

Assessment of Adherence of Public and Private Universities to Examination Regulatory Frameworks in Mount Kenya Region

Meshack Ambani Mulongo

*Department of Planning, Administration & Curriculum Development, Karatina University,
Karatina, Kenya*

mulongomesh@gmail.com

First draft received: 7 August 2019 Date Accepted: 15 Dec 2019 Final proof received: 28 Feb 2020

Abstract

The study focused on the assessment of the adherence of public and private universities to examination regulatory frameworks in Mount Kenya region. The objectives of the study were to: assess the extent to which universities in Mount Kenya region adhere to examination regulatory frameworks, and examine the significant differences between public and private universities levels of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks in Mount Kenya region. Descriptive research design was used. The study sampled 380 university students using Kathuri and Pals' (1999) sampling table. Self-constructed questionnaires were used to collect data from students and university examination officers and an interview schedule from registrars. Data was analyzed descriptively by use of means, percentages and frequencies; and inferentially by computation of a *t*-test. Results indicated that majority of universities did not adhere to regulatory frameworks as indicated by 51.3% of respondents, students were congested in examination rooms as reflected by 47.7% of subjects, and there was weakness in identification of examinees as they entered examination rooms as shown by 55.7% of respondents. The *t*-test yielded a *p*-value of 0.887 against the α value of 0.05; hence, the null hypothesis was supported (at $\alpha = .05$) and concluded that the adherence to regulatory framework for private and public universities was largely the same. The study concluded that university students did not adhere to regulatory frameworks, there was no proper spacing of students in examination rooms, and there was weakness in identification of students as they entered examination rooms. The study also found that students did not borrow materials in examination rooms, and they were not allowed to talk during examinations. Implications of the study were: both public and private universities should ensure adherence to regulatory frameworks, avail sufficient spacing in examination rooms, and ensure proper identification of students as they enter examination rooms. Results will be referred to by education policy makers to improve the management of examinations in universities.

Keywords: assessment; adherence; regulatory frameworks; universities.

To cite this paper (in APA style):

Mulongo, M. A. (2019). Assessment of adherence of public and private universities to examination regulatory frameworks in Mount Kenya Region. *International Journal of Education*, 12(2), 101-108. doi: 10.17509/ije.v12i2.22254

INTRODUCTION

The levels of students' adherence to university examination rules and regulations in Kenya and particularly in the Mount Kenya region are not clearly established. Examination malpractice is any form of infamous habit portrayed by an examinee or any person who has been entrusted with responsibility of examining candidates but goes against guidelines of examinations (Alutu & Aluede 2006). Khan, Khan, and Khan (2012) reported that all systems of education utilize examinations to measure academic performance. Diego (2010) argued that the importance associated with examinations were the root causes of cheating in university examinations.

According to Yusuf, Olufunke, and Bamgbose (2015), examination malpractices are caused by lack of adherence to rules and regulations by both students and university

examination officers, parental threats, ineffective examination invigilation and fear of failure. University students have continually failed to adhere to examination regulatory frameworks put in place by institutions, amid the availability of stringent rules and regulations which are meant to curb examination malpractices. Corroborating with research on rules and regulations, Flutter and Rudduck (2007) posit that in order to mitigate examination malpractice in universities, university management needs to promote integrity of examinations by adhering to examination codes and ethical guidelines which have been put in place by universities. In view of that, integrity and accountability remain of utmost importance in the management of examination malpractices in universities.

In the same vein, Badmus (2006) reiterated that it was the responsibility of lecturers to adhere to rules and regulations that govern unique institutions in order to enhance academic truthfulness during examinations. Contrary to these propositions, it was disturbing to observe that a number of university lecturers did not adhere to set rules and regulations during university examinations. Onuka and Dorowoju (2012) argued that in order to end the challenge of examination malpractice in learning institutions, the government needed to avail rules and regulations that provided for stringent punishments to students who violated examination regulatory frameworks. Again, they informed that lack of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks lead to several forms of examination malpractices.

Ambrose, Arnaud, and Schminke (2007) observed that adherence to rules and regulations in learning institutions motivated members of an institution to have desirable behaviors and make ethical decisions. Universities can improve standards of examinations by encouraging students to adhere to examination rules and regulations. In a study conducted by Flutter and Rudduck (2007), it was found that examination malpractices can be mitigated through fostering examination accountability and adherence to provided rules and regulations in universities. Peters and Okon (2014) reported that although universities and many countries had put in place regulatory frameworks to manage examination malpractices, lack of universities to adhere to the rules has resulted in escalating cases of cheating during university examinations. Corroborating with Peters and Okon (2014) views, Suleman, Gain and Kamran (2015) and Ambrose et al. (2007) observed that lack of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks was a major factor that resulted in increased examination malpractices in universities. Yusuf, Olufunke, and Bamgbose (2015) recommended that non-compliance to rules and regulations should be punished strongly and consistently. It was in view of the provided background that the study, assessment of adherence of public and private universities to examination regulatory frameworks in the Mount Kenya region was an important aspect to be considered and engaged in, so as to enhance integrity of examination outcomes in both private and public universities.

In view of Anzene (2014), the root causes of examination malpractice are: moral decadence among the youth as a result of poor parenting, the emphasis attached to certificates by employers, lack of effective teaching by lecturers, drug abuse and other vices. In the contemporary society, every parent and guardian wants every learner to go to university. Consequently, the pressure to pass examinations motivated students to engage in examination malpractices so as to please their educators.

There could be dire effects of examination malpractices on society if the menace is not dealt with urgently. Akaranga and Ogong (2013) opined that examination malpractices lead to expulsion of students from learning institutions. Over the years, there have been incidences of students not completing their studies because of being sent away as a result of involvement in cheating in examinations. Lack of confidentiality in university certificates, and corruption in various sectors of the economy are other effects of examination malpractices. If the situation is left to escalate, there will be increased corruption, high dropout rates, lack of confidence and trust in university certification, which will

consequently lead to high crime rates, unemployment, poverty and retrogressive nations of the world (Adelakum & Lawal, 2008). Hence, there is an urgent need for the problem to be solved and the relevance of the current study.

Institutions of learning have regulations for students to adhere to in matters of examinations. However, the crucial question that puzzles leaders is whether prescribed rules and regulations are adhered to by students or not. Consistent with conventional practices of mitigation of examination malpractices in universities through regulatory frameworks, Kogi State College of Education (KSCOE) in Nigeria, has rules and regulations contained in the Students' Handbook and Academic Regulations. The Handbook has all behaviors that constitute examination malpractices. The book, in addition, provides penalties for violation of the said rules and regulations (Adegoke, 2010). This implies that globally, universities have guidelines and regulatory frameworks which are used in dealing with examination malpractices. Ambrose et al. (2007) observed that institutional rules and regulations motivate learners to embrace ethical attributes in order to improve examination standards. However, the established guidelines are not expected to be punitive in order to eliminate fear and opposition.

Consistent with the ongoing discussion, Chaminuka in (Onah, 2013) viewed examination malpractice as an act of going against examination rules and regulations by persons being examined. This shows that when rules and regulations are not followed by either examiners or examinees, there is high tendency of occurrence of examination malpractices at examination venues. This implies that when rules and regulations are not followed by either the examiners or examinees, there is a tendency of examination malpractice activities to occur at examination venues. In addition, Edukukho (2007) asserted that when educational rules, policies and regulations are not executed, there was bound to be an escalation of examination malpractice. There are stipulated rules and regulations which govern the conduct of examinations in each university in Kenya and the world over; for example at Moi University, there are rules and regulations which guide the administration and procedures of conducting both undergraduate and postgraduate examinations (Moi University, 2009) It is thus a matter of great importance for educationists to encourage the adherence to regulatory framework by students and other stakeholder in education.

The situation at Moi University is not unique. Another example of examination process and justification that each university has guidelines which should guide students and the entire examination process is the University of Eldoret. Guided by Statute XL of the University Statutes examination process shows that a school shall constitute a Board of Examiners (BOA) for the purpose of Quality Assurance (QA). Members of the board shall the Dean (Head of Department), Program Coordinator and the time table/examination coordinator and external examiners (UOE, 2014). With this regard, it is therefore evident that universities are concerned about regulations that are meant to guide on various examination aspects and ensure there is authenticity and proper accountability in matters concerned with examinations.

In private universities, the senate approves internal as well as external examiners of the university. As it is in public

universities, internal examiners, who are lecturers in the university are responsible for the setting, invigilation, marking and grading of examination papers. In both types of universities, the Chief Examiner (CE), who is usually the HOD, is responsible for moderation and coordination of examination papers before final forwarding for processing (MKU, 2014). Available literature does not show the position of private universities when it comes to what should be done when examination malpractices are discovered, or the cheating is confirmed after the graduation of the culprit. Rules and regulations provide types of examinations malpractices and penalties for each irregularity, for example warnings, results cancellations, suspensions, or total expulsion from the institution; as dictated by the nature of the committed examination malpractice. Despite measures having been put in place, there have been escalating instances of examination malpractices reported in the process of examinations management and administration.

This study aimed at demystifying the menace of examination malpractice in Kenyan public and private universities with a view of making credible suggestions on how the government can have desired examination outcomes from those institutions. Kithuka (2004) observed that cheating in examinations had escalated to a fearful proportion and the situation was complicated and institutionalized in many countries. He further noted that measures by government administration and education stakeholders to end the menace had been frustrated by perpetrators of this vice. GOK (2010) reported that the peak of examination malpractices was reached in Kenya in 2010 and was enhanced by modern technology. Consequently, Aulo (2004) noted the trend had led to high production of incompetent graduates from higher institutions of learning. Consistent with GOK (2010), was Ragaa (2001) observation that examination cheating had been reported in the Kenyan System of Education every year starting from 1995. Mwanyumba and Mutwiri (2009) noted that at whatever level of students' assessment, examinations have to be reliable, relevant, and efficient and should enhance equity. In addition, they reiterated that examinations must be handled under safe conditions to ensure that no examinee obtained undue advantage over others.

The integrity of university certificates is determined by the integrity of their institutional examination processes. One of the guiding principles in the University Act was to promote inclusive, efficient and transparent governance systems, practices and maintenance of public trust. Education and training aims at instilling integrity, honesty and respect for others and hard work (GOK, 2012). Examination cheating goes against this aim. Examination malpractices affect the standard of any given system of education and even affect a person's long term character traits.

The established Quality Assurance Department (QAD) ensured the right procedures were followed during the evaluation process of students (GOK, 2012). It therefore remains on the part of each institution to ensure procedures are adhered to by learners. In the event where examination outcomes are to be credible, examinations have to be done according to rules and regulations (Monday, 2008). Consequently, examinations which are not guided by rules are considered bad. GOK (2005) provides general code of conduct and ethics and minimum ethical standards for all

public servants. Every public officer is expected to carry out duties honestly and efficiently. It is against the law for public officers to be dishonest and favor individuals for selfish gains. Being public servants, all university examination officers who are charged with the responsibility of ensuring sobriety in examination should do their work in line with government expectations. Institutions of learning are bound to have guidelines that are applicable to members of the organization. Such rules and regulations are important as they help workers to be focused on the core business of a given institution.

The existing literature indicates that there have been studies done on examination malpractices at university level (Onuka & Dorowaju, 2012; Yusuf, Olufunke, & Bamgbose; 2015) and other researchers carried out similar studies in secondary schools in Kenya (Mwonga, 2019; Owenga, Raburu, & Aloka, 2018) and Malawi (Makaula, 2018). The current study went further and identified specific ways in which university students in Mount Kenya region universities fail to adhere to examination regulatory frameworks and propose to stakeholders on the possible remedy. In addition, the current study compared levels of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks in public and private universities, which has not been studied as seen from existing literature. The study was thus unique in that similar study had not been done in the region of the current study, and adherence to examination malpractices had not been evaluated by comparing public and private universities. The outcomes of the study were important and became a source of reference for researchers in the area of education administration.

METHOD

The study was quantitative type because all procedures used were statistical. The study involved both public and private universities located in Mount Kenya region in Kenya. Two (2) private and three (3) public universities were selected purposively. Three hundred and eighty (380) students were chosen from the five universities using Kathuri and Pals' Sampling table. According to Kathuri and Pals (1999), when the population is 40,000 subjects and above, an appropriate sample size is 380 subjects.

The 380 students were proportionately distributed into five universities due to variation in populations unique to each university. The researcher was interested in the five universities due to the fact that they were upcoming and their structures and systems were not as stable as those in long established universities. The 380 students were divided proportionately among the 5 purposively selected universities, as follows: Chuka University, 179 students (47%); Karatina University, 87 students (23%); University of Embu, 61 students (16%); Kenya Methodist University, 30 students (8%); and Mount Kenya University, 23 students (6%) due to their variation in population sizes. Fourth year students were purposively selected cognizant of the fact that they had been to universities for long and would provide feedback effectively, unlike first, second- and third-year students who did not have long experiences at their universities. The researcher distributed questionnaires to students in 4 faculties proportional to their students' populations. Table 1 indicates summary data on sample size of the study in form of frequencies and percentages Table 1

shows that students who were sampled from the five universities were 179, 87, 61, 30 and 23 respectively,

making a total of 380. Students from public universities were 327 while those from private universities were 53 in total.

Table 1: Sample Size

Institution	Total number of students	Sample size	Percentage
Chuka University	16,603	179	47
Karatina University	9,105	87	23
University of Embu	6,603	61	16
Kenya Methodist University	4,107	30	8
Mount Kenya University	3,605	23	6
Total	40,023	380	100

Data was collected using the Students' Questionnaire (SQ) which was administered to sampled students. The questionnaire had ten statements which were rated using a likert scale with 5 points as follows; 1=strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3=undecided, 4=agree and 5=strongly agree. The questionnaire was constructed in reference to earlier studies which had been carried on similar topics.

The researcher conducted a pilot study on 38 students randomly selected from one university which was not earmarked for the study. The interpretation of questionnaire items by respondents was checked for similar understanding and the feasibility of items was modified accordingly. A reliability coefficient of the research instrument was 0.79 which was greater than the 0.7 recommended by Fraenkel, Wallen, and Hyun (1996). The validity of the questionnaire was checked by experts in the department of education. Data were analyzed by use of Descriptive Statistics by computation of means, percentages and standard deviations, and *t*-test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Universities' Adherence to Examination Regulatory Frameworks

Results were further discussed as guided by a five-level of Likert agreement scale in order to enhance the discussion and make rational inferences. The scale thus provided as follows:

1.00 – 1.99	significantly disagree
2.00 – 2.99	moderately disagree
3.00	Neutral
3.01 – 3.99	moderately agree
4.00 – 5.00	significantly agree

Results of data analysis of objective 1 are presented in table 2.

Table 2: Students' responses on adherence to regulatory framework

Statement	SD		D		UD		A		SA		\bar{X}	σ
	N	%	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%		
1. Examinations are conducted according to rules and regulations	67	20.0	105	31.3	17	5.1	68	20.3	78	23.3	2.96	1.50
2. There is no proper spacing of students in examination rooms	67	20.0	100	29.9	13	3.9	82	24.5	73	23.3	2.98	1.49
3. No lending or borrowing of materials is allowed	6	1.8	8	2.4	34	10.1	129	38.5	158	47.2	4.27	0.87
4. Writing is allowed on examination papers	74	22.1	121	36.1	23	6.9	74	22.1	43	12.8	2.67	1.37
5. Students sign attendance during examinations	15	4.5	9	2.7	36	10.7	145	43.3	130	38.8	4.09	1.00
6. Students submit scripts personally to invigilators and sign	7	2.1	20	6.0	33	9.9	140	41.8	135	40.3	4.12	0.96
7. Students are not allowed to move unless accompanied	82	24.5	72	21.5	55	16.4	61	18.2	65	19.4	2.87	1.46
8. Students are not allowed into exam room 15 minutes after start or end	32	9.6	35	10.4	108	32.2	91	27.2	69	20.6	3.39	1.99
9. There is effective identification of students before exams begin	82	24.5	105	31.3	51	15.2	53	15.8	44	13.1	2.62	1.35
10. No talking is allowed during examinations	15	4.5	18	5.4	63	18.3	116	34.6	123	36.7	3.94	1.08

The findings of the study on table 2 indicate that 51.3% of respondents disagreed to the statement that examinations are conducted according to rules and regulations. Those who affirmed were 43.6% and those who were undecided were 5.1%, at \bar{X} =2.96. This implies that students moderately disagreed that, university examinations were not done as per rules and regulations. On the statement 'There is no proper spacing of students in examination rooms' 49.9% of

respondents disagreed. Those who agreed were 47.8% while those who were undecided were 10.1% at \bar{X} =2.98. This shows that on average, there is lack of proper spacing in examination rooms, as shown by 47.8% of respondents which possibly leads to examination malpractice. It would be of help if the universities come up with standardized spacing for university examinations if examination malpractice has to be controlled. On lending and borrowing of materials in

examination rooms, 4.2% of respondents disagreed that there was no lending and borrowing while 10.1% indicated they were undecided and a majority of them (85.7%) indicated that borrowing and lending was not allowed at $\bar{X}=4.27$. This implies that students significantly agreed that there was no lending or borrowing of materials. The variable 'writing is allowed on examination papers, 58.2% of respondents disagreed that writing on examination papers was allowed, 6.9% of them were undecided whereas 34.9% were in agreement that writing was allowed at $\bar{X}=2.67$. This meant that students moderately disagreed that students write on examination scripts, to an extent of 34.9%.

The study revealed that students sign examination attendance sheets at 82.1% level of agreement, 7.2% level of disagreement, 10.7 of undecided, and 82.1% level of agreement at $\bar{X}=4.09$. This shows that in most universities, it is a requirement for students to sign attendance sheets. This is was done as a way of confirming those who have physically sat exams. The practice has helped in reduction of impersonation and complains of missing marks. Research revealed that students submit scripts personally to invigilators and sign. Those who affirmed that they do so were 82.1%, those who were of the contrary opinion were 8.1%, while those undecided were 9.9%, at $\bar{X}=4.12$ implying that they submitted and signed. The signing was a proof that the students who had signed did the examination. This practice was done to prevent impersonation whereby some students plan to payee impersonators to sit for examinations on behalf of the right examinees. On 'students are not allowed to move unless accompanied', 46% of respondents did not agree, 16.4% were undecided while 37.6% agreed that students are restricted in their movement at $\bar{X}=2.87$. This revealed that to a greater extent, (46%), students were allowed to move in examination rooms, which created loopholes for examination Malpractices.

Comparison between Public and Private Universities

It has been hypothesized that there was no statistically significant difference between public and private universities in levels of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks in Mount Kenya region. To test this hypothesis, the *t*-test was computed. In order to establish whether there existed a statistically significant difference in adherence to examination regulatory frameworks

University students had a habit of moving into examination rooms some fifteen minutes before start or end of examinations. This practice encourages students to write tiny notes on their seats, which they keenly referred to during examinations. The study revealed that students were not allowed to move to examination rooms 15 minutes to and after (20%) did not agree, 32.2% of respondents were undecided while 47.8% agreed that they were not allowed at $\bar{X}=3.39$. This indicated that those who were undecided were significantly a larger percentage because they concentrated on their examinations and did not observe the happenings in the room. The study showed that 55.8% of respondents denied that there was effective identification of students before they started examinations, those undecided were 15.2% while those who affirmed that there was effective identification of students were 28.9% at $\bar{X}=2.62$ meaning that students are not effectively identified. It can hence be inferred that there is dire need for universities to enhance identification of students. The study revealed that students were not allowed to talk in examination rooms as shown by 71.3% of respondents, 18.3% undecided and 9.9% said the talking was not allowed at $\bar{X}=3.94$. This means that students are controlled in examination rooms and they do not communicate to each other.

Learners need to take note that varied performances at examinations give them varied opportunities at work place. They need to appreciate their unique abilities because not all learners can perform the same. McCabe (2012) asserted that students who cheat in examinations lack principles and only depend on others for their posterity careers. This assertion is consistent with that of Uzochukwu (2018). He reported that culprits of examination malpractices devalue their personalities and proclaim that they cannot do in their careers without the input of others. Consequently, students should purpose to be honest in their academic endeavors.

between private and public universities, independent sample *t*-test was computed; thus; H01: There is no statistically significant difference between public and private universities in levels of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks in Mount Kenya region.

Table 3: Independent Sample *t*-test on Adherence to Regulatory Framework

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances				<i>t</i> -test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper	
Adherence to regulatory framework	Equal variances assumed	5.226	.023	.142	333	.887	.03626	.25545	-.46624	.53875
	Equal variances not assumed			.152	233.677	.880	.03626	.23923	-.43508	.50759

Analyzed data presented in Table 3 indicates that the *t*-test computed yield a *p*-value of 0.887 against the value α value of 0.05. Therefore, Ho1 (at $\alpha = .05$) was accepted, and it can

be concluded that the adherence to regulatory framework for private and public universities was largely the same, meaning there is no significant difference between public

and private universities in levels of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks in Mount Kenya region. Hence, the study supported the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between public and private universities in levels of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks in Mount Kenya region; hence, an inference that both public and private university students equally engage in examination malpractices and need similar redemptive measures if there is to be integrity in university assessment of students.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the study was to assess the extent to which universities in Mount Kenya region adhere to examination regulatory frameworks. In addition, the study aimed at comparing the levels of adherence to examination malpractices between public and private universities. Franklyn-Stokes & Newstead (2009) in a study in USA found out that cheating in university examinations occurred in every country. In another study, McCabe (2005) in USA reported that a majority of respondents had cheated during examinations. The study found out that to a significant extent, there was shortage of sufficient spacing in examination rooms during university examinations. Consequently, the study recommended that there was a need to increase spacing between students in examination rooms. The results were consistent with the study of Nnam and Inah (2015), who carried out a study on 250 final year students at Ebonyi State University in Nigeria and respondents agreed, at a mean of 3.9, that overcrowded examination rooms encouraged examination malpractices in universities. The finding was further corroborated by Onuka and Obialo (2004) who observed that overpopulation caused dishonesty in university examinations.

The findings also supported the views of Ruto, Cheruto and Kimutai (2011) who found out that lack of sufficient spacing was a major factor that escalated examination malpractices in universities and observed that culprits of malpractices should be subjected to stringent punishments. The findings also were consistent with those of Oyieko (2017) findings, which revealed that examination malpractices could be minimized by the provision of larger spaces in examination rooms. Oyieko (2017) studied 609 respondents and 70% of them affirmed that spacing in examination rooms was an important aspect in the management of examination malpractices in universities, while 71% proposed introduction of heavier punishments on culprits of cheating. The current study reported that university students did not adhere to the given regulatory frameworks, suggested enhanced observance of rules and regulations.

The finding was also consistent with that of Chaminuka and Ndudzo (2014) who found out from 55% of respondents that adherence to examination regulatory frameworks was necessary in curbing examination malpractices. The study showed that 55.8% of respondents denied that there was effective identification of students as they entered examination rooms. Every semester in all universities, students register for courses by payment of fees. It is expected that those who are registered are the only persons eligible to do examinations. Identification of students as they enter examination rooms should be observed keenly by university examination offices; otherwise, there could room

for impersonation and other forms of examination malpractices. The suggestion is consistent with that of Joktham (2013) assertion that the menace of examination malpractice could be curbed effectively by examination officers ensuring that only officially registered students sat for examinations, which is possible when students are identified as they enter examination rooms.

In support of the view, Chikweru and Opuiyo (2018) reported that examination malpractice could be mitigated by ensuring that only students who had registered for a particular course were permitted to sit for the given examination. Consistent with this view, Nneku and Eluwa (2016) found out that the presentation of identity cards as they entered examination rooms was a useful strategy in curbing examination malpractices in universities. Respondents had a mean of 3.33 and SD of 0.41, which, according to the scale of interpretation, showed that the strategy was accepted to be effective. Generally, the supervision of students in examination rooms is satisfactorily done by examination invigilators and they need to keep up the good work done for accountability in university examination processes. If this was done, then the three will be no threat to the accountability and legitimacy of education systems of the world as cautioned by Makaula (2018) in Zambia. In order to curb examination irregularities in global education institutions, a study done in the USA by Eckstein (2003) found out that it was important for all stakeholders in the education sector to follow examination regulatory frameworks which guide the process and administration of examinations.

Both public and private universities had largely similar levels of adherence to examination regulatory frameworks, hence the need for both types of universities to use similar strategies of mitigating examination malpractices. Hence both public and private university students equally engaged in examination malpractices and needed similar redemptive measures if there is to be integrity in university assessment of students. The findings were in agreement with the study of Ahmed (2018), who researched 111 students at Private Middle Eastern University in United Arab Emirates and found that there was lack of adherence by students to examination regulatory frameworks; therefore, both public and private universities equally did not adhere to examination regulatory frameworks. This implies that examination dishonesty exists in both private and public universities, as reported by earlier research by Ruto et al. (2011) at the University of Nairobi and Kenyatta University in Kenya. There is therefore a need for public and private universities to be innovative and find ways of dealing with the problem.

CONCLUSIONS

A number of universities did not conduct examinations as per rules and regulations which had been put in place by institutions. Another inference drawn was that there was a challenge of spacing students in examination rooms due to lack of sufficient spaces in those rooms. The study, in addition, concluded that students wrote on examination materials during examinations. University students signed examination attendance during examinations. Apart from observations made, the study concluded that students were not identified effectively during examinations and invigilators controlled the communication of students in examination rooms. In addition, the study inferred that both public and

private university students equally engaged in examination malpractices, consequently, both university categories needed redemptive attention. The following are the possible implications for the field of educational administration and education fraternity in general. First, university leaderships should enhance their policies to ensure students and lecturers adhere to laid down examination rules and regulations. Second, university leadership should ensure that students are spaced properly during examinations in order to enhance the credibility of university examinations.

Acknowledgment

I am grateful to my supervisors, Dr. Johannes Njoka and Dr. Maurice Kimosop of Karatina University, for guidance during the research process and to the conclusion of this study. Above all, I am indeed thankful to God almighty for wisdom and understanding accorded to me in this noble task.

References

- Adegoke, B. (2010). *Survey of examination malpractice among secondary school students: Causes, effects and solutions*. Retrieved from <http://www.grin.com>.
- Adelakum, A. A., & Lawal, D. A. (2008). Examination malpractice: A major challenge to public examinations in Nigeria, (The WAE experience). A paper presented at 26th AEEA Annual Conference, Accra, Ghana.
- Ahmed, K. (2018). Students' perceptions of academic dishonesty in private Middle Eastern university. *High Learning Resource Communication*, 8(1) 16-29. <https://doi.org/10.18870/hlrc.v8i1.400>
- Akaranga, S. L & Ogong, J. J. (2013). The phenomenon of examination malpractice: An example of Nairobi and Kenyatta Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 4(18), 87-96.
- Alutu, A. N. G., & Aluede, O. (2006). Secondary school students' perception of examination malpractices and examination ethics. *Journal of Humanities Ecology, India: Kamar-Rai Enterprises*, 20(4), 295-300. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09709274.2006.11905942>
- Ambrose, M. L., Arnaud, A., & Schminke, M. (2007). Individual moral development and ethical climate: The influence of person-organization fit on job attitudes. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 77, 323-333. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-007-9352-1>
- Anzene, S. (2014). Trends in examination malpractices in Nigerian education system and its effects on socio-economic and political development of Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 1-8.
- Aulo, P. A. (2004). An investigation into factors contributing to examination irregularities in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education in Nairobi Province. (Unpublished thesis). University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Badmus, G. A. (2006). Accountability in teaching/learning environment and examination malpractice. 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, Center, Abuja, August 15-16.
- Boakye, J. (2015). Examination Malpractices and Solutions. Retrieved from: www.ghanaweb.com.
- Chaminuka, L., & Ndudzo, D. (2014). Students and staff perceptions on examination malpractice and fraud in higher education in Zimbabwe. *Asian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 78-90.
- Chikweru, E. M., & Opuiyo, A. R. (2018). Examination malpractice among Nigerian university students: A review. *International Journal of Innovative Legal & Political Studies*, 6(1) 13-17.
- Diego, L. A. B., (2017). Friends with benefits: Causes and effects of learners' cheating practices during examination. *IAFOR Journal of Education*, 5(2), 121-138. <https://doi.org/10.22492/ije.5.2.06>
- Eckstein, M.A. (2003). *Combating academic fraud towards a culture of integrity*. Paris, France: International Institution for educational planning.
- Edukukho, E. (2007, Feb). Why government blacklisted 324 schools. *Vanguard*, p. 38.
- Flutter, J., & Rudduck, J. (2004). *Consulting pupils: What's in it for schools?* London, UK: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203464380>
- Fraenkel, J. R., Wallen, N. E., & Hyun, H. H. (2012). *How to design and evaluate research in education* (8th ed.). New York, US: McGraw Hill.
- Franklyn-Stokes, A., & Newstead, S. E. (2009). Examination malpractices and university students. *International Journal of Education*, 27(2), 213-227.
- Government of Kenya (2005). Kenya National Examinations Council. Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2010). The Constitution of Kenya-Nairobi: Government Printer.
- Government of Kenya. (2012) Nairobi: KNEC Examination Rules and Regulations: Government Printer.
- Joktham, E. T. (2013). Curbing examination malpractice in schools: participative advocacy. *Journal of Research in National Development*, 11(2), 125-131.
- Kathuri, N. J., & Pals, D. A. (1999). *Introduction to education research: Kenya education media centre*. Egerton, Kenya: Egerton University Press.
- Kithuka, M. (2004). Educational management and evaluation, Egerton: Egerton University Press Assessment to Improve Classroom Teaching. Retrieved 18/10/2015 from <http://www.col.org/stamp/module13.pdf> Times Newspaper.
- Khan, I., Khan, M. J., & Khan, J. (2012). Teachers perception regarding malpractices examinations in urban areas of District Peshwar. University of Peshwar, Pakistan: Munich Personal RePEc Archive.
- McCabe, D. L., Trevino, L. K. & Butterfield, K. D. (2012). *Cheating in college: Why students do it and what educators can do about it*. Baltimore, USA: John Hopkins University Press.

- McCabe, D. L. (2005). It takes a village: Academic dishonesty and educational opportunity. *Liberal Education*, 91(2), 26-31.
- Makaula, F. B. (2018). Perceived causes and methods of examination malpractice in the Malawian education in selected secondary schools in Kitwe District, Zambia. Presented at the Annual Graduate Symposium of University of Northern Iowa.
- Mount Kenya University. (2014). Mount Kenya University Student Handbook. Retrieved from www.mku.ac.ke.
- Moi University (2009). Common Rules and Regulations for Undergraduate Examinations (Revised).
- Monday, T. J. (2008). Examination malpractice: The monster in our midst. A paper presented at Capacity Building Workshops for Science and English Language teachers in Akwalborn State, Nigeria.
- Mwanyumba, D. & Mutwiri, J. (2009). Challenges associated with implementation of control mechanisms in public examinations and how the Kenya National Examinations Council (KNEC) has handled some of these challenges. Presented at the 27th annual conference of the association for Educational assessment in Africa (AEAA).
- Mwonga, C. M. (2019). Stakeholders perception of control of measurers on attainment of sustainable credible examinations in secondary schools in Makumi County, Kenya. (Unpublished Thesis), Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.
- Nnam, M., & Inah, A. (2015). Empirical investigation into the causes, forms and consequences of examination malpractices in Nigerian institutions of higher learning. *International Journal of Novel Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 52-62.
- Nneku, A. D., & Eluwa B. O. (2016). Assessment of effective management strategies for curbing examination malpractices in secondary schools in Nigeria. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 2(11), 47-70.
- Peters, J. S. & Okon, M. O. (2014). Students' perceptions of the causes and effects of examination malpractice in Nigerian educational system: The way forward for quality education. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5(114), 125-129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.671>
- Onah, F. E. (2013). Forms and causes of examination malpractices in Nigerian universities. *Journal of Educational Review*, 6(3), 396-401.
- Onuka, A. U., & Dorowaju, E. (2012). Stakeholders' role in curbing examination malpractices in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economy Management and Social Sciences*, 2(6), 342-348.
- Onuka, A. O., & Obialo F. O. (2004). The causes and effects of examination malpractices. In Efemikhe, O. A. & Adewale, J. G. (eds.) *Measurement and evaluation papers in Honor of Professor Wole Falayajo.Ibadan*. Institute of Education, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
- Owenga, O., Raburu, A. P., & Aloka, J. O. (2018). Relationship between selected school determinants and examination cheating tendencies among kenyan secondary school students. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 9(3), 243-252. <https://doi.org/10.2478/mjss-2018-0066>
- Oyieko, J. (2017). Examination rules and regulations and examination malpractices in secondary schools (students' perceptions): A case study of schools in Bondo, Kenya. (Unpublished Project Report), University of Nairobi, Kenya.
- Ragaa, R. (2001, February). Irregularities detected in 100 Centers. *Kenya Times*, p.10.
- Ruto, D., Cheruto, L., & Kimutai, D. (2011). Student factor influencing cheating in undergraduate examinations in universities in Kenya. *Problems of Management in the 21st Century*, 2, 1, 181.
- Suleman, Q., Gail, R., & Kamran, K. (2015). Factors contributing to examination malpractices at secondary school level in Kohat Division, Pakistan. *Journal of Education and Learning* 9(2) 165-183. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v9i2.1732>
- UOE. (2014). Policy guidelines, rules and regulations governing admission and examination certificates, diploma programs. Retrieved from www.uoe.ac.ke.
- Uzochukwu, M. (2015). Examination malpractice and causes. Retrieved from <http://uzochukwumike,hubpages.com>.
- Yusuf, F. A., Olufunke, Y. R., & Ruth, B. O. (2015). Factors responsible for examination malpractices as expressed by undergraduates of Osun State University Nigeria. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(33), 75- 80.