

# Managing Dishonesty in Students' Admission Process: Implications for Access to Higher Education in Nigeria

Okpa, Ovat Egbe<sup>1</sup> Alade, Feyisayo Omotunde<sup>2</sup>  
Odigwe, Francisca Nonyelum<sup>3</sup> Sule, Mary Anike<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1,3,4</sup>*Department of Educational Management, University of Calabar, Calabar, Nigeria*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Catering and Food Services, Babcock University,  
Ileshan - Remo, Ogun State, Nigeria*

## Abstract

The purpose of the study was to investigate the forms of dishonesty in students' admission process in Universities and how it is managed. The population of the study comprised 110 heads of department and 15 programme managers. A sample of 75 academic heads of department and programme managers from two public universities in Nigeria was used. The descriptive survey research design was adopted. Four research questions guided the study. A questionnaire tagged 'Management of Dishonesty in Students' Admission Questionnaire (MDSAQ) was developed, face validated by experts and used for data collection. Cronbach Alpha method of reliability was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. The reliability value stood at  $r = 0.86$ . Data were analyzed using mean scores and standard deviation with a criterion mean of 2.50. The findings show that dishonest practices such as bribery, nepotism, racketeering, grade malpractice, distortion of application criteria, falsification of data, are prevalent in the students' admission process. The contributory factors among others include poor design of examination, low carrying capacity, high propensity for corruption, laxity in punishing offenders. Suggested strategies for curbing the menace include adequate supervision, ethical re-orientation of all those involved in students' admission process. It was therefore recommended among others that the management of universities should ensure constant and strict monitoring of the admission process.

Keywords: Dishonesty; Student admission; Access; Higher education; University

## 1. Introduction

Nigeria has the largest higher education system in Africa yet access to university education is still being criticized. This is especially true in view of the rapidly mounting demand for education, fueled by population growth, rising income levels and social mobility. The number of people who seek university qualification has grown enormously. Having a university education is a valuable commodity and choosing a university is one of the most important decisions for students. After all, being awarded a degree is a lifelong achievement and having it from a reputable school confers a non-physical advantage that will directly affect one's workplace competitiveness (Okpa, Okoi, Igbineweka & Udida, 2017). It can affect salary, job security and has power to influence society. The overall benefits of university education are strong. The National Policy on Education (FRN, 2004) emphasized the need for provision of equal access to educational opportunities for all citizens of

the country at tertiary and other levels both inside and outside the formal school system. Equity of access to university education requires that admissions be open to those who successfully complete secondary school, or its equivalent, or present entry qualifications without any discrimination. But the problem of access in the country is currently so severe that sometimes less than one third of the applicants gain access to university. Yearly, out of the huge number of Nigerian youths who apply for admission into universities, only a small percentage is given admission. For instance, only about 30 per cent out of the 1.7 million candidates who wrote the Unified Tertiary Matriculation Examination (UTME) were admitted in 2017 (Lawal, 2017).

Students' admissions refer to the process of applying for entrance to institutions of higher education for undergraduate study at one of the nation's colleges or universities. It is a formal process of accepting students into the school or a programme of choice having met the prescribed requirements. University admission is the legitimate gateway through which qualified citizens get enrolled for university education in Nigeria (National University Commission, 2012). The qualified prospective students are usually selected, screened and placed by Joint Admissions and Matriculation Board (JAMB) which is the coordinating body for undergraduate programmes. Admissions into the universities vary according to the programme of study, and this includes admission into the remedial programmes and part-time and full-time programmes for both undergraduate and postgraduate students. The admissions process serves as a gateway to higher education opportunities and future career options and often places young adults at the beginning of a unique pathway that will lead them to a promising future. The importance of transparency and fairness in admissions processes cannot be over-emphasized.

The guidelines for admission to the Nigerian universities (federal, state, and private) are based on the quota system: 45% merit, 35% catchment/locality, and 20% educationally disadvantaged states and 10% to the discretion of the individual vice-chancellor (Odigwe & Tefa, 2016). The merit-based 45% admission guideline gives priority to candidates who score higher than the cut-off marks (required points) on each matriculation examination. These applicants are given first consideration for their first choice of course and institution. The quota system of university admission was introduced in an attempt to provide admission for candidates using the federal character policy of the federal government. Unfortunately, this has been greatly abused.

Access to university education has become very competitive with marginal possibilities. The screening of candidates takes various forms and poses multiple hurdles before intending candidates could secure admission into the university system (Ilusanya, 2012). The hurdles require the students to first pass the senior secondary school certificate examination, second, pass the Joint Admission and Matriculation Board Examination and thirdly, passing the university of choice "screening tests"(Post-UTME). The Unified Tertiary Matriculation Examination (UTME) scores (set at national cut-off point) form the basis for admission into universities. Candidates attaining this score or higher are eligible for admission into undergraduate programmes. Beyond the minimum cut-off point universities are at liberty to set cut-off marks for specific programmes and conduct post-UTME. The quality of candidates admitted is based on the thoroughness of the conduct of the UTME and post-UTME. Unfortunately the chances of being admitted are further reduced due to logistics such as lack of examination numbers or/and centers, and distance to examination venues.

In spite of government attempt to provide equitable access to limited places by prescribing admission quotas to federal institutions and the massive expansion and development of universities through setting up of more federal and state universities as well as granting of licenses to private individuals to establish universities, which has brought a total of about 156 universities as at the last count, many young people are still unable to gain admission into these institutions. This indicates that the problem of access and equality of educational

opportunity still persist. While the demand for access to university education continues to increase, the most disturbing is the fact that the number of those who fail to secure admission increase yearly and the institutions lack capacity to absorb the number of students seeking admission yearly (Kanyip, 2013). The combination of underfunding and limited access to education becomes a fertile ground for petty corruption in admissions, as it creates asymmetrical dependencies between underpaid staff and students with limited options (Uduak and Ovat, 2018). *Osewa (2018) and Oloko & Edem (2016)* stated that the problem of gaining admission into a university is also aggravated by poor infrastructure and limited carrying capacity. An average university in Nigeria has the capability of admitting just 4000 students per session. If every university in Nigeria is properly upgraded to admit at least 10000 students per session problems of admission would drastically reduce. Other reasons include bad leadership, bribery and corruption, University politics and bad secondary schools amongst others. The inability of the universities to accommodate the teeming population of students seeking for tertiary education has led to large number of students pursuing tertiary education abroad.

Competition for admission to limited spaces have led to unintended and dishonest practices such as cheating in examination, bribery for admission, manipulation of examination scores, and denial of admission (Moja, 2000). Limited access has contributed to nepotism in favour of less qualified candidates and the use of personal connections to gain coveted places at universities, with some admissions officials reportedly working with agents to obtain bribes from students. There are indications that prospective students are able to purchase not only their university admission, but also passing grades. Parents of university applicants simply bribe the admissions body before the entrance examinations. Those who have no ability or willingness to resort to corruption face lost opportunities. Some of the most competent students who have great potential are denied admission because of geographical constraints, discretion, or over-emphasis on science majors as opposed to the arts. While those who should have been denied access, gain admission into universities, thus contributing to the decline in quality and growing mediocrity. This situation has a grave effect on the students and parents who have to face many challenges in seeking admission.

The suspicion of a double standard and a shadow admissions process that favors well-connected students and caters for applicants who are supported by public officials, University council members, and other prominent individuals in students' admission process is not new among Nigerian universities. Akerele (2008) reported that admission officials also get pressure from ministers or other top government officials to increase enrolment and sometimes work with student agents to demand cash for admissions. The cash is collected by other students who linger near admissions offices, telling hopefuls they can guarantee admission for a price (Murdock, 2012).

Gaining admission into the university is increasingly seen as a private benefit to individuals rather than as public benefit to the society. According to Wong (2016) the rankings of universities and colleges have helped to shape a world in which students are seen as consumers, and colleges and universities as commodities. The rankings are a key reason the higher-education landscape today operates like a marketplace in which institutions compete to convince the best students to buy their product. Universities that saw their revenues sinking have taken to desperate new promotional techniques to enroll enough students to balance their budgets. Others are turning to the business world for the techniques to keep themselves among the survivors of the academic squeeze to come. The proliferation of universities on the other hand has added a dead weight to the admission process thus lowering the standards and quality of the process through the recruitment of all sorts of characters with questionable higher degrees. Our universities have become associated with "sharp practices" perpetrated by unscrupulous students and unconscionable lecturers alike (Adedimiji, 2015). In some instances, being a son

of the soil or indigeneship is ranked higher than merit. Okolo (as cited in Joachim, Ene, & Victoria (2016) captured a sordid picture of what thrives in Nigerian universities during admissions thus:

“ . . . Universities suffered from arbitrary governance . . . Rather than being a place which justice and truth are to be nurtured; the universities triumphed on mediocrity and untruths. Promotion was earned through sycophancy and the admission procedure became systematically bastardized as wives, children and cronies of vice chancellors had their own admission quota without reference to the established procedure. University governance became unpredictable and university finances in shamble.”(p.3)

Joachim, Ene, and Victoria (2016) maintained that the conduct of students' admission procedure seems to be devoid of equity, as meritorious students are denied admissions; their grades are manipulated in favor of other students because of their background. Stakeholders of university education have expressed deep dissatisfaction on the conduct of admissions in universities. They alleged that admission procedure in these universities is unconventional, unethical, and unfavorable to meritorious candidates. Rules and regulations are compromised and certain mischievous behaviors seem to be condoned.

Lack of transparency, poor design of the examinations, the subjects' tolerance of corruption, high levels of corruption propensity, and high income expectations in future careers are identified as the main causes of corruption. Corruption in the examinations lowers student trust in the accountability of faculty and staff in higher educational institutions and this degrading trust in turn exacerbates bribery among new generations of examinees, which results in a vicious cycle of corruption. The prevalence of wide-scale dishonesty in students' admission increases the costs of education, thereby limiting access among lower income students. Corruption in students' admission processes deteriorates educational quality and increases the risk of unqualified practitioners in professions with critical public impact, such as medicine, nursing, education, architecture, or law. Duruji, Segun, Olarenwaju, Oviasogie, Ajayi, and Loromeke (2013) maintained that *the down-grading of merit as a basis for admission through racketeering has resulted in loss of faith in merit, fair play and justice, mediocrity and economic power take precedence over academic standards*. Lack of available university seats or merit-based admission increases the income gap between the rich and the poor, exacerbating security issues that threaten to destabilize the country (Murdock, 2012).

Kanyip (2013) pointed out that following the unethical practices inherent in the admission process in most Nigerian universities, some of the universities and departments are increasingly losing their credibility, integrity, and honor. This is largely due to a decline in the cherished values of objectivity, fairness, service to humanity, productivity, and search for the truth at all costs. The perpetuation of different dishonest practices have made most of candidates seeking admission to be discouraged, lose confidence in the entire system, changed their minds and decided to go into different fields of life. Some who gain admission through dubious means (personal connections and money), are unable to successfully complete university education. This situation consequently affects the quality of products and outputs in these institutions. According to Lawal (2017) the purpose of introducing the Post-UME screening policy is far from being achieved as successful candidates still turned out ill-equipped for university education. While that policy was aimed at addressing the problem of student quality, it reintroduced and entrenched many of the problems it sought to eliminate. It is also evident that the post-UME is an avenue of extortion and maximizing the income flows of universities. A fair and transparent admissions system is essential for all applicants. It is against this backdrop that this study investigated dishonesty in students' admission process in universities in Nigeria.

## 2. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to:

1. Find out the forms of dishonesty in students' admission process.
2. Investigate the factors aiding dishonesty in students' admission process.
3. Determine the consequences of dishonesty in students' admission process.
4. Suggest strategies to be adopted in curbing the menace of dishonesty in students' admission process.

## 3. Problem of the Study

Public universities are supposed to adopt the best practices of governance and follow a transparent process of admission, offering equal access into higher education to students from all categories based on merit and other agreed criteria. But in recent times, some stakeholders have raised a number of grievances with respect to the commercialization or racketeering of admission process. They have expressed deep dissatisfaction on the conduct of admissions and alleged that admission procedure is unconventional, unethical, and unfavorable to meritorious candidates. Rules and regulations are compromised and certain mischievous behaviours seem to be condoned. There are indications that explosive detail of illegalities and irregularities are committed under the leadership of those in charge of the process. Admission Officers arbitrarily change the quota criteria to prepare merit list of admission in the middle of the admission process. Also, at departmental level those in charge of admission use their arbitrary power and randomly select students/candidates with minimum eligibility or minimum qualifying marks for admission. This dishonest practice is attracting grievance complaints from students and other stakeholders. It is in the light of these discrepancies that the study was conceptualized to investigate the forms of dishonesty in students' admission process and its implication for access to higher education.

## 4. Research Questions

1. What are the forms of dishonesty in students' admission process?
2. What factors are aiding dishonesty in students' admission process?
3. What are the consequences of dishonesty in students' admission process?
4. What strategies can be adopted in curbing the menace dishonesty in students' admission process?

## 5. Method

The design adopted for study was descriptive survey involving two universities located in Cross River State- University of Calabar and Cross River University of Technology. The target population was all 110 heads of department and 15 programme managers. 60 academic head of departments (HODs) and 15 programme managers were used as respondents. Out of this number, 50 HODs and 10 programme managers were selected from University of Calabar, while 10 HODs and 5 programme managers were taken from Cross River University of Technology. The research instrument was the researchers' constructed questionnaire titled 'Management of Dishonesty in Students' Admission Questionnaire (MDSAQ)'. The instrument contained two sections. Section A sought demographic information. Section B contained four open ended items. Item 1 sought information on the forms of dishonesty in admission process. Item 2 inquired into the factors aiding the increase in admission dishonesty, item 3 sought for information on the consequences of dishonesty in students' admission process, while item 4 sought for strategies for curbing dishonesty in student admission. The research

instrument was adjudged suitable for the study through face validation by three academic staff in the area of measurement and evaluation. Data obtained were analyzed using Cronbach alpha which had a coefficient of 0.86. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer the research questions. In analyzing the data, the response options in the questionnaire were weighted as follows: strongly agree (SD) = 4 Points, agree (A) = 3points, disagree (D) = 2points, and strongly disagree (SD) = 1. The mean score was compared with the criterion mean value of 2.50. Any score that was above 2.50 was accepted, while mean less than 2.50 was rejected.

## 6. Results

### 6.1. Research question 1: What are the forms of dishonesty in students' admission process?

**Table 1:** Mean responses of respondents on the forms of dishonesty in students' admission process. N=75

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	$\bar{x}$	SD	DECISION
1	Admission racketeering	32	12	10	20	3.02	0.89	Agree
2	Applicants being given false hope or promised admission on the spot	28	31	8	8	3.00	0.79	Agree
3	Applicants not eligible for admissions are unduly charged a variety of fees	30	10	20	17	3.05	0.87	Agree
4	Applicants use fake documents or credentials to gain admission,	16	41	8	10	3.05	0.90	Agree
5	Indiscriminate recruitment of students as a means of chasing money	27	39	6	5	3.09	0.94	Agree
6	Applicants being charged by corrupt recruiters & agents for the falsification of documents that will qualify them for admission	12	41	4	18	3.01	0.78	Agree
7	Bribery of admission officers	34	17	14	10	3.06	0.81	Agree
8	Falsification of data files and result sheets(admission test scores or the ranking of students in the admission list being illegally changed)	33	30	8	4	3.17	0.97	Agree
9	Distortion in the application criteria	28	17	11	19	3.27	0.95	Agree
10	Grading malpractice (Collusion between the candidate and the grader, intimidation of graders by parents or intimidation of parents by graders seeking rewards from candidates parents)	17	33	15	10	3.66	0.66	Agree
11	poor design of the examinations	40	10	21	4	3.00	0.77	Agree
12	Sale of seats to students whose test scores do not qualify them for a position (at times through abiding process if the number of seats is limited)	16	48	1	10	3.11	0.95	Agree
	<b>Grand mean</b>					<b>3.12</b>		

Table 1 contains twelve (12) items showing the forms of dishonesty in students' admission. It can be observed that all the items were highly rated by the respondents. With the aggregate mean of 3.12, it shows that respondents are of the opinion that the items identified constitute forms of dishonesty in students' admission process in universities.

### 6.2 Research Question 2: What are the Factors Aiding Dishonesty in Students' Admission Process?

**Table 2:** Factors aiding dishonesty in students' admission in universities N=75

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	x	SD	DECISION
13	Pressure from students/parents for admission to best universities and to professional programmes	20	20	15	20	2.52	0.78	Agree
14	A university degree now a prerequisite for most white-collar jobs	33	14	20	10	3.57	0.89	Agree
15	high income expectations in future careers	18	39	16	4	3.00	0.76	Agree
16	high levels of corruption propensity,	6	37	16	16	3.12	0.68	Agree
17	Difficult socio-economic conditions	40	11	10	14	3.66	0.69	Agree
18	Limited public funding for education	20	2	21	32	2.39	0.79	Disagree
19	Low carrying capacity(lack of infrastructure)	19	41	5	10	3.01	0.77	Agree
20	Greed for money	20	28	12	15	3.15	0.97	Agree
21	Lack of discipline/poor moral integrity	40	15	10	10	3.00	0.77	Agree
22	Entice by students to offer money/sex	22	29	14	4	3.25	0.95	Agree
23	Poor supervision of the admission process	18	38	17	2	2.97	0.79	Agree
24	Use of faulty procedure in student admission	32	15	18	10	2.68	0.83	Agree
25	Laxity in punishing culprits	33	22	9	11	3.12	0.96	Agree
	<b>Grand mean</b>					<b>3.03</b>		

Data in table 2 showed that mean scores of responses of respondents on the factors aiding dishonesty in students admission in universities in Cross River State. From the data presented above, it can be observed all the items were highly rated by the respondents and had a mean score above the criterion mean of 2.50 except item 18 with mean scores lower than the criterion mean. With the aggregate mean of 3.03, it indicates that respondents are of the opinion that all the factors identified aid dishonesty in students' admission process.

### 6.3. Research 3: What are the Consequences of Dishonesty in Students' Admission Process?

**Table 3:** Consequences of dishonesty in students' admission N=75

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	x	SD	DECISION
26	Wasting of resources	22	33	8	12	3.08	0.83	Agree
27	Distortion of selection process	40	12	21	2	3.00	0.77	Agree
28	Overall devaluation of degrees	29	31	11	4	3.65	0.66	Agree
29	Under qualified professionals	23	25	20	7	3.22	0.95	Agree
30	Poor quality of students	33	30	4	8	3.58	0.89	Agree
31	Increase cost of education	32	23	10	10	3.00	0.77	Agree
32	Vicious cycle of corruption	28	32	9	6	3.66	0.67	Agree
	<b>Grand mean</b>					<b>3.31</b>		

Data in table 3 showed the mean scores of responses of respondents on consequences of dishonesty in students' admission in universities. From the data presented above, it can be observed all the items were highly rated by the respondents and had a mean score above the criterion mean of 2.50. With the aggregate mean of 3.31, it indicates that respondents are of the opinion that all the factors identified aid dishonesty in students' admission process.

### 6.4 Research question 4: What Strategies can be Adopted in Curbing the Menace Dishonesty in Students' Admission Process?

**Table 4:** Suggested strategies for curbing dishonesty in students' admission in universities N=75

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	x	SD	DECISION
33	Ethical values re-orientation through seminars and workshops	41	10	10	14	3.17	0.97	Agree
34	Proper supervision and monitoring of admission process	20	2	21	32	3.06	0.81	Agree
35	Appropriate sanctioning of guilty admission officers	19	41	4	11	3.07	0.92	Agree
36	Feedback mechanism put in place for reporting erring staff	28	20	12	15	3.66	0.66	Agree
37	Review of admission criteria to be more comprehensive	40	15	15	5	2.89	0.88	Agree
38	Adopting and following proper procedure for student admission	22	29	14	4	3.11	0.95	Agree
39	Employing qualified staff to handle admission process	19	38	16	2	2.58	0.71	Agree
	<b>Grand mean</b>					<b>3.08</b>		

Table 4 showed that mean scores of responses of respondents on suggested strategies to the menace of dishonesty in students admission process in universities. From the data presented above, it can be observed all the items were highly rated by the respondents and had a mean score above the criterion mean of 2.50. With the aggregate mean of 3.08, it indicates that respondents are of the opinion that all the factors identified aid dishonesty in students' admission process.

## 7. Discussion of Findings

To ascertain the forms of dishonesty in students' admission questionnaire items 1-12 were analyzed. From the data presented above, it can be observed all the items were highly rated by the respondents. With the aggregate mean of 3.12, it indicates that respondents identified with the items raised as forms of dishonesty in students' admission prevalent in universities. A close examination indicates that the issues related to bribery, falsification of data, poor design and administration of qualifying examination. Apparently some scrupulous admission officers in order to make illegal gains have employed agents to collect money on their behalf. This agrees with the views of Adedimiji, (2015) and Joachim, Ene, and Victoria (2016) that our universities have become associated with "sharp practices" perpetrated by unscrupulous staff and students and that the admission procedure has become systematically bastardized as wives, children and cronies of vice chancellors had their own admission quota without reference to the established procedure.

For research question two, the result revealed that mean scores of responses of respondents on the factors aiding dishonesty in students' admission in tertiary universities were highly rated and above the criterion mean of 2.50 except item 18 with mean scores lower than the criterion mean. With the aggregate mean of 3.03, it implies that the items are significantly related to factors aiding dishonesty in students' admission process. This agrees with *Osewa (2018) and Oloko and Edem (2016)* stated that the problem of gaining admission into a university is aggravated by poor infrastructure, limited absorptive capacity bad leadership, bribery and corruption, University politics and bad secondary schools.

The result of finding for research question three as observed from the data presented in table 3, shows that all the items were highly rated by the respondents and had mean scores above the criterion mean of 2.50. With the aggregate mean of 3.31, it indicates that respondents are of the opinion that dishonesty in students' admission has severe consequences on the university. This finding agrees with Duruji, Segun, Olarenwaju, Oviasogie, Ajayi, & Loromeke (2013) that *down-grading of merit as a basis for admission through racketeering has resulted in loss of faith in merit, fair play and justice, mediocrity and preference of economic power over academic standards*. Lawal (2017) harped that the Post-UME screening by universities after JAMB results and before offering admission is still turning out ill-equipped candidates for university education. It has failed in addressing the problem of student quality, instead it is festering an avenue of extortion. *Also*, it corroborates with Kanyip (2013) findings that the unethical practices inherent in the admission process has made universities and departments to increasingly lose their credibility, integrity, and honor. There is also decline in the cherished values of objectivity, fairness, service to humanity, productivity and quality of University education.

The analysis on table 4 shows result of finding of research question four on viable suggestions for curbing the menace of dishonesty in students' admissions. It agrees with Kukogho (2015) suggestion that the fight against corruption in our universities must be done by creating and fostering attitudinal change, reorientation of values. The suggestion of ethical re-orientation is apt in view of high ethical standard is expected of the university managers given the crucial role university play in molding of youth and overall societal development. Equally, the university management should review admission criteria and ensure that qualified staff are put in place to handle the admission process. All other suggestions require departments, faculties and other management levels to take appropriate action in enhancing the quality of admission process. The need to properly supervise the admission process and prescribe appropriate sanctions for guilty officers has been



identified by respondents as necessary if universities are to make headway in reducing the prevalence of dishonesty in students' admission process.

## 8. Implication for Access

The risks of corruption can be found at every level of the education system and the measures taken to prevent it are geared towards enhancing quality, efficiency of the system and access to education. Concerned observers of public university situation in Nigeria insist that public universities are not only poorly funded, they are confronted by moral and social decay that demands a total overhaul of the system. Dishonesty in students' admission is a major challenge to expanding and ensuring equitable access to university education. It is obvious that universities have lost their good glorious prestige of strict admission process (Okecha, 2014). The beauty, the splendor and enduring legacy usually associated with the university globally, are no more in our system. The menace in the admission process leaves thousands of prospective students in anguish, hardship, spending more years at home before gaining entry into higher institutions.

Bribery, nepotism and falsification of data in the process of recruiting students bring unqualified students deficient in moral probity into classrooms. This portends danger and has adverse implications for educational quality and learning outcomes. It does not only distort access to higher education but also affects the quality of education, quality of the products of the system and the reliability of academic research findings. To foster and ensure the integrity of the admission process, universities must employ best practices. Recruitment and admissions policies should be disclosed to the public and should be consistent with stated university goals to garner public trust.

## 9. Conclusion

Managing students' admission process remains a challenging task for all universities. It requires sensitivity to the varied needs and requirements of the students seeking university admission. The findings of the study have indicated that dishonesty in students' admission has huge negative impact on access to university education. Curbing the menace of dishonesty in students' admission should be the concern of all stakeholders at all levels of the education sector. The study has provided some insight into the manifestation of dishonesty in students' admissions process and the factors aiding its prevalence. It has equally highlighted some the consequences of dishonesty and suggested strategies for curbing dishonesty. The management of universities should therefore strive to employ best practices, trained its staff, install effective supervision and monitoring process that aligns with the goals and objectives of the school. It is important that everyone should have confidence in the transparency and integrity of the admission process.

## 10. Recommendations

Based on the finding the following recommendations were made:

1. University management should make deliberate effort to train Admission officers to equip them with practical skills on how to manage the admission process.
2. The management of universities should ensure constant and strict monitoring of the admission process
3. Educational managers must address the severe need to increase absorptive capacity of the institutions by expanding considerably some of the existing facilities to accommodate the rising number of applicants.
4. The management of universities should regularly organize submit on corruption and immorality on the university system to enable its members and other stakeholders to consciously map out relevant strategies to halt the plunging of the system into further immoral stench.
5. There should be appropriate sanctions for erring staff who engage in dishonest and image-tarnishing practices.

6. Universities should voluntarily and proactively disclosed basic information under a transparent admission process. They should uploaded omnibus list of candidates who participated in the written test and interview and marks secured therein.

## References

- [1] Akerele, W. O. (2008). *Quality assurance in Nigeria's university system: the imperative of the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. In J.B. Badalona, L. Popoola, A. Onuka, S. Oni, W. Olatokun & R. Agholahor (Eds.). *Towards Quality in African Higher Education*. Ibadan: Higher Education Research and Policy Network, 119-140.
- [2] Adedimeji, M. A. (2015). *What is academic corruption?* EDUPEACE.
- [3] Duruji, M. M., Segun, J., Olarenwaju, I. P., Oviasogie, F.O., Ajayi, O. O., & Loromeke, E.R. (2013). *Ethnicization of university education and national development: The Nigerian experience*. Covenant University (NIGERIA).
- [4] Ilusanya, G. (2012). *Politics and development of tertiary institutions in Nigeria*. Ondo: NIEPA, 166-178.
- [5] Joachim C. O., Ene I. E., & Victoria O. A. (2016). *Impact of quota system and catchment area policy on the University admissions in North Central Nigeria*. SAGE Open April-June 2016: 1 –8.
- [6] Kanyip, B. P. (2013). Admission crisis in Nigerian universities: The challenges youth and parents face in seeking admission. *Seton Hall University Dissertations and Theses (ETDs)*. 1908. <http://scholarship.shu.edu/dissertations/1908>.
- [7] Kukogho I. S. (2015). *Fighting corruption: There's too much corruption in Nigerian tertiary institutions — ICPC*. Pulse Nigeria.
- [8] Lawal, I. (2017). Admission crisis and Nigeria's education system. *The Guardian*. <https://guardian.ng/features/admission-crisis-and-nigerias-education-system/>.
- [9] Murdock, H. (2012). Nigerian universities demand bribes for admission. *Global Post*, May 11, 2012 · UTC.
- [10] National University Commission (2012). *Draft manual on access, equity and quality in higher education*. Abuja: NUC.
- [11] Odigwe, F., & Swem, T. (2016). Nigerian university quota admission system and quality of education in Universities in Cross River State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Education*, 9(4), 325-332. Retrieved November 10, 2018 from <http://www.ij sre.com>.
- [12] Okecha, S.A. (2014). *Brain circulation in Nigerian universities system*. Prof. Grace Mbipom Foundation 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Lecture at the University of Calabar International Conference Centre.
- [13] Okpa, O. E., Okoi, I.I, Igbineweka, P.O. & Udida, J. (2017). Strategies for enrolment management, market and sustainability of consultancy programmes in University of Calabar, Nigeria. *Education for Today*, 13(12), 241-252.
- [14] Osewa, O. (2018). *Why admission to enter University in Nigeria is very hard*. Education – Nairaland. <https://www.nairaland.com/546677/why-admission-enter-university-nigeria>.
- [15] Okolo, J. A. (2014). Assessment of supervisory roles of principals for quality assurance in public secondary schools in the federal capital territory Abuja, Nigeria (Unpublished doctoral thesis). *University of Nigeria, Nsukka*.
- [16] Oloko, O. O. & Edem, E. F. (2016). Implementation of admission policies in public universities in Rivers State. *Nigerian Journal of Educational Administration and Planning*, 16(3), 642-656.
- [17] Uduak, I. E. & Ovat E. O. (2018). Issues on access and equalization of university educational opportunities in Nigeria. *Scholars Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 6(7), 1414-1418.
- [18] Wong, A. (2015). *Commodification of higher education: Colleges and universities have become a marketplace that treats student applicants like consumers. Why?* <https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2016/03/the-commodification-of-higher-education/475947>.