have people point accusing fingers at students at the mention of cheating in academia. Empirical evidence shows that the contributing factors are many hence, the rejection of the earlier assertion. Ivowi (1997) reporting on the subject discovered lack of confidence, inadequate preparation on the side of the stakeholders, peer influence, societal influence, parental influence and poor facilities in school among others are well notable contributing factors to the phenomenon. This validates the assertion that cheating in academia is a three phase system. School programmes, teaching and learning environment, the teacher, student, overvalue of certificates and moral decadence in society have also been well noted in literatures by numerous researchers, unanimously added as some of the factors also responsible for examination malpractice.

Wilkinson (2009) writing on the school programme believes that the educational programmes are the building blocks of education employed by both the instructor and the learner to bring about the desired or needed input in the life of the learner. A good school program he said must be relevant for the present or the future life of the individual and as well be dynamic to meet demanding trends of the global market. These deficiencies create lean ways for students to indulge in sharp practices during exams in order to get undeserved grades and promotion. Badmus (2006) writing on the causes of examination malpractice discovered the teacher as a principal factor. He sees the teacher as a vital figure in the business of schooling on which the quality of instruction given is highly dependent. The quality of instruction he professed is affected by the calibre of people in the teaching job and the extent to which they desire to upgrade themselves and the working environment. Touching on the background and the ability of instructor asserted the two key factors play an integral part in the learning process and almost account for 40%. Kofi and Kwabena, (2014) argued that Badmus (2006) was quick to add in his finding that instructors do not possess the capacity to offer learners the experience and a formidable guide with respect to progress and development as they themselves lack the cutting edge, rendering them ineffective to act in that capacity and challenge their students enough to build them up.

Empirical Evidence of Academic Misconduct in Nigeria Tertiary Institutions

Empirical evidence of academic misconduct abounds a lot in literature. Aluede (2006) stated that there has been incidence of involvement of students, teachers and parents in cases of academic misconduct. Expanding further, Aluede (2006) asserted the incidence of the phenomenon is wide spread irrespective of the level at which the examination is being conducted or undertaken, and the most serious challenge is that it has extended beyond the formal school systems. A study on the subject as a matter of fact, identifies different forms of academic cheating (Carrauna, Ramesshan & Ewing, 2003). Four notable areas according to the research has become the bedrock for cheating or exhibiting academic integrity violation acts, thus using unauthorized materials, fabrication of information, plagiarism and extending help to compatriots in the act of cheating. There have been several instances where parents and teachers have collaborated to cheat. On the part of parents, they get involved by paying bribes to help their wards earn good grades while the teachers for good name and praise create the conducive atmosphere for students to engage in such nefarious acts. The issue has assumed a proportional height due to the shameful involvement of parents, teachers and school authorities, and all and sundry who in one way or the other take part in the examination process.

The premium or stature assumed by the canker has placed the credibility of qualification and certificates issued by educational institutions in doubt. It is disheartening to see certificates from top class educational institutions suffer shame and no longer the true reflection of the competence and skills of products churned out. It is very sad and disgracing to have people point accusing fingers at teachers, parents, head teachers, examination officials and to larger extent security men, who have the mandate to ensure sanity prevails in the evaluation process, turn around to contribute to its decay and deterioration, (Kofi & Kwabena, 2014).

There are several instances where institutional heads have been blamed for the poor performance of their students. In the bid to redeem their image and save their face resort to giving students the necessary push to secure their future. On the part of lazy teachers they believe will chart the same course as performance is linked to results. Rocha and Teixeira (2006) closing the chapter on the teachers as contributory factor to cheating in exams discovered that 83.3% agreed that poor attendance of lecturers in class encourage learners to cheat in examination, 62.5% in support of their colleagues, also agreed that the high-handedness of lecturers in marking script also breeds sharp practices in examinations.

Forms of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers

Academic misconduct takes different forms in higher institutions of learning, ranging from plagiarism, fabrication, deception, cheating, bribery, to professional misconduct.

Plagiarism: Plagiarism, as defined in the 1995 *Random House Compact Unabridged Dictionary*, is the "use or close imitation of the language and thoughts of another author and the representation of them as one's own original work, (Stepchyshyn & Robert, 2007). In academia, it is seen more broadly as the adoption or reproduction of original intellectual creations (such as concepts, ideas, methods, pieces of information or expressions, etc.) of another author (person, collective, organization, community or other type of author, including anonymous authors) without due acknowledgment, in contexts where originality is acknowledged and rewarded, (Rughinis, 2010). This can range from borrowing without attribution a particularly apt phrase, to paraphrasing someone else's original idea without citation, to wholesale contract cheating, (Pennycook, 2006). Plagiarism is not a crime but is disapproved more on the grounds of moral offence, (Lynch, 2007; Green, 2013). It may be a case for civil law if it is so substantial to constitute copyright infringement. Since 2000, discussions on the subjects of student plagiarism have increased, (Ronald & Jude, 2006), with a major strand of this discussion center around the issue of how best students can be helped to understand and avoid plagiarism.

Fabrication: This is the falsification of data, information, or citations in any formal academic exercise. This includes making up citations to back up

arguments or inventing quotations. Fabrication predominates in the natural sciences, where academics sometimes falsify data to make experiments "work". It includes data falsification, in which false claims are made about research performed, including selective submitting of results to exclude inconvenient data to generating bogus data, (www.wikipedia.org).

Deception: This is providing false information to a teacher/instructor concerning a formal academic exercise. Examples of this include taking more time on a take-home test than is allowed, giving a dishonest excuse when asking for a deadline extension, or falsely claiming to have submitted work. This type of academic misconduct is often considered softer than the more obvious forms of cheating, and otherwise-honest academics sometimes engage in this type of misconduct without considering themselves cheaters. It is also sometimes done by students who have failed to complete an assignment, to avoid responsibility for doing so, (www.wikipedia.org).

Bribery: This is an act of giving money or gift giving that alters the behaviour of the recipient. Bribery constitutes a crime and is defined by *Black's Law Dictionary* as the offering, giving, receiving, or soliciting of any item of value to influence the actions of an official or other person in charge of a public or legal duty. The bribe is the gift bestowed to influence the recipient's conduct. It may be any money, good, right in action, property, preferment, privilege, emolument, object of value, advantage, or merely a promise or undertaking to

induce or influence the action, vote, or influence of a person in an official or public capacity, (Markus, 2011).

Professional misconduct: This includes improper grading of students' papers and oral exams, grade fraud, deliberate negligence towards cheating or assistance in cheating. This can be done for reasons of personal bias towards students (favoritism) or a particular viewpoint (intellectual misconduct), for a bribe, or to improve the teacher's own perceived performance by increasing the passing rate, (www.wikipedia.org).

Study conducted by Ijeoma (2012) on forms of misconduct amongst academic staff and the way forward noted that a close examination indicates that the issue related to forceful sale of text books to students by some academic staff was pointed out by respondents. Management of all higher institutions of learning in Nigeria have had to battle the 'handout' syndrome that took hold of the institutions of learning since 1990s through outright ban on the sale of handouts and insistence that staff submit their published books to the central books committee for evaluation. Apparently some scrupulous academic staff in order to make their illegal gains has taken to forcing students to buy their textbooks by attaching assignments to them and binding the handouts with covers to make them look like quality textbooks.

In the words of Markus (2011) the "publish or perish" syndrome in the Nigerian higher institutions of learning appears to be behind the four

interrelated factors. Some academic staff in their quest to meet the demands for promotion have resorted to using students' work especially those they supervised without due credit to the students, 'swapping' the order of appearance of names on publications in order to take credit as the lead author and adding their names to work they simply paid the publication fees but did not make any academic contribution to. Added to these examples of dishonest forms of behaviour is the falsification of research data and findings. One of the problems plaguing the higher institutions of learning is the dearth of academic staff, a problem that has been exacerbated by the rapid expansion in the establishment of universities, especially the private ones.

This probably explains the indiscipline of holding more than one adjunct position alongside a full employment in an institution by some academic staff. Such staff, in a bid to cover the various institutions they are committed to, are always on the move. This results in absenteeism and inability to adequately teach the students, appropriately cover the course content in a given semester or resort to trying to teach everything in two or three visits to the class. In the end some set exams for students on what they did not teach. These actions have other negative implications for the quality of education delivery and students' performance. Academic misconduct is a disease that has festered and eaten deep into the moral fibre of higher institutions of learning. Its manifestation is perverse and seems to be on the increase. Academic staff participates in

academic misconduct through poor supervision of students during examinations and unwillingness to report students caught cheating, (Ijeoma, 2012). Commenting on this issue Copeland (2005) asked “what kind of expectation for ethical behaviour is communicated when professors ignore cheating? Abdulkareem and Alabi (2004) on their part opined that many strategies so applied to curb academic misconducts within the university system tend to be ineffective. This situation according to them might not be unconnected to the fact that the student culprits are usually targeted by these strategies, brushing aside the contributory roles of others institution members in the ultimate act. Although, the established procedure for handling cases of academic misconduct can be tiresome, ignoring offenders certainly gives the impression of either indifference or collusion.

Causes of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers

Several factors are responsible for academic misconduct among academic staff. Stagnation in career and the need to get promoted are cited by Ijeoma (2012) as contributory factors to the prevalence of academic misconduct among academic staff. There are two dimensions to this promotion related factor. First is the fact that some academic staff have stayed at a particular level/rank for so long owing to their inability to meet the requirements for promotion namely acquisition of higher degree and particularly publication of quality articles. The second dimension has to do with those that want to beat the system and get

promoted by any means. Given this scenario, coupled with the lack of research skills by some academics.

The teaching profession in Nigerian higher institutions of learning is made up of individuals with varying degrees of passion for the job. Among the academic staff are those who exhibit greed for money, live above their income and lack the commitment and dedication needed to bring about quality education delivery. In line with this view Ikhariale (2003) observes that Nigerian universities are currently harbouring misfits within their belly and that there are those who call themselves teachers but who, due to their intellectual and ethical weakness, ought not to be associated with the ivory tower. Pressures from parents and students as well as the corruption in the society are certainly yielding undesirable fruits in the institutions of learning. It is no longer news that some students in their desperation to pass either entice the academic staff with money, gifts and even their bodies or on the other hand those in cults use threats to obtain their desires.

Poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in punishing “culprit” lecturers, faulty employment procedures in academic staff employment and employment of incompetent lecturers were equally advanced by respondents as factors contributing to the increase in academic misconduct among academic staff. These indicated causative factors are administrative in nature and seem to indict the university management. Some of the occurrences in the educational system

such as absenteeism of academic staff from duty delay in preparing and release of students' results and the non-formalized means of obtaining feedbacks from students especially about teaching quality. The delay in meting out deserved punishment to offending persons in the system owing to the bureaucratic process involved in the disciplinary procedure, the "man know man" (network of friends or relations) and sacred cow syndrome in Nigerian society which shields culprits often provide the boldness for other academics with weak moral to indulge in academic misconduct, (Ijeoma, 2012).

The fact remains that the severity of a written sanction loses its bite and weakens the system if not promptly executed when necessary. Again, it is often difficult for management of institutions to cleanse the system of morally bankrupt academic staff due to students' unwillingness to testify against them either because they benefit from the corruption or are afraid of reprisals. The employment of academic staff ought to follow the due process in order to establish the suitability of such an individual for the position, but this is not often the case as the university managements are often under pressure to employ staff based on other considerations. Such action often brings in staff that heads of departments find difficult to manage because they are the untouchables with high connections. Commenting on employment of lecturers into the Nigerian higher institutions of learning, Abudugana (2009) notes that there are those employed based on merit, due process, the man-know-man factor and some

based on quota system. He partly attributes the alarming decline in the quality of education to the fact that quality and merit is not a major determinant of who becomes a lecturer in Nigerian higher institutions of learning.

However, there are other factors aiding academic misconduct. Researchers have studied the correlation of cheating to; incentive to cheat, personal characteristics, demographics, contextual factors, ethical causes, (www.wikipedia.org).

Incentive to Cheat: Some scholars contend that there are staff/students who have a pathological urge to engage in academic misconduct, (www.wikipedia.org). The writer Mallon(2004) noted that many scholars had found plagiarism in literature (Samuel Taylor Coleridge and Charles Reade being two notable examples) to often be perpetrated in a way similar to “kleptomania”. That is, a psychological disease associated with uncontrollable stealing, even when it is against the interests of the thief, (Mallon, 2004). On the other hand, Mallon (2004) concludes it is probable that most "cheaters" make a rational choice to commit academic misconduct. Richard (2006) puts forward the possibility that business scandals in the real world make students believe misconduct is an acceptable method for achieving success in contemporary society, (Richard 2006). Academic misconduct, in this case, would be practice for the real world. For some students, there would be a dichotomy between success and honesty, and their decision is that: "It is not that we love honesty

less, but that we love success more, (Bowers 2004). Conversely, other scholars consider that with the recent rise in corporate ethics related dismissals in the business world, this approach to cheating may be losing its appeal, if it ever really had any, (Landon, 2005).

Demographic and Personal Characteristics: Research has identified a number of demographic characteristics that appear to be important influences on cheating, including age, gender and grade point average, (Donald & Linda, 2007). Older students, females, and students with higher academic achievement (Jude, 2007), are less likely to cheat, whereas students involved with many extra-curricular activities are more likely to do so. Students involved in extra-curricular activities may be less committed to their studies, or may have more demands on their time, which interfere with their studies, creating a greater incentive to cheat. It has been found that younger students are somewhat more likely to engage in academic misconduct, one study finding the highest incidence of cheating occurs during sophomore year at college, (Kenneth, Jeanette and Debbie, 2004).

Although, academic misconduct might be expected to decline with greater moral development, one experiment found that there was no relationship between how a student performed on a morality test and his likelihood of misconduct (that is, students at a pre-conventional stage of morality are as likely to cheat as those at a post-conventional stage), (Tim, Sue and Charles, 2004).

Race, nationality, and class all show little correlation with academic misconduct. There is also no correlation between how religious someone is and the likelihood that the person will engage in academic misconduct. A comparison between students of different religions yielded similar results, although the study did show that Jews tend to cheat less than members of other religions, (Bowers, 2004).

One of the strongest demographic correlations with academic misconduct in the United States is with language. Students who speak English as a second language have been shown to commit academic misconduct more and are more likely to be caught than native speakers, since they will often not want to rewrite sources in their own words, fearing that the meaning of the sentence will be lost through poor paraphrasing skills, (Jude, 2007).

Contextual Causes: Academic misconduct is more easily traced to the academic and social environment of the staff/students than to his or her background. These contextual factors can be as broad as the social milieu at school to as narrow as what instructions a teacher gives before an exam, (www.wikipedia.org). Contextual factors that individual teachers can affect often make the least difference on misconduct behaviour. A study found that increasing the distance between students taking an exam has little effect on academic misconduct, and that threatening students before an exam with

expulsion if they cheat actually promotes cheating behaviour, (Joe and Charles, 2009).

Indeed, increased exam supervision and other methods of detecting cheating in the classroom are largely ineffective. According to one survey of American college students, while 50% had cheated at least once in the previous six months, and 7% had cheated more than five times in that period, only 2.5% of the cheaters had been caught, (Labeff, 2004). As teachers invent more elaborate methods of deterring cheating, students invent even more elaborate methods of cheating (sometimes even treating it as a game), leading to what some teachers call a costly and unwinnable arms race, (Jude, 2007).

Increased punishment for academic misconduct also has little correlation with misconduct behaviour. It has been found that students with markedly different perceptions of what the severity of the punishment for cheating were all equally likely to cheat, probably indicating that they thought that increased penalties were immaterial since their cheating would never be discovered, (Douglas, Steven & Daniel, 2007). However, if a professor makes clear that he disapproves of cheating, either in the syllabus, in the first class, or at the beginning of a test, academic misconduct can drop by 12%, (Joe & Charles, 2009). Some professors may have little incentive to reduce cheating in their classes below a point that would otherwise be obvious to outside observers, as

they are rated by how many research papers they publish and research grants they win for the college, and not by how well they teach (*www.emich.edu*).

Ethical Causes: No matter what the demographic or contextual influences are on a student who decides to engage in dishonest behaviour, before they can cheat they must overcome their own conscience. This depends both on how strongly someone disapproves of academic misconduct and what types of justifications the student uses to escape a sense of guilt, (*www.wikipedia.org*). For instance, students who personally do not have a moral problem with academic misconduct can cheat guilt-free. However, while many students have been taught and have internalized that academic misconduct is wrong, it has been shown that on average one third of students who strongly disapprove of cheating have in fact cheated, (Bowers, 2004). People who cheat despite personal disapproval of cheating engage in something called "neutralization", in which a student rationalizes the cheating as being acceptable due to certain mitigating circumstances, (Richard, Rene, Ryan, Marisa, and Scofield, 2004).

Influences of Academic Misconduct on the Integrity of the Institution

Academic misconduct has a host of influence on students, academies, individual schools, and the educational system itself. For instance, students who engage in neutralization to justify cheating, even once, are more likely to engage in cheating in the future, potentially putting them on a road to a life of

misconduct, (Kenneth, Jeanette and Debbie, 2004). Indeed, one study 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, (Sarath and Cathy, 2004). Students are also negatively affected by academic misconduct after graduation. A university diploma is an important document in the labour market. Potential employers use a degree as a representation of a graduate's knowledge and ability. However, due to academic misconduct, not all graduates with the same grades actually did the same work or have the same skills. Thus, when faced with the fact that they do not know which graduates are skilled and which are the "lemons", employers must pay all graduates based on the quality of the average graduate. Therefore, the more students who cheat, getting by without achieving the required skills or learning, the lower the quality of the average graduate of a school, and thus the less employers are willing to pay a new hire from that school. Because of this reason, all students, even those that do not cheat themselves, are negatively affected by academic misconduct, (www.wikipedia.org).

Academic misconduct also creates problems for academics. In economic terms, cheating causes an underproduction of knowledge, where the lecturer's job is to produce knowledge, (Douglas, et al, 2007). Moreover, a case of misconduct often will cause emotional distress to faculty members, many considering it to be a personal slight against them or a violation of their trust.

Dealing with academic misconduct is often one of the worst parts of a career in education, one survey claiming that 77% of academics agreed with the statement "dealing with a cheating student is one of the most onerous aspects of the job, (Whitley 2008).

Academic misconduct can also be justified on a college's reputation, one of the most important assets of any school. An institution plagued by misconduct scandals may become less attractive to potential donors and students and especially prospective employers. Alternatively, schools with low levels of academic misconduct can use their reputation to attract students and employers.

Ultimately, academic misconduct undermines the academic world. It interferes with the basic mission of education, the transfer of knowledge, by allowing students to get by without having to master the knowledge, (Whitley 2008). Furthermore, academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive to the learning process, which affects honest students as well, (Bowers, 2004). When honest students see cheaters escape detection, it can discourage student morale, as they see the rewards for their work cheapened. Academic misconduct also undermines academia when students steal ideas. Ideas are a professional author's "capital and identity", and if a person's ideas are stolen it retards the pursuit of knowledge, (Mallon, 2004).

Control Measures to Curb Academic Misconduct among Lecturers

There are diverse suggestions aimed at curbing the menace of academic misconduct among academic staff. Ijeoma (2012) suggested ethical re-orientation of academic staff in her study. This apt is in view of the fact that high ethical standard is certainly expected of the institutions of learning given the crucial role it plays in the moulding of youths and the overall societal development. Equally, the polytechnics management should give due attention to the orientation of new academic staff on employment. The gains of orientation exercise and mentoring programme cannot be over emphasized particularly as orientation provides an avenue for letting new staff know the norms guiding conduct in the institution while mentoring provides a means of ensuring an all-round development of a staff. Bisong (2011) has urged the need for moral education or re-orientation to basic moral values. This in no small measure will help to ensure that academic staff cultivate and maintain the culture of academic integrity.

Numerous insights have emerged from the study of Donald, Linda, and Kenneth (2011) they stated that faculty, administrators, academics, and students can use to help reduce academic misconduct on their campuses. The primary implication of their study was that academic misconduct can be most effectively addressed at the institutional level. On many campuses, the fundamental elements of an academic honour code may be a particularly useful tool for colleges and universities who seek to reduce academic misconduct. However, at

an even broader level, academic institutions are advised to consider ways of creating an “ethical community” on their campuses one that includes clear communication of rules and standards, moral socialization of community members, and mutual respect between students and faculty, and one that extends certain privileges to its academic staff and students (e.g., unproctored exams, self-scheduled exams, etc.). However, building an ethical community also might involve techniques such as creating a “hidden curriculum” in which students not only receive formal ethics instruction but also learn by actively discussing ethical issues and acting on them. The hidden curriculum might include allowing students to participate in the many opportunities for teaching and learning about ethical issues that arise in the day-to-day operations of an educational institution. In such an environment, messages about ethics and values are implicitly sent to and received by academic staff and students throughout their college experience, both in and out of the classroom (Donald, Linda, and Kenneth, 2011).

In addition, McCabe and Pavela (2007) suggested 10 principles of academic integrity for faculty. These principles, represent strategies that faculty can employ to minimize academic misconduct in their classrooms. Several of these factors point to the importance of student involvement in reducing academic misconduct behaviour. This suggests that faculty and students may not be very far apart in their views on curbing college academic misconduct and

further indicates that these groups can work together toward the goal of establishing an ethical community.

Indeed, involving both faculty and students in an ongoing dialogue about academic integrity may be one of the most important components of an honour code tradition. Some schools do little more than tell their students where in the student handbook they can find the school's policy on academic integrity. Many honour code schools, in contrast, use orientation sessions, initiation ceremonies, or both to convey to their students the tradition of honour on campus and what will be expected of them as the newest members of the community.

Nkedishu (2015) stated that some control measures have been used to curb academic misconduct, these include;

Paying attention to catching and punishing lecturers/students involved in academic misconduct: One of the traditional approaches toward managing academic misconduct is deterrence. This usually takes the form of a dishonest policy that sets out the consequences of being caught engaging in such behaviour. Prevention strategies have wide support in the literature (Zobel and Hamilton, 2007; Joyce, 2006; Woessner, 2004), with the argument being that rigorously imposing and publicizing potential penalties will assist in reducing the incidence of academic misconduct. Evidence of the efficacy of such an intervention was provided by McCabe and Trevino (2006) who found that academic misconduct is influenced by the likelihood of being reported and the

severity of penalties. Haswell, Jubb and Wearing (2009), in one of the few empirical studies in this area that was conducted outside the US, found that for a pooled sample of UK, South African and Australian students, the willingness of students to engage in a various forms of plagiarism in a risk-free environment fell dramatically when detection risk and significant penalties were introduced, with size of penalty exerting a greater influence than risk of detection. Most recently, Woessner (2004) has argued that students are utility maximizers who use rational choice to weigh up the advantage of engaging in misconduct (that is, higher grades for less work) against the risk of being caught and the penalties imposed. He claims that failure to apply heavy penalties is tantamount to encouraging misconduct as it presents an excellent gamble to students.

Another approach toward reducing academic misconduct involves minimizing opportunities for students to engage in such behaviour. Since most forms of student academic misconduct relate to assessment practices (for example, exam cheating, assignment copying or plagiarism), it has been argued that careful assessment design can reduce dishonest behaviour (Zobel & Hamilton, 2007; Joyce, 2006; Bolin, 2004), illustrated that the use of plagiarism detection software also minimizes opportunity by providing an effective detection device - the incidence of misconduct was shown to decline as students became aware of the use of the software by academics. These authors also noted the importance of devoting sufficient resources (in the form of staff time as well as financial resources for the purchase of specialized software) to

combat this problem (Zobel and Hamilton, 2007; Joyce, 2006; Larkham & Manns, 2007).

Empowering students to be able to detect and prevent academic misconduct: Academic honour codes provide an alternative intervention towards reducing the incidence of academic misconduct by shifting much of the onus for its detection and prevention from institutions and academics onto students themselves. Honour systems operate at many institutions of higher education in the United States and typically involve students pledging to abide by an honour code that clarifies expectations regarding appropriate and inappropriate behaviour, and to take responsibility for detection and sanctioning of violations when they occur. McCabe and Pavela (2004) report that United States universities are increasingly implementing strategies based on traditional or putting students in charge of the judicial hearing process that emphasise student leadership and peer reporting, to reduce the incidence of academic misconduct. They argued that “the current generation of students face the danger of being portrayed as moral slackers, habituated to cheating” and claim their research indicates that “a substantial majority of students will support stricter penalties for academic misconduct and are ready for such a change” (McCabe and Pavela, 2004). McCabe and Trevino (2006) found empirical support for honour codes. Employing survey data from more than 6,000 university students, they observed significant negative correlations between

(self-reported) levels of academic misconduct and the existence of an honour code, the perceived certainty of being reported and the perceived severity of penalties.

Fostering an Environment of Academic Integrity: Alternative intervention towards reducing the incidence of student academic misconduct revolves around developing a shared (between faculty and students) understanding of academic integrity what it means and how it can be achieved. For example, McCabe and Trevino (2006) observed a strong association between academic misconduct and “perceptions of peers’ behaviour”; a variable that encompassed students’ estimated frequency of cheating by peers as well as the actual frequency with which they had observed peers cheating. This variable, in turn, was found to be significantly influenced by an institution’s ability to develop a shared understanding and acceptance of its academic integrity policies, leading the authors to suggest that “... programs aimed at distributing, explaining, and gaining students and faculty acceptance of academic integrity policies may be particularly useful (in reducing academic misconduct)”.

Roberts and Toombs (2006), also reasoned that the development of prevention strategies would be easier where faculty and students perceive cheating with similar degrees of seriousness, arguing for “a comprehensive effort to implement strategies of what both faculty and students view as appropriate to deal with cheating”. Roig and Ballew (2004) further supported

this stance, calling for faculty to take a more active role in establishing an atmosphere of academic integrity in the classroom by communicating to students their strong position on academic misconduct and the negative consequences of such behaviour. These authors also called for increased vigilance during examinations and professional and timely retribution for cheating, since inaction would likely result in the reinforcement of misconduct.

More recently, Zobel and Hamilton (2007) added a further dimension to this argument, contending that the willingness of staff to implement (and assist in the development of) university policy is critical to the management of student misconduct. They suggested that staff often see themselves as being ‘on the side of the student’ rather than as implementers of policy, an attitude that severely limits the ability of institutions to deal with student academic misconduct. Larkham and Manns (2007), argue for cooperation not only between staff and institutions, but between institutions themselves. Accusing institutions of hiding behind confidentiality to avoid revealing their policy towards, and treatment of, incidences of academic misconduct, these authors assert that such an attitude effectively condones dishonest behaviour. They call for a more open cooperation between institutions in both assessing and dealing with the problem of academic misconduct.

Lecturers and students should form judicial board to try lecturers/students who are academically dishonest: However, many people doubted the

advisability of relying on an abstract notion of honour to prevent academic misconduct. This doubt has perhaps led to the reality that no more than a quarter of American institutions have adopted honour codes, (Bowers, 2004). Moreover, many professors could not envisage a student run trial process that treated faculty accusers fairly. In response to these concerns, in the middle of the twentieth century, many schools devised mixed judicial panels composed of both students and faculty. This type of academic integrity system was similar to the traditional faculty control system in that it relied on professors to detect cheating, except in this system cheaters were brought before centralized boards of students and faculty for punishment. By the 1960 over a quarter of American institutions had adopted this system of mixed judicial boards, (Bowers, 2004).

Putting students in charge of the judicial hearing process: Recently, McCabe and Trevino, two experts in the field of academic misconduct, have proposed a new way of deterring cheating that has been implemented in schools such as the University of Maryland. Modified honour codes put students in charge of the judicial hearing process, making it clear that it is the students' responsibility to stop cheating amongst them, but at the same time students still have proctored exams and are not allowed to take pledges of good conduct in place of professor oversight, (McCabe & Trevino, 2007). The researchers who advocate this type of code seem to think that the normal honour code is something of a special case that is not applicable to many schools, (McCabe &

Trevino 2007). According to supporters of this system, schools with a large student body, a weak college community, or no history of student self-governance will not be able to support a full honour code. However, while modified honour codes seem to be more effective than faculty or administration run integrity codes of conduct, research shows that schools with modified codes still have higher rates of cheating than schools with full honour codes, (McCabe & Trevino 2007).

Appraisal of Reviewed Literature

The theoretical framework of this study was based on theory of planned behaviour. The researcher considered this theory appropriate for the study, since the theory of planned behaviour specifies the nature of relationships between beliefs and attitudes. People's evaluations of, or attitudes toward behaviour are determined by their accessible beliefs about the behaviour, where a belief is defined as the subjective probability that the behaviour will produce a certain outcome. Specifically, the evaluation of each outcome contributes to the attitude in direct proportion to the person's subjective possibility that the behaviour produces the outcome in question. The literature revealed that academic misconduct is any type of cheating that occurs in relation to a formal academic exercise. Academic misconduct takes the following forms; plagiarism, fabrication, deception, cheating, bribery, professional misconduct.

The literature revealed that stagnation in career and the need to get promoted, the teaching profession in Nigerian higher institutions of learning is made up of individuals with varying degrees of passion for the job, Poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in punishing “culprit” lecturers are some of the factors responsible for academic misconduct among academic staff. The literature also revealed that academic misconduct has a host of influence on students, academies, individual schools, and the educational system itself. There are diverse suggestions aimed at curbing the menace of academic misconduct among academic staff.

Thus, the need to undertake this study was based on the fact that a lot of research has been undertaken on the issue of academic misconduct, most of it focused on students. However, for the literature reviewed the researcher discovered that no scholar seems to have carried out academic misconduct and control measures among polytechnics lecturers in Delta State, thus the gap this study tends to cover.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHOD AND PROCEDURE

This chapter describes the method and procedure used in the study these include: research design, population of the study, sample and sampling techniques, research instrument, validity of instrument, reliability of the instrument, and administration of the instrument and method of data analysis.

Research Design

The study is a descriptive survey design. Descriptive survey is used to describe characteristics of a population or phenomenon being studied. However, the issue of academic misconduct has occurred and still occurring in the polytechnics.

Population of the Study

The population of the study consists of 444 lecturers Polytechnics in Delta State. Specifically, as at the time of this study, Delta State Polytechnic Oghara has 113 lecturers, Delta State Polytechnic Ogwushi-Uku has 154 lecturers while Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro has 177 lecturers, in the 2014/2015 academic year.

Table 3: Population Distribution of Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics

S/N	Name of Institutions	Lecturers Population
1.	Delta State Polytechnic Oghara	113
2.	Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku	154
3.	Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro	177
Total		444

Source: *The Polytechnics' Establishment Division/Unit 2016*

Sample and Sampling Technique

The sample used for this study was 178 lecturers drawn from the population of the study. The sample represents 40% of each institution's lecturers. The sampling procedure used was stratified random sampling technique. This was done by dividing the population into strata on the basis of institution and then a random selection was made within each stratum separately and the results were combined to give the sample for the study.

Table 4: A Summary of Sampled lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics

S/N	Name Of Institutions	Number of Lecturers	40% of Lecturers
1.	Delta State Polytechnic Oghara	113	45
2.	Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku	154	62
3.	Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro	177	71
Total		444	178

Source: *The Polytechnics' Establishment Division/Unit 2016*

Research Instrument

The instrument used for the study was a self developed questionnaire titled “Academic Misconduct and Control Measures Questionnaire (AMCMQ)”. The instrument consisted of two sections. Section A was used to sought for demographic data. While section B consists of 64 items and respondents were required to rate in four point scale of Strongly Agree (SA)=4, Agree (A)=3, Disagree (D)=2, and Strongly Disagree (SD)=1.

Validity of the Instrument

The instrument was determined by subjecting it to screening by the researcher’s supervisor and other experts in educational administration and policy studies. The items were examined to find out if they were adequate for the study. Based on their suggestions, comments, recommendations, corrections on spelling errors, grammatical errors as well as addition of new items were made and the questionnaire was approved as valid through face validity.

Reliability of the Instrument

To ensure that the instrument measured considerably and consistently what it intended to measure, it was subjected to a split-half reliability test using 20 lecturers from Federal Polytechnic Auchu Edo State, an institution outside the area of study. The instrument was administered to the respondents after which the items were divided into halves of odd and even numbers. The scores

were computed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-Efficient Statistic and a Co-efficient of 0.85 was obtained which showed high reliability.

Administration of the Instrument

The instrument was administered by the researcher and seven colleagues to the respondents by visiting the institutions. Copies of the questionnaire were administered to the lecturers in the institutions out of which 178 copies were properly filled and retrieved. The presence of the researcher and her assistants enhanced the responses of the respondents in filling and completion of the questionnaire

Method of Data Analysis

The data collected were carefully analysed using mean scores and standard deviation to provide information for answering the research questions while ANOVA at 0.05 level of significance was used to test the hypotheses earlier formulated. For the research questions a mean score of 2.50 is the benchmark for agreeing, any score below is said to disagree.

CHAPTER FOUR

PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results obtained from the data analyzed. The presentation was in accordance with the research questions and the formulated hypotheses.

Demographic Variable

Table 5: Distribution of Sampled Respondents According to Institutions

S/N	Name of Institutions	Lecturers Sampled	% of Lecturers Sampled
1.	Delta State Polytechnic Oghara	45	25.3
2.	Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku	62	34.8
3.	Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro	71	39.9
Total		178	100

The distribution shows that out of 178 respondents, 45 representing 25.3% were from Delta State Polytechnic Oghara, 62 representing 34.8% were from Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku while 71 representing 39.9% were from Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro, respectively.

Research Question 1

What are the forms of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics?

Table 6: Mean and Standard Scores of Forms of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics

S/N	Forms of Academic Misconduct	No of Respondents	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Absenteeism from work.	178	2.12	0.53	-
2.	Allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision.	178	3.03	0.76	+
3.	Allowing students to mark students' scripts.	178	3.20	0.80	+
4.	Arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores.	178	2.91	0.73	+
5.	Awarding undeserved scores to students.	178	3.13	0.78	+
6.	Collection of money to change grades for students.	178	2.69	0.67	+
7.	Covering up examination malpractice cases.	178	2.99	0.75	+
8.	Delay in preparing students results.	178	2.40	0.60	-
9.	Exchange of grades for sex.	178	3.03	0.76	+
10.	Extortion of money as typing fee.	178	2.23	0.56	-
11.	Falsification of data/research finding.	178	3.33	0.83	+
12.	Falsification of examination record.	178	2.61	0.65	+
13.	Forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students.	178	2.68	0.67	+
14.	Forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached.	178	3.11	0.78	+
15.	Giving students examination without teaching.	178	2.82	0.71	+
16.	Inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to.	178	2.94	0.74	+
17.	Leakage of examination question.	178	2.76	0.69	+
18.	Plagiarism/ use of students' ideas.	178	3.00	0.75	+
19.	Swapping of names for publication in order to take credit.	178	3.32	0.83	+
20.	Taking adjunct lectureship in more than one place at a time.	178	2.43	0.61	-
21.	Victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty.	178	2.81	0.70	+
22.	Writing project/seminar papers for money.	178	2.77	0.69	+

Keys: + =Agreed

- =Disagreed

The data in Table 6 shows mean scores analysis on forms of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta state polytechnics. The respondents agreed with mean scores of 3.03, 3.20, 2.91, 3.13, 2.69, 2.99, 3.03, 3.33, 2.61, 2.68, 3.11, 2.82, 2.94, 2.76, 3.00, 3.32, 2.81 and 2.77 on allowing students to cheat in

examination hall through poor supervision, allowing students to mark students' scripts, arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, awarding undeserved scores to students, collection of money to change grades for students, covering up examination malpractice cases, exchange of grades for sex, falsification of data/research finding, falsification of examination record, forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students, forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached, giving students examination without teaching, inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to, leakage of examination question, plagiarism/ use of students' ideas, swapping of names for publication in order to take credit, victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty and writing project/seminar papers for money respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.12, 2.40, 2.23 and 2.43 on absenteeism from work, delay in preparing students results, extortion of money as typing fee and taking adjunct lectureship in more than one place at a time respectively.

From the result and interpretation above, the forms of academic misconduct in Delta State polytechnics includes; allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision, allowing students to mark students' scripts, arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, awarding undeserved scores to students, collection of money to change grades for students, covering up examination malpractice cases, exchange of grades for sex, falsification of

data/research finding, falsification of examination record, forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students, forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached, giving students examination without teaching, inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to, leakage of examination question, plagiarism/ use of students' ideas, swapping of names for publication in order to take credit, victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty and writing project/seminar papers for money.

Research Question 2

What are the causes of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics?

Table 7: Mean and Standard Scores of Causes of Academic Misconduct among Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics

S/N	Causes of Academic Misconduct	No of Respondents	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Stagnation in lecturers' career.	178	2.85	0.71	+
2.	Desperation for promotion.	178	2.02	0.51	-
3.	Emphasis in publication as basis for promotion.	178	2.18	0.55	-
4.	Lack of research skill.	178	3.19	0.80	+
5.	Lack of commitment to the profession.	178	2.93	0.73	+
6.	Greed for money.	178	2.81	0.70	+
7.	Lack of discipline.	178	3.20	0.80	+
8.	Living above income.	178	3.29	0.82	+
9.	Pressure from students.	178	1.92	0.48	-
10.	Wanting to be popular among students.	178	2.85	0.71	+
11.	Fear of student "cult" attack.	178	2.33	0.58	-
12.	Enticement by students through offering sex.	178	3.22	0.81	+
13.	Get rich quick mentality.	178	3.12	0.78	+
14.	Poor supervision of academic staff.	178	3.04	0.76	+
15.	Lack of feedback from students.	178	2.14	0.54	-
16.	Laxity in punishing "culprit" lecturers.	178	3.09	0.77	+
17.	Nature of staff employment-adjunct.	178	2.00	0.50	-
18.	Faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment.	178	2.51	0.63	+
19.	Employment of incompetent lecturers.	178	2.72	0.68	+
20.	Excess workload on academic staff.	178	2.69	0.67	+

Keys: + =Agreed
 - =Disagreed

The data in Table 7 shows mean scores analysis on causes of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta state polytechnics. The respondents agreed

with mean scores of 2.85, 3.19, 2.93, 2.81, 3.20, 3.29, 2.85, 3.22, 3.12, 3.04, 3.09, 2.51, 2.72 and 2.69 on stagnation in lecturers' career, lack of research skill, lack of commitment to the profession, greed for money, lack of discipline, living above income, wanting to be popular among students, enticement by students through offering sex, get rich quick mentality, poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in punishing "culprit" lecturers, faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment, employment of incompetent lecturers and excess workload on academic staff respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.02, 2.18, 1.92, 2.33, 2.14 and 2.00 on desperation for promotion, emphasis in publication as basis for promotion, pressure from students, fear of student "cult" attack, lack of feedback from students and nature of staff employment-adjunct respectively.

Thus, stagnation in lecturers' career, lack of research skill, lack of commitment to the profession, greed for money, lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity, living above income, wanting to be popular among students, enticement by students through offering money/sex, get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society, poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in punishing "culprit" lecturers, faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment, employment of incompetent lecturers and excess workload on academic staff causes academic misconduct in Delta State Polytechnics.

Research Question 3

What influence does academic misconduct have on the integrity of the institution?

Table 8: Mean and Standard Scores of Influence of Academic Misconduct on the Integrity of the Institution

S/N	Influence of Academic Misconduct	No of Respondents	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Causes an underproduction of knowledge.	178	2.78	0.70	+
2.	Cause emotional distress to faculty members.	178	2.21	0.55	-
3.	Institution becomes less attractive to potential donors.	178	3.12	0.78	+
4.	Institution becomes less attractive to students.	178	2.14	0.54	-
5.	Institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers.	178	3.15	0.79	+
6.	Academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education.	178	3.10	0.78	+
7.	Academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning.	178	3.63	0.91	+
8.	Academic misconduct affects honest students.	178	2.41	0.60	-
9.	Academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas.	178	2.82	0.71	+

Keys: + =Agreed

- =Disagreed

The data in Table 8 shows mean scores analysis on influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institution. The respondents agreed with mean scores of 2.78, 3.12, 3.15, 3.10, 3.63 and 2.82 on causes an underproduction of knowledge, institution becomes less attractive to potential

donors, institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers, academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education, academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning and academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.21, 2.14 and 2.41 on cause emotional distress to faculty members, institution becomes less attractive to students and academic misconduct affects honest students respectively.

Thus academic misconduct brings about an underproduction of knowledge, institution becomes less attractive to potential donors, institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers, academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education, academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning and academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas.

Research Question 4

What are the control measures to curb academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics?

Table 9: Mean and Standard Scores of Control Measures to Curb Academic Misconduct among Lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics

S/N	Control Measures to Curb Academic Misconduct	No of Respondents	Mean	SD	Remark
1.	Ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff.	178	3.14	0.79	+
2.	Orientation of staff on employment.	178	3.13	0.78	+
3.	Mandatory mentoring of younger lecturer by senior ones.	178	2.44	0.61	-
4.	Enhancing the teaching–learning facilities.	178	3.43	0.86	+
5.	Appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers.	178	3.22	0.81	+
6.	Following the proper procedure for staff recruitment.	178	2.09	0.52	-
7.	Proper supervision of academic staff by heads of departments.	178	3.03	0.76	-
8.	Ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff.	178	3.31	0.83	+
9.	Training and re-training of academia.	178	3.17	0.79	+
10.	Set up lecture monitoring team in each faculty.	178	2.07	0.52	-
11.	Review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive.	178	3.53	0.88	+
12.	Feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers.	178	3.32	0.83	+
13.	Employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload.	178	2.86	0.72	+

Keys: + =Agreed
 - =Disagreed

The data in Table 9 shows mean scores analysis on control measures to curb academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta state polytechnics. The respondents agreed with mean scores of 3.14, 3.13, 3.43, 3.22, 3.31, 3.17, 3.53,

3.32 and 2.86 on ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the teaching–learning facilities, appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers, ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff, training and re-training of academia, review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive, feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers and employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.44, 2.09, 3.03 and 2.07 on mandatory mentoring of younger lecturer by senior ones, following the proper procedure for staff recruitment, proper supervision of academic staff by heads of departments and set up lecture monitoring team in each faculty respectively.

Thus academic misconduct can be controlled through ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the teaching–learning facilities, appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers, ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff, training and re-training of academia, review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive, feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers and employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload.

Research Question 5

Is there any difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on forms of academic misconduct?

Table 10: Mean and Standard Scores of Differences Among the Three Polytechnics in Delta State on Forms of Academic Misconduct

S/N	Forms of Academic Misconduct	Delta State Polytechnic Oghara				Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku				Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro			
		Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark
1	Absenteeism from work.	45	2.08	0.52	-	62	2.10	0.53	-	71	2.42	0.61	-
2	Allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision.	45	3.19	0.79	+	62	3.01	0.75	+	71	3.59	0.95	+
3	Allowing students to mark students' scripts.	45	2.92	0.73	+	62	2.64	0.66	+	71	3.43	0.93	+
4	Arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores.	45	2.86	0.71	+	62	2.91	0.72	+	71	3.00	0.87	+
5	Awarding undeserved scores to students.	45	3.05	0.76	+	62	2.80	0.70	+	71	2.94	0.86	+
6	Collection of money to change grades for students.	45	3.11	0.78	+	62	3.22	0.80	+	71	3.44	0.93	+
7	Covering up examination malpractice cases.	45	2.63	0.65	+	62	2.70	0.67	+	71	3.33	0.83	+
8	Delay in preparing students results.	45	2.32	0.58	-	62	2.40	0.60	-	71	1.96	0.49	-
9	Exchange of grades for sex.	45	3.21	0.80	+	62	2.86	0.71	+	71	2.78	0.83	+
10	Extortion of money as typing fee.	45	2.00	0.50	-	62	2.02	0.51	-	71	1.99	0.50	-
11	Falsification of data/research finding.	45	2.51	0.62	+	62	2.91	0.85	+	71	3.42	0.93	+
12	Falsification of examination record.	45	3.32	0.91	+	62	2.68	0.82	+	71	3.12	0.78	+
13	Forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students.	45	2.50	0.63	+	62	2.60	0.81	+	71	3.03	0.75	+
14	Forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached.	45	3.23	0.81	+	62	2.84	0.84	+	71	3.42	0.85	+
15	Giving students examination without teaching.	45	2.90	0.73	+	62	3.16	0.89	+	71	3.90	0.97	+
16	Inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to.	45	3.77	0.97	+	62	3.07	0.88	+	71	2.85	0.71	+
17	Leakage of examination question.	45	3.60	0.95	+	62	2.54	0.80	+	71	3.17	0.79	+
18	Plagiarism/ use of students' ideas.	45	3.46	0.92	+	62	2.72	0.82	+	71	2.51	0.62	+
19	Swapping of names for publication in order to take credit.	45	3.33	0.91	+	62	2.99	0.75	+	71	3.51	0.87	+
20	Taking adjunct lectureship in more than one place at a time.	45	2.12	0.73	-	62	1.98	0.50	-	71	2.30	0.58	-
21	Victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty.	45	3.50	0.93	+	62	3.28	0.82	+	71	3.17	0.79	+
22	Writing project/seminar papers for money.	45	3.32	0.91	+	62	2.60	0.65	+	71	3.12	0.78	+

The data in Table 10 above shows mean scores analysis on differences among the three polytechnics in Delta state on forms of academic misconduct. Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Oghara agreed with mean scores of 3.19, 2.92, 2.86, 3.05, 3.11, 2.63, 3.21, 2.51, 3.32, 2.50, 3.23, 2.90, 3.77, 3.60, 3.46, 3.33, 3.50 and 3.32 on allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision, allowing students to mark students' scripts, arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, awarding undeserved scores to students, collection of money to change grades for students, covering up examination malpractice cases, exchange of grades for sex, falsification of data/research finding, falsification of examination record, forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students, forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached, giving students examination without teaching, inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to, leakage of examination question, plagiarism/ use of students' ideas, swapping of names for publication in order to take credit, victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty and writing project/seminar papers for money respectively.

However, the respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.08, 2.32, 2.00 and 2.12 on absenteeism from work, delay in preparing students results, extortion of money as typing fee and taking adjunct lectureship in more than one place at a time respectively.

Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku agreed with mean scores of 3.01, 2.64, 2.91, 2.80, 3.22, 2.70, 2.86, 2.91, 2.68, 2.60, 2.84, 3.16, 3.07, 2.54, 2.72, 2.99, 3.28 and 2.60 on allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision, allowing students to mark students' scripts, arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, awarding undeserved scores to students, collection of money to change grades for students, covering up examination malpractice cases, exchange of grades for sex, falsification of data/research finding, falsification of examination record, forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students, forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached, giving students examination without teaching, inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to, leakage of examination question, plagiarism/ use of students' ideas, swapping of names for publication in order to take credit, victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty and writing project/seminar papers for money respectively. However, the respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.10, 2.40, 2.02 and 1.98 on absenteeism from work, delay in preparing students results, extortion of money as typing fee and taking adjunct lectureship in more than one place at a time respectively.

While respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro agreed with mean scores of 3.59, 3.43, 3.00, 2.94, 3.44, 3.33, 2.78, 3.42, 3.12, 3.03, 3.42, 3.90, 2.85, 3.17, 2.51, 3.51, 3.17 and 3.12 on allowing students to cheat in

examination hall through poor supervision, allowing students to mark students' scripts, arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, awarding undeserved scores to students, collection of money to change grades for students, covering up examination malpractice cases, exchange of grades for sex, falsification of data/research finding, falsification of examination record, forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students, forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached, giving students examination without teaching, inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to, leakage of examination question, plagiarism/ use of students' ideas, swapping of names for publication in order to take credit, victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty and writing project/seminar papers for money respectively. However, the respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.42, 1.96, 1.99 and 2.30 on absenteeism from work, delay in preparing students results, extortion of money as typing fee and taking adjunct lectureship in more than one place at a time respectively.

Thus from the result and interpretation above, it was apparent to deduce that there is no difference among the three polytechnics in Delta state on forms of academic misconduct.

Research Question 6

Is there any difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on causes of academic misconduct?

Table 11: Mean and Standard Scores of Difference among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Causes of Academic Misconduct

S/N	Causes of Academic Misconduct	Delta State Polytechnic Oghara				Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku				Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro			
		Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark
1	Stagnation in lecturers' career.	45	3.12	0.78	+	62	3.32	0.91	+	71	3.10	0.77	+
2	Desperation for promotion.	45	2.06	0.52	-	62	1.50	0.61	-	71	2.01	0.50	-
3	Emphasis in publication as basis for promotion.	45	2.42	0.61	-	62	2.23	0.75	-	71	1.64	0.41	-
4	Lack of research skill.	45	3.90	0.97	+	62	3.40	0.85	+	71	2.91	0.72	+
5	Lack of commitment to the profession.	45	2.85	0.71	+	62	3.77	0.97	+	71	2.80	0.70	+
6	Greed for money.	45	3.17	0.79	+	62	3.60	0.95	+	71	3.22	0.80	+
7	Lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity.	45	2.51	0.62	+	62	3.12	0.78	+	71	2.70	0.67	+
8	Living above income.	45	3.51	0.87	+	62	3.33	0.91	+	71	2.50	0.62	+
9	Pressure from students and their parents/guardians.	45	2.09	0.52	-	62	2.08	0.52	-	71	1.86	0.47	-
10	Wanting to be popular among students.	45	3.17	0.79	+	62	3.19	0.79	+	71	2.51	0.79	+
11	Fear of student "cult" attack/ intimidation.	45	2.14	0.54	-	62	1.92	0.48	-	71	1.77	0.44	-
12	Enticement by students through offering money/sex.	45	2.61	0.81	+	62	2.86	0.71	+	71	2.91	0.85	+
13	Get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society.	45	3.16	0.79	+	62	3.05	0.76	+	71	2.62	0.81	+
14	Poor supervision of academic staff.	45	3.18	0.89	+	62	3.11	0.78	+	71	3.15	0.81	+
15	Lack of feedback from students.	45	2.38	0.77	-	62	1.63	0.41	-	71	2.29	0.57	-
16	Laxity in punishing "culprit" lecturers.	45	3.03	0.87	+	62	3.32	0.83	+	71	3.09	0.89	+
17	Nature of staff employment- adjunct/part time.	45	2.41	0.78	-	62	2.21	0.55	-	71	2.33	0.58	-
18	Faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment.	45	3.03	0.76	+	62	2.98	0.74	+	71	2.82	0.84	+
19	Employment of incompetent lecturers.	45	2.74	0.83	+	62	2.51	0.62	+	71	2.65	0.81	+
20	Excess workload on academic staff.	45	2.61	0.81	+	62	3.08	0.77	+	71	2.51	0.62	+

Keys: + =Agreed

- =Disagreed

The data in Table 11 shows mean scores analysis on differences among the three polytechnics in Delta state on causes of academic misconduct.

Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Oghara agreed with mean scores of 3.12, 3.90, 2.85, 3.17, 2.51, 3.51, 3.17, 2.61, 3.16, 3.18, 3.03, 3.03, 2.74 and 2.61 on stagnation in lecturers' career, lack of research skill, lack of commitment to the profession, greed for money, lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity, living above income, wanting to be popular among students, enticement by students through offering money/sex, get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society, poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in punishing "culprit" lecturers, faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment, employment of incompetent lecturers and excess workload on academic staff respectively. However, the respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.06, 2.42, 2.09, 2.14, 2.38 and 2.41 on desperation for promotion, emphasis in publication as basis for promotion, pressure from students and their parents/guardians, fear of student "cult" attack/ intimidation, lack of feedback from students and nature of staff employment-adjunct/part time respectively.

Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku agreed with mean scores of 3.32, 3.40, 3.77, 3.60, 3.12, 3.33, 3.19, 2.86, 3.05, 3.11, 3.32, 2.98, 2.51 and 3.08 on stagnation in lecturers' career, lack of research skill, lack of commitment to the profession, greed for money, lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity, living above income, wanting to be popular among students, enticement by students through offering money/sex, get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society, poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in

punishing “culprit” lecturers, faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment, employment of incompetent lecturers and excess workload on academic staff respectively. However, the respondents disagreed with mean scores of 1.50, 2.23, 2.08, 1.92, 1.63, 2.21 on desperation for promotion, emphasis in publication as basis for promotion, pressure from students and their parents/guardians, fear of student “cult” attack/ intimidation, lack of feedback from students and nature of staff employment-adjunct/part time respectively.

While respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro agreed with mean scores of 3.10, 2.91, 2.80, 3.22, 2.70, 2.50, 2.51, 2.91, 2.62, 3.15, 3.09, 2.82, 2.65 and 2.51 on stagnation in lecturers’ career, lack of research skill, lack of commitment to the profession, greed for money, lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity, living above income, wanting to be popular among students, enticement by students through offering money/sex, get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society, poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in punishing “culprit” lecturers, faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment, employment of incompetent lecturers and excess workload on academic staff respectively. However, the respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.01, 1.64, 1.86, 1.77, 2.29 and 2.33 on desperation for promotion, emphasis in publication as basis for promotion, pressure from students and their parents/guardians, fear of student “cult” attack/ intimidation, lack of feedback from students and nature of staff employment-adjunct/part time respectively.

From the result and discussion above, there is no difference among the three polytechnics in Delta state on causes of academic misconduct.

Research Question 7

Is there any difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on influence of academic misconduct?

Table 12: Mean and Standard Scores of Difference Among the Three Polytechnics in Delta State on Influence of Academic Misconduct

S/N	Influence of Academic Misconduct	Delta State Polytechnic Oghara				Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku				Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro			
		Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark
1	Causes an underproduction of knowledge.	45	3.08	0.77	+	62	3.17	0.79	+	71	2.92	0.73	+
2	Cause emotional distress to faculty members.	45	2.19	0.55	-	62	2.01	0.50	-	71	1.59	0.40	-
3	Institution becomes less attractive to potential donors.	45	2.96	0.74	+	62	2.54	0.64	+	71	3.13	0.78	+
4	Institution becomes less attractive to students.	45	1.86	0.47	-	62	1.91	0.48	-	71	2.29	0.57	-
5	Institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers.	45	3.15	0.79	+	62	2.91	0.73	+	71	2.74	0.69	+
6	Academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education.	45	3.21	0.80	+	62	3.17	0.79	+	71	3.14	0.79	+
7	Academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning.	45	2.69	0.67	+	62	2.73	0.68	+	71	3.23	0.81	+
8	Academic misconduct affects honest lecturers/students.	45	2.32	0.58	-	62	2.42	0.61	-	71	1.98	0.50	-
9	Academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas.	45	3.24	0.81	+	62	2.96	0.74	+	71	2.79	0.70	+

Keys: + =Agreed
 - =Disagreed

Data in Table 12 shows mean scores analysis on difference among the three polytechnics in Delta state on influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institution. Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Oghara agreed with mean scores of 3.08, 2.96, 3.15, 3.21, 2.69 and 3.24 on causes an

underproduction of knowledge, institution becomes less attractive to potential donors, institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers, academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education, academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning and academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.19, 1.86 and 2.32 on cause emotional distress to faculty members, institution becomes less attractive to students and academic misconduct affects honest lecturers/students respectively.

Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku agreed with mean scores of 3.17, 2.54, 2.91, 3.17, 2.73 and 2.96 on causes an underproduction of knowledge, institution becomes less attractive to potential donors, institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers, academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education, academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning and academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.01, 1.91 and 2.42 on cause emotional distress to faculty members, institution becomes less attractive to students and academic misconduct affects honest lecturers/students respectively.

While respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro agreed with mean scores of 2.92, 3.13, 2.74, 3.14, 3.23 and 2.79 on causes an underproduction of knowledge, institution becomes less attractive to potential donors, institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers, academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education, academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning and academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 1.59, 2.29 and 1.98 on cause emotional distress to faculty members, institution becomes less attractive to students and academic misconduct affects honest lecturers/students respectively.

From the result and discussion above, there is no difference among the three polytechnics in Delta state on influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institution.

Research Question 8

Is there any difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on control measures of academic misconduct?

Table 13: Mean and Standard Scores of Difference Among the Three Polytechnics in Delta State on Control Measures of Academic Misconduct

S/N	Control Measures to Curb Academic Misconduct	Delta State Polytechnic Oghara				Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku				Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro			
		Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark	Number	Mean	SD	Remark
1	Ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff.	45	3.18	0.80	+	62	2.93	0.73	+	71	2.72	0.68	+
2	Orientation of staff on employment.	45	2.99	0.75	+	62	3.21	0.80	+	71	2.59	0.65	+
3	Mandatory mentoring of younger lecturer by senior ones.	45	2.32	0.58	-	62	2.24	0.56	-	71	2.40	0.60	-
4	Enhancing the teaching-learning facilities.	45	2.88	0.72	+	62	2.98	0.75	+	71	3.10	0.78	+
5	Appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers.	45	3.03	0.76	+	62	2.82	0.71	+	71	2.93	0.73	+
6	Following the proper procedure for staff recruitment.	45	2.16	0.54	-	62	2.22	0.56	-	71	2.44	0.61	-
7	Proper supervision of academic staff by heads of departments.	45	1.83	0.46	-	62	1.70	0.43	-	71	2.35	0.59	-
8	Ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff.	45	3.32	0.83	+	62	2.70	0.68	+	71	2.96	0.74	+
9	Training and re-training of academia.	45	3.25	0.81	+	62	2.89	0.72	+	71	2.98	0.75	+
10	Set up lecture monitoring team in each faculty.	45	2.05	0.51	-	62	1.99	0.45	-	71	1.90	0.48	-
11	Review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive.	45	3.17	0.79	+	62	2.93	0.72	+	71	3.22	0.81	+
12	Feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers.	45	3.08	0.77	+	62	2.75	0.69	+	71	3.07	0.77	+
13	Employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload.	45	2.59	0.65	+	62	2.69	0.67	+	71	2.99	0.75	+

Keys: + =Agreed
- =Disagreed

Data in Table 13 shows mean scores analysis on difference among the three polytechnics in Delta state on control measures of academic misconduct.

Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Oghara agreed with mean scores of 3.18, 2.99, 2.88, 3.03, 3.32, 3.25, 3.17, 3.08 and 2.59 on ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the teaching–learning facilities, appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers, ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff, training and re-training of academia, review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive, feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers and employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.32, 2.15, 1.83 and 2.05 on mandatory mentoring of younger lecturer by senior ones, following the proper procedure for staff recruitment, proper supervision of academic staff by heads of departments and set up lecture monitoring team in each faculty respectively.

Respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku agreed with mean scores of 2.93, 3.21, 2.98, 2.82, 2.70, 2.89, 2.93, 2.75 and 2.69 on ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the teaching–learning facilities, appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers, ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff, training and re-training of academia, review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive, feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers and employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.24, 2.22,

1.70 and 1.99 on mandatory mentoring of younger lecturer by senior ones, following the proper procedure for staff recruitment, proper supervision of academic staff by heads of departments and set up lecture monitoring team in each faculty respectively.

While respondents from Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro agreed with mean scores of 2.72, 2.59, 3.10, 2.93, 2.96, 2.98, 3.22, 3.07 and 2.99 on ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the teaching–learning facilities, appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers, ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff, training and re-training of academia, review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive, feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers and employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload respectively. However, respondents disagreed with mean scores of 2.40, 2.44, 2.35 and 1.90 on mandatory mentoring of younger lecturer by senior ones, following the proper procedure for staff recruitment, proper supervision of academic staff by heads of departments and set up lecture monitoring team in each faculty respectively.

Hypotheses 1

There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on forms of academic misconduct.

Table 14: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Forms of Academic Misconduct

Groups	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Cal.	F-Crit.	Decision
Between Groups	31.5	2	17.9	0.17	3.0	Not Significant
Within Groups	17991.1	175	102.5			
Total	18022.6	177	120.4			

Table 14 shows that the F-calculated of 0.17 is less than the F-critical of 3.0 at 0.5 level of significant this implies that the null hypothesis of there is no significant differenceamong lecturers in the three polytechnics on forms of academic misconduct not rejected.

Hypotheses 2

There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on causes of academic misconduct.

Table 15: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Causes of Academic Misconduct

Groups	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Cal.	F-Crit.	Decision
Between Groups	0.41	2	9.19	0.06	3.0	Not Significant
Within Groups	25506	175	147			
Total	25506.41	177	156.19			

Table 15shows that the F-calculated of 0.06 is less than the F-critical of 3.0 at 0.5 level of significant this implies that the null hypothesis of there is no

significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on causes of academic misconduct not rejected.

Hypotheses 3

There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on influence of academic misconduct.

Table 16: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) on Influence of Academic Misconduct among the three Polytechnics in Delta State

Groups	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Cal.	F-Crit.	Decision
Between Groups	19.9	2	12.25	0.12	3.0	Not Significant
Within Groups	18891	175	101.4			
Total	18910.9	177	113.65			

Table 16 shows that the F-calculated of 0.12 is less than the F-critical of 3.0 at 0.5 level of significant this implies that the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on influence of academic misconduct not rejected.

Hypotheses 4

There is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on control measures of academic misconduct.

Table 17: One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) among the three Polytechnics in Delta State on Difference on Control Measures to curb academic misconduct

Groups	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-Cal.	F-Crit.	Decision
Between Groups	109.5	2	63.9	0.24	3.0	Not Significant
Within Groups	44706.5	175	265.4			
Total	44816	177	329.3			

Table 17 above shows that the F-calculated of 0.24 is less than the F-critical of 3.0 at 0.5 level of significant this implies that the null hypothesis of there is no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on control measures of academic misconduct not rejected.

Discussion of Findings

Forms of Academic Misconduct in Delta State Polytechnics

Finding revealed that forms of academic misconduct include; allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision, allowing students to mark students' scripts, arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, awarding undeserved scores to students, collection of money to change grades for students, covering up examination malpractice cases, exchange of grades for sex, falsification of data/research finding, falsification of examination record, forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students, forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached, giving students examination without teaching, inclusion of name to publish paper one did not

contribute to, leakage of examination question, plagiarism/ use of students' ideas, swapping of names for publication in order to take credit, victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty and writing project/seminar papers for money. The hypothesis tested no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on forms of academic misconduct.

This finding agrees with Rughinis, (2010) who identify plagiarism as a form of academic misconduct. However Rughinis (2010) stated that in academia, it is seen more broadly as the adoption or reproduction of original intellectual creations (such as concepts, ideas, methods, pieces of information or expressions, etc.) of another author (person, collective, organization, community or other type of author, including anonymous authors) without due acknowledgment, in contexts where originality is acknowledged and rewarded. Pennycook, (2006) also stated that plagiarism can range from borrowing without attribution a particularly apt phrase, to paraphrasing someone else's original idea without citation, to wholesale contract cheating.

This finding also agrees with Ijeoma (2012) who noted that a close examination indicates that the issue related to forceful sale of text books to students by some academic staff was pointed out by respondents. Apparently some scrupulous academic staff in order to make their illegal gains has taken to forcing students to buy their textbooks by attaching assignments to them and

binding the handouts with covers to make them look like quality textbooks. Some academic staff in their quest to meet the demands for promotion have resorted to using students' work especially those they supervised without due credit to the students, 'swapping' the order of appearance of names on publications in order to take credit as the lead author and adding their names to work they simply paid the publication fees but did not make any academic contribution to. Academic staff participates in academic misconduct through poor supervision of students during examinations and unwillingness to report students caught cheating.

Causes of Academic Misconduct in Delta State Polytechnics

Finding revealed that causes of academic misconduct include stagnation in lecturers' career, lack of research skill, lack of commitment to the profession, greed for money, lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity, living above income, wanting to be popular among students, enticement by students through offering money/sex, get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society, poor supervision of academic staff, laxity in punishing "culprit" lecturers, faulty employment procedure in academic staff employment, employment of incompetent lecturers and excess workload on academic staff. The hypothesis tested no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on causes of academic misconduct.

This finding agrees with Ijeoma (2012) who stated that stagnation in career and the need to get promoted as contributory factors to the prevalence of academic misconduct among academic staff. There are two dimensions to this promotion related factor. First is the fact that some academic staff have stayed at a particular level/rank for so long owing to their inability to meet the requirements for promotion namely acquisition of higher degree and particularly publication of quality articles. The second dimension has to do with those that want to beat the system and get promoted by any means. Given this scenario, coupled with the lack of research skills by some academics.

In line with this view Ikhariale (2003) observes pressures from parents and students as well as the corruption in the society are certainly yielding undesirable fruits in the institutions of learning. It is no longer news that some students in their desperation to pass either entice the academic staff with money, gifts and even their bodies or on the other hand those in cults use threats to obtain their desires. Abudugana (2009) also noted that there are those employed based on merit, due process, the man-know-man factor and some based on quota system. He partly attributes the alarming decline in the quality of education to the fact that quality and merit is not a major determinant of who becomes a lecturer in Nigerian higher institutions of learning.

Influence of Academic Misconduct on the Integrity of the Institution

Finding revealed that influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institution include; causes an underproduction of knowledge, institution becomes less attractive to potential donors, institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers, academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education, academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning and academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas. The hypothesis tested no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on influence of academic misconduct.

This finding agrees with Douglas, et al, (2007) who stated that academic misconduct creates problems for academics. In economic terms, cheating causes an underproduction of knowledge, where the lecturer's job is to produce knowledge. Moreover, a case of misconduct often will cause emotional distress to faculty members, many considering it to be a personal slight against them or a violation of their trust. Whitley (2008) stated that dealing with academic misconduct is often one of the worst parts of a career in education, one survey claiming that 77% of academics agreed with the statement "dealing with a cheating student is one of the most onerous aspects of the job. Academic misconduct undermines the academic world. It interferes with the basic mission of education, the transfer of knowledge, by allowing students to get by without having to master the knowledge.

Bowers (2004) also stated that academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive to the learning process, which affects honest lecturers/students as well. Academic misconduct can also be justified on a college's reputation, one of the most important assets of any school. An institution plagued by misconduct scandals may become less attractive to potential donors and students and especially prospective employers. Alternatively, schools with low levels of academic misconduct can use their reputation to attract students and employers.

Controls of Academic Misconduct in Delta State Polytechnics

Finding revealed that academic misconduct can be controlled through ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the teaching–learning facilities, appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers, ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff, training and re-training of academia, review of promotion criteria to be more comprehensive, feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers and employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload. The hypothesis tested no significant difference among lecturers in the three polytechnics on control measures of academic misconduct. This finding agrees with Ijeoma (2012) who suggested ethical re-orientation of academic staff in her study. This apt is in view of the fact that high ethical standard is certainly expected of the institutions of learning given the crucial role it plays in the

moulding of youths and the overall societal development. Equally, the polytechnics management should give due attention to the orientation of new academic staff on employment. The gains of orientation exercise and mentoring programme cannot be over emphasized particularly as orientation provides an avenue for letting new staff know the norms guiding conduct in the institution while mentoring provides a means of ensuring an all-round development of a staff. Bisong (2011) also urged the need for moral education or re-orientation to basic moral values. This in no small measure will help to ensure that academic staff cultivate and maintain the culture of academic integrity.

Donald, Linda, and Kenneth (2011) also stated that faculty, administrators, academics, and students can use to help reduce academic misconduct on their campuses. The primary implication of their study was that academic misconduct can be most effectively addressed at the institutional level. On many campuses, the fundamental elements of an academic honour code may be a particularly useful tool for colleges and universities who seek to reduce academic misconduct. However, at an even broader level, academic institutions are advised to consider ways of creating an “ethical community” on their campuses one that includes clear communication of rules and standards, moral socialization of community members, and mutual respect between students and faculty, and one that extends certain privileges to its academic staff and students.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This study was conducted to examine academic misconduct and control measures among polytechnics lecturers in Delta state. To guide the study therefore, eight research questions were raised and four hypotheses were formulated. This study is a descriptive survey which adopted the ex-post-facto design. The population of the study consists of 444 lecturers in Delta State Polytechnics. The sample used for this study was 178 lecturers drawn from the study population. The sampling procedure used was stratified random sampling technique. The instrument used for the study was a self developed questionnaire titled “Academic Misconduct and Control Measures Questionnaire (AMCMQ)”. The instrument consisted of two sections. Face validity was used to validate the instrument. To ensure that the instrument measured considerably and consistently what it intended to measure, it was subjected to a split-half reliability test using 20 lecturers from Federal Polytechnic Auchu Edo State, an institution outside the area of study. The scores were computed using the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Co-Efficient Statistics and a Co-Efficient of 0.85 was obtained which showed high reliability. Copies of the instrument were administered by the researcher and some colleagues to the respondents. The data collected were carefully analyzed using mean scores and standard

deviation to provide information for answering the research questions while ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses earlier formulated.

Findings

The following findings were arrived at;

1. Forms of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta state polytechnics includes;arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores, awarding undeserved scores to students, exchange of grades for sex, falsification of research finding, falsification of examination record, forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached, giving students examination without teaching, inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to. Hypothesis tested no significant difference on forms of academic misconduct among the three polytechnics in Delta state.
2. Causes of academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta state polytechnics includes;stagnation in lecturers' career, greed for money, living above income, wanting to be popular among students, enticement by students through offering money/sex, get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society, Hypothesis tested no significant difference on causes of academic misconduct among the three polytechnics in Delta state.

3. Influence of academic misconduct on the integrity of the institution includes;causes an underproduction of knowledge, institution becomes less attractive to potential donors, institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers. Hypothesis tested no significant difference on influence of academic misconduct among the three polytechnics in Delta state.
4. Control measures to curb academic misconduct among lecturers in Delta state polytechnics includes;ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff, orientation of staff on employment, enhancing the appropriate sanction of culprit, training and re-training of academia, feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers. Hypothesis tested no significant difference on control measures to curb academic misconduct among the three polytechnics in Delta state.

Conclusion

From the study therefore, the researcher concluded that academic misconduct is a major challenge to educational systems particularly in the polytechnics.

Recommendations

The researcher recommended that;

1. There is a need for Nigerian polytechnics to develop an academic integrity policy that stipulates the professional norms or ethical codes which all academic staff are required to uphold.
2. There is need for moral education or re-orientation for basic moral values. This in no small measure will help to ensure that academic staff cultivate and maintain the culture of academic integrity.
3. Periodic conferences, seminars and workshops should be mounted for both lecturers and students on the importance of academic integrity.
4. Polytechnics should device a multi-faceted approach aimed at lecturers, non-teaching staff and students which will be both proactive and reactive in order to combat this problem.

Contribution to Knowledge

The study has contributed the following to knowledge;

1. The study established that academic misconduct is a major challenge in Delta State Polytechnics.
2. The study also revealed that academic misconduct can be controlled through ethical reorientation seminar for academic staff

Suggestion for Further Research Study

This study was conducted to examine academic misconduct and control measures in Delta state polytechnics. Any researcher who wishes to carry out similar study can examine the same issue from other institutions like

universities, private universities/polytechnics and primary and secondary schools.

REFERENCES

- Abdulkareem, A. Y. & Alabi, T. (2004). *Curbing Examination Malpractice in the University System: A Management Perspective*. Retrieved on 22nd July, 2012 from www.naere.org.ng/journal.pdf
- Abudugana, A. J. (2009). *The Parody of Nigerian Education and the Alternative Search for Foreign Certificate: Whither the Hope of a Better Future? (Part, 1)*. Retrieved on 2nd August, 2012 from http://www.esinislam.com/News200910/WritersArticles/WritersArticles_AdebiyiJeliliAbudugana_1102.htm
- Adeyemi, B.A. (2008), Enhancing Quality Assurance through Teacher's Effectiveness. *Educational Research and Review*. 3(2), 61-65
- Agbo, F.O (2013). An Investigation into the forces behind examination malpractice. A challenge for secondary school education in the 21st Century. *Journal of the Curriculum Organization of Nigeria* 10 (2) 344 – 347.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). "The theory of planned behaviour". *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 50 (2): 179–211. doi:[10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T).
- Ajzen, I. (2002). *From intentions to actions: A theory of planned behaviour*. In J. Kuhl & J. Beckmann (Eds.), *Action control: From cognition to behaviour*. Berlin, Heidelberg, New York: Springer-Verlag. (pp. 11-39).
- Ajzen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behaviour: An introduction to theory and research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Aluede, O, Omoregie, E. O. and Osa-Edoh, G. I. (2006). *Academic dishonesty as a problem in higher education: how academic advisers can help*. (Electronic Version) Reading Improvement. Summer 2006. Retrieved January 13, 2011 from <http://www.findarticle.com/p/articles/mi>
- Annesi, J. J. (2005). *Correlations of Depression and Total Mood Disturbance with Physical Activity and Self-Concept in Preadolescents Enrolled in an After-School Exercise Program 1*. *Psychological reports*, 96(3c), 891-898.
- Badmus, G. A. (2006) "Accountability in teaching\learning environment and examination malpractices". A Paper Presented at a Two-Day Summit on Examination Malpractice in Nigeria Organized by the House of

Representatives Committee on Education Held at the Shehu Musa Yar' Adua Centre, Abuja, August 15-16, 2006.

- Baker, D. & LeTendre, G. (2005). *National differences, global similarities: World Culture and Future of Schooling*. Stanford, CA: Stanford university press.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bisong, J. O. (2011). *Moral Education in the context of Millennium Development Goals (MDG's) for sustainability*. A Lead Paper Delivered at the 6th Annual Conference of the association of Nigerian Teachers (ASSONT) held at CRUTECH, Calabar, 8th-12th August.
- Bolin, A. (2004) "Self-Control, Perceived Opportunity and Attitudes as Predictors of Academic Dishonesty". *The Journal of Psychology*, 138(2), pp.101-115.
- Bowers, W. J. (2004). "*Student Dishonesty and its Control in Colleges*" (New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University), 155.
- Brian, A.J. & Steven, D. L. (2013), "*Catching Cheating Teachers: The Results of an Unusual Experiment in Implementing Theory*",
- Bushway, A. and Nash W. R. (2007), "*School Cheating Behaviour*", *Review of Educational Research* 47, no. 4, 623.
- Caruana, A., Rameseshan, B. and Ewing, M.T. (2003). The Effect of Anomie on Academic Dishonesty among University Students. *The International Journal of Educational Management*, 14, 23-30.
- Copeland, J. E., Jr. (2005). *Ethics as an Imperative*. *Accounting Horizons*, 19(1), 35-43.
- Donald L. M., Linda K. T., and Kenneth D. B., (2011) "Academic Integrity in Honor Code and Non-Honor Code Environments: A Qualitative Investigation", *The Journal of Higher Education* 70, no. 2 (March–April 1999), 213.
- Donald, L. M., and Linda, K. T. (2007), "*Honour Code and Other Contextual Influences on Academic Integrity: A Replication and Extension to Modified Honour Code Settings*" *Research in Higher Education* 43, no. 3, 368.

- Douglas, N.B., Steven, B.C., and Daniel, M.G. (2007), "Crime in the Classroom: An Economic Analysis of Undergraduate Student Cheating Behaviour", *The Journal of Economic Education* 23, no. 3, 205.
- Fayombo. G. A. (2004). *Factors Influencing examination malpractices among Nigeria secondary school student*. A Paper presented at first national conference of Institute of education O.O.U, Ago-Iwoye. Jan. 12-15 Pp160-167 Federal Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (1985). A handbook on continuous assessment. Ibadan: first edition, Heinemann Education Books (Nigeria) Limited.
- Fishbein, M. (1975). A Bayesian analysis of attribution processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 82(2), 261.
- Green, S. P. (2013). "Plagiarism, Norms, and the Limits of Theft Law: Some Observations on the Use of Criminal Sanctions in Enforcing Intellectual Property Rights" (PDF). *Hastings Law Journal* (University of California) 54: 167–242.
- Gyurcsik, N. C., & Brawley, L. R. (2000). Mindful Deliberation About Exercise: Influence of Acute Positive and Negative Thinking. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 30(12), 2513-2533.
- Hardy, A. B., & Howells, G. N. (1980). *Tests of the generality of self-efficacy theory*. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 4(1), 39-66.
- Haswell, S., Jubb, P. and Wearing, B. (2009). "Accounting Students and Cheating: A Comparative Study for Australia, South Africa and the UK", *Teaching Business Ethics*, 3(3), pp. 211-239.
- Ihejirika, J.C. (2005). *View Point: The Nigerian society is to blame for examination malpractice*. Available: <http://nm.onlinenigeria.com/templates/?a=3605&z=12>.
- Ijeoma A. A. (2012). Forms of Dishonesty amongst Academic Staff and the Way Forward. *Canadian Social Science*, 8 (6), 39-43. Available from: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/css/article/view/j.css.1923669720120806.1057> DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/j.css.1923669720120806.1057>
- Ikhariale, M. (2003). *Education: ASUU and the problems in our universities*. Vanguard, Thursday, May 8.
- Ivowi, U. M. O. (1997). Examination malpractices: profile, causes, warning signs, case studies, prevention and detection strategies in Onyechere, I.

- (Eds) *Promoting Examination Ethics: the challenges of a collective responsibility*, Lagos: Potomac Books.
- Joe, K. and Charles, L.S. (2009). "Can We Control Cheating in the Classroom?" *The Journal of Economic Education* 30, no. 4, 331.
- Joyce, D., (2006), "Checking Originality and Preventing Plagiarism", Proceedings of the 16th Annual NACCQ.
- Jude, C. (2007), "A Handbook for Deterring Plagiarism in Higher Education"; The Oxford Centre for Staff and Learning Development.
- Justin P. (2007), 'Higher education sees rise in dishonesty', [Associated Press](#), May 19, 2007
- Kenneth, J.S., Jeanette, A.D., and Debbie, E. (2004). "An Examination of Cheating and its Antecedents among Marketing and Management Majors", *the Journal of Business Ethics*, no. 1, 66.
- Kerkvliet J. and Sigmund, C. L. (2009) "Can We Control Cheating in the Classroom?", *The Journal of Economic Education* 30, no. 4, (Autumn, 1999), 331.
- Kofi A. K. and Kwabena, N. (2014) Inclining Factors towards Examination Malpractice among Students in Takoradi Polytechnic, Ghana, *Journal of Education and Practice* www.iiste.org ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288X (Online) Vol.5, No.22, 2014
- Kohn, A. (2007). *Who's cheating whom?* Phi Delta Kappan, 89(2), 89-97.
- Labeff, E. E. (2004), "Situational Ethics and College Student Cheating", *Sociological Inquiry* 60, no.2, 192.
- Landon, T. Jr., (2005). "On Wall Street, a Rise in Dismissals over Ethics", *New York Times*, 29 March 2005.
- Larkham, P. J. and Manns, S. (2007), "Plagiarism and its Treatment in Higher Education", *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(4), pp. 339-349.
- Lynch, J. (2007), "The perfectly acceptable practice of literary theft: plagiarism, copyright, and the eighteenth century", in *Colonial Williamsburg: The Journal of the Colonial Williamsburg Foundation* 24, no. 4 (Winter 2007-3), pp. 51-54.
- Macleane, P (2009). "[Cheating goes high tech](#)" (PDF). *Ohio State News*.

- Maduemezia, M.U (1998). Examination Malpractice in the Senior School Certificate Examination: In Solomon J. A (Eds) Trends in Examination Malpractice in Nigerian Educational System and its Effects on the Socio-Economic and Political Development of Nigeria, *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (AJHSS) Volume 2, Issue-3, August, 2014 ISSN: 2320-9720*
- Mallon, T. (2004), *“Stolen Words”* (San Diego: Harcourt), 4.
- Markus F. T., (2011) ["Don't Pay for the Misdeeds of Others: Intro to Avoiding Third-Party FCPA Liability," 6 BNA White Collar Crime Report 33 \(January 14, 2011\)](#) (discussing bribery in the context of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act).
- Markus, F. (2011). "Don't Pay for the Misdeeds of Others: Intro to Avoiding Third-Party Liability," 6 BNA White Collar Crime Report 33 (January 14, 2011).
- McCabe, D. and Trevino, L., (2006), “Academic Dishonesty: Honour Codes and Other Contextual Influences”, *the Journal of Higher Education*, 64(5), pp. 522-538.
- McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. R. (1997). Ten principles of academic integrity. *The Journal of College and University Law*, 24, 117–118.
- Nichols, S. & Good, T. (2004). *America’s Teenagers*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum and Associates. 2004.
- Nkedishu V. C. (2015), *Academic Dishonesty Interventions and Lecturers/Students Sensitivity in Delta State Colleges of Education*, Unpublished Dissertation, Delta State University, Abraka
- Patrzek, J., Sattler, S., Van Veen, F., Grunschel, C., and Fries, S. (2014). “Investigating the effect of academic procrastination on the frequency and variety of academic misconduct: a panel study”. *Studies in Higher Education*.
- Pennycook, A. (2006). “Borrowing Others' Words: Text, Ownership, Memory, and Plagiarism” 201-230 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3588141>
- Perry, A. R. (2010). *Type A behaviour, competitive achievement-striving, and cheating among college students*. *Psychological Reports*, 66, 459–465.
- Richard T. (2006) *Business Ethics*. 5th edition Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- Richard, A.B., Rene, L. M., Ryan, G., Scofield, B., and Marisa, A. (2004). "Examining the Decision Process of Students' Cheating Behaviour: An Empirical Study" *Journal of Business Ethics* 50, no. 1, (2004), 399.
- Roberts, D. and Toombs, R., (2006), "A Scale to Assess Perceptions of Cheating in Examination-Related Situations", *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53, pp. 755-762.
- Rocha, M.F and Teixeira, A.C. (2006). *A cross-country evaluation of cheating in academic: Is related to real world' business ethics?* CENMPRE. Retrieved December 10, 2010 from http://www.fep.up.pt/investiganoes/working_papers/06.06.01_WP_214_rochateixeira.Pdf
- Rodgers, W. M., & Brawley, L. R. (1996). The influence of outcome expectancy and self-efficacy on the behavioral intentions of novice exercisers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 26(7), 618-634.
- Roig, M. and Ballew, C., (2004) "Attitudes Toward Cheating of Self and Others by College Students and Professors", *The Psychological Record*, 44(1), pp. 3-12.
- Ronald, M. and Jude, C. (2006): "Plagiarism—a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*",
- Rughinis, C. (2010) "PlagiatulDocs.Google.com", 2010
- Sarath, N. and Cathy, O.S. (2004), "An Examination of the Relationship between Academic Dishonesty and Workplace Dishonesty", *Journal of Business Education* 77, no. 2, 69-77.
- Sheppard, B.H., Hartwick, J. & Warshaw, P.R. (1988). The theory of reasoned action: A meta-analysis of past research with recommendations for modifications and future research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15, 325–343.
- Simmons, A. (2009). "Why Professors Don't Do More to Stop Students who cheat," *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 22 January.
- Solomon J. A (2014) Trends in Examination Malpractice in Nigerian Educational System and its Effects on the Socio-Economic and Political Development of Nigeria, *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (AJHSS) Volume 2, Issue-3, August, 2014 ISSN: 2320-9720*

Stanley, M. A., & Maddux, J. E. (1986). *Cognitive processes in health enhancement: Investigation of a combined protection motivation and self-efficacy model*. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(2), 101-113.

Stepchyshyn, V., Robert, S. N. (2007). “*Library plagiarism policies*”. Assoc of College & Research Libraries. p. 65. ISBN 0-8389-8416-9.

[The Ethics of American Youth: 2008](#) (PDF). *Report Card on the Ethics of American Youth*. Josephson Institute. Retrieved 14 November 2012.

Tim, W., Sue, R., and Charles, S. (2004). "Cheating and Moral Judgment in the College Classroom: A Natural Experiment", *Journal of Business Ethics* 54, no. 2, 181.

Whitley, B. E. (2008), “*Factors Associated With Cheating Among College Students*”: A Review Research in Higher Education.

Wilfred, D. (2012), “*Crisis on Campus: Confronting Academic Misconduct*” (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press), 23.

Wilkinson, J 2009. Staff and student perceptions of plagiarism and cheating. *International Journal of Teaching in Higher Education*. Retrieved December 25, 2010 from <http://www.isctl.org/ijtlhe/>

Woessner, M.C., (2004) “*Beating the House: How Inadequate Penalties for Cheating Make Plagiarism an Excellent Gamble*”, *Political Science and Politics*, April, pp. 313-320.

www.emich.edu

www.Wikipedia.org/academicdishonesty

Zobel, J. and Hamilton, M., (2007) “*Managing Student Plagiarism in Large Academic Departments*”, *Australian Universities Review*, 45(2), pp. 23-30.

APPENDIX A
Department of Educational Administration
and Policy Study,
Faculty of Education,
Delta State University, Abraka.
27/08/2015

Dear Sir/Madam,

Letter of Identification

I write to request your assistance in responding to the items in the attached questionnaire. It is divided into two sections, your response is purely for research purposes and will be treated with highest degree of confidentiality.

Thanking you most sincerely for the anticipated co-operation.

Yours sincerely

ALIBERI, Vivian

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Academic Misconduct and Control Measures Questionnaire

Instruction: - This is a research undertaken by a Post-graduate Student of the Department of Educational Administration, Faculty of Education, Delta State University, Abraka.

It is not in any way related to the Ministry of Education or any agency in charge of school supervision and administration. You are therefore required to read each of the following statement carefully and tick (✓) as appropriate using the scale provided.

SECTION A

Name of Institutions:

Delta State Polytechnic Ozoro ()

Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku ()

Delta State Polytechnic Otefe Oghara ()

SECTION B

B(i)	Forms of Academic Misconduct	SA=4	A=3	D=2	SD=1
1.	Absenteeism from work.				
2.	Allowing students to cheat in examination hall through poor supervision.				
3.	Allowing students to mark students' scripts.				
4.	Arbitrary award of continuous assessment scores.				
5.	Awarding undeserved scores to students.				
6.	Collection of money to change grades for students.				
7.	Covering up examination malpractice cases.				
8.	Delay in preparing students results.				
9.	Exchange of grades for sex.				
10.	Extortion of money as typing fee.				
11.	Falsification of data/research finding.				

12.	Falsification of examination record.				
13.	Forceful/compulsory sale of substandard text to students.				
14.	Forcing students to buy text books with assignments attached.				
15.	Giving students examination without teaching.				
16.	Inclusion of name to publish paper one did not contribute to.				
17.	Leakage of examination question.				
18.	Plagiarism/ use of students' ideas.				
19.	Swapping of names for publication in order to take credit.				
20.	Taking adjunct lectureship in more than one place at a time.				
21.	Victimization of students who do not agree to engage in academic dishonesty.				
22.	Writing project/seminar papers for money.				
B(ii)	Causes of Academic Misconduct				
23.	Stagnation in lecturers' career.				
24.	Desperation for promotion.				
25.	Emphasis in publication as basis for promotion.				
26.	Lack of research skill.				
27.	Lack of commitment to the profession.				
28.	Greed for money.				
29.	Lack of discipline/poor moral/integrity.				
30.	Living above income.				
31.	Pressure from students and their parents/guardians.				
32.	Wanting to be popular among students.				
33.	Fear of student "cult" attack/ intimidation.				
34.	Enticement by students through offering money/sex.				
35.	Get rich quick mentality/corruption in the society.				
36.	Poor supervision of academic staff.				
37.	Lack of feedback from students.				
38.	Laxity in punishing "culprit" lecturers.				
39.	Nature of staff employment-adjunct/part time.				
40.	Faulty employment procedure in academic				

	staff employment.				
41.	Employment of incompetent lecturers.				
42.	Excess workload on academic staff.				
B(iii)	Influence of Academic Misconduct				
43.	Causes an underproduction of knowledge.				
44.	Cause emotional distress to faculty members.				
45.	Institution becomes less attractive to potential donors.				
46.	Institution becomes less attractive to students.				
47.	Institution becomes less attractive to prospective employers.				
48.	Academic misconduct interferes with the basic mission of education.				
49.	Academic misconduct creates an atmosphere that is not conducive for learning.				
50.	Academic misconduct affects honest lecturers/students.				
51.	Academic misconduct undermines academia when colleagues steal ideas.				
B(iv)	Control measures to Curb Academic Misconduct				
52.	Ethical re-orientation seminars for academic staff.				
53.	Orientation of staff on employment.				
54.	Mandatory mentoring of younger lecturer by senior ones.				
55.	Enhancing the teaching–learning facilities.				
56.	Appropriate sanctioning of guilty lecturers.				
57.	Following the proper procedure for staff recruitment.				
58.	Proper supervision of academic staff by heads of departments.				
59.	Ensuring recruitment of qualified academic staff.				
60.	Training and re-training of academia.				
61.	Set up lecture monitoring team in each faculty.				
62.	Review of promotion criteria to be more				

	comprehensive.				
63.	Feedback mechanism should be put in place to enable students report erring lecturers.				
64.	Employment of more qualified lecturers so as to reduce workload.				

APPENDIX C

Reliability Test of Academic Misconduct and Control Measures Questionnaire

CORRELATIONS

/VARIABLES=VAR00001 VAR00002

/PRINT=ONETAIL NOSIG

/MISSING=PAIRWISE.

Correlations

Correlations

		Odd Numbers	Even Numbers
Odd Numbers	Pearson Correlation	1	.85
	Sig. (1-tailed)		.001
	N	32	32
Even Numbers	Pearson Correlation	.85	1
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.001	
	N	32	32

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).