

Influence of Corruption and Service Delivery on Students' Academic Performance in South-South Universities in Nigeria

By

Jaja, Ethel Kalanne Ph.D
Rivers State University
Faculty of Humanities
jajaethel905@yahoo.com
+2348033398841

Abstract

Corruption in this paper refers to acquisition of gain in dishonest or questionable ways; illegal or unfair gain absurd or deviant disposition of people in institutions of higher learning which violates the ethical standards. Therefore, this paper examines the influence of corruption and service delivery on students' academic performance in south-south universities in Nigeria, the population of this study comprised of three universities randomly selected from the South- South geopolitical zone (Rivers/Bayelsa, Akwa Ibom/ Cross Rivers and Delta/Edo). Expost facto design of the survey type was utilized. Two research questions were formulated for this study, one instrument comprising of 29 items was used which is Corruption and Service Delivery Questionnaire for University Students (CSDQUS), $r = 0.81$. Data for the study was analyzed using descriptive statistics frequency and percentages. Findings revealed that bribery, sexual gratification, admission, favouritism and nepotism influence corruption and service delivery in south-south universities. It was recommended that awareness and sensitization programmes should be organized by higher institutions on the implication of female students offering their body for marks from male lecturers and also lecturers requesting for sexual gratification from female students. Finally equal opportunity should be given to male and female students who desire higher education.

Keywords: corruption, higher education, service delivery, administration

Introduction

Education is regarded as the highest organization for human development. Many countries in the world invest a lot of money so as to make available adequate education for their citizens. Globally, education is been valued as a formative condition of human and national development (Jordan, 2016). Higher education, also recognized as the third level is the non-compulsory final stage of formal learning that follows after the completion of secondary education. Higher education is delivered at universities, academies, colleges,

seminaries, conservatories and institute of technology, also available through certain college-level institutions, including vocational schools, trade schools, and other career colleges that award academic degrees of professional certification. It is therefore important that higher education should be made accessible to all students who are interested in it and should be devoid of all forms of vices such as bribery and corruption.

Corruption according to Merriam-Webster Dictionary (2007) is the acquisition of gain in dishonest or questionable ways; illegal or unfair gain. While Hallak and Poisson, (2002) opines that Corruption in education is the systematic use of public office for private benefit, whose impact is significant on the availability and quality of public goods and services and, as a consequence on access, quality or equity in education. In post-secondary education, corruption is not limited to the developing world, but also typical in the developed nations. Corruption in higher education is not also limited to public higher education institutions only, private colleges are plagued with corruption as well. Some forms of corruption are indeed universal and can be found in private and public colleges in both developing and developed nations. Corruption in education is perhaps more harmful than in other sectors, because its victims are young people, and this may affect the educational quality and learning outcomes of the young adults and corruption will be seen as an indispensable means for getting ahead in education, they are more likely to engage in corrupt behaviors well into adulthood (Hallak & Poisson, 2007). Corruption not only distorts access to education but also affects the quality of education and the reliability of academic research findings. Corruption risks can be found at every level of education and research systems. It can be manifested under different forms, from the procurement of school resources to subjectivism in the hiring of teachers or even skewing of research results for personal gain. Corruption in academic field includes illicit activities directly linked to the academic process. These activities include biasness in selection process, admissions, grading, graduation, conferral of academic degrees, failure to advise, cheating, plagiarism, research misconduct, data falsification, ghost teachers, biasness in hiring and promotion. Other forms of corruption include embezzlement, fraud, nepotism, favoritism, kickbacks, ethics and sexual misconduct, and abuse of private property.

Corrupt practices in education may also be linked to academic publishing and distribution of textbooks, mismanagement, misallocation of public resources, and gross waste. Forms of corruption point to corruption opportunities in higher education. The room for corrupt activities exists in just about every national system of higher education. Areas that are vulnerable to corruption include selection and training of students, research, publishing, hiring and promotion of faculty, management of public funds and public property. Corruption risks in education system are elevated by two main factors: the high stakes of

educational opportunity and the large sums allocated to fund it. Research on corruption in the Western literature appears in two major areas: development economics and political science. Within the literature of development economics, corruption is regarded as a feature of the third world countries and in that of political science, the focus is on corruption in public policy, including America (Scott, 1969; Benson, 1978; Moore, 1992; Philip, 1997), Japan (Mitchell, 1996), and Australia (Palmer, 1992). Certain description of corruption is done from a politico-economic perspective, It entails rent-seeking behavior (Krueger, 1974; Buchanan, et al, 1980; White, 1996).

Similarly some aspects of corruption in education have been addressed in recent works by Anderson (1992, 1999, 2001), Noah & Eckstein (2001), Hallak & Poisson (2002, 2007), Eckstein (2003), Heyneman (2004), Segal (2004), and Washburn (2005). The risk of corruption in education also stems from an inevitable tension between the general notion that merit should be the basis of educational success and the particular desire of parents to ensure the advantage of their own children. Corruption becomes endemic when people engage in corrupt behaviors because they see such behaviors as widespread (Gee, Button & Cook, 2011). It is therefore pertinent to note that in order for higher institutions to meet up with the yearnings of the people concerning merit in relation to admission, the service delivery of such institutions must be in consonance with quality.

Quality has been the bed rock of the success of any developed and successful establishments around the world. Service industries are not exceptions, quality service delivery is more essential in service industry since most products are not physically present but can only be felt or experienced. Academic institutions are real examples of a service delivery industry where quality service delivery determines the success and continuous existence of such establishment. The major determinant of the growing concern of any University is the quality of service delivery, if the university wants to remain in business. Universities exist to disseminate knowledge through teaching, research and community service. These triple mandates make universities unique organizations whose existence stands for purely academic purposes. It is therefore necessary to state that the ability of universities to fulfill their mandates is a function of their effectiveness in managing their academic service delivery. Peck et al. 2010 sees academic service delivery as any activity or social exchange that supports students in their academic studies. Service quality deliveries therefore, are necessary for the survival of the university education in Nigeria and Africa in general. According to Oronsaye (2010), public service delivery can be seen as "the process of meeting the needs of citizens through prompt and efficient procedures." This implies that the interaction between the universities and students are

such that the needs of the students are met in a timely manner, thereby making the students key in service delivery.

The implication here is that as the private sector considers its customer as 'king' in the delivery of quality service, so should universities regard students as "master" in the delivery of quality service in relation to education (Aladegbola & Jaiyeola, 2016). Ohemeng 2010 assesses service delivery from the light of its key features as "doing more with less, empowering citizens, enhancing transparency and holding public servants accountable." Corroborating this further, Coopers (2014) stated seven core objectives for public service delivery namely: Speed – The time taken to deliver a service should be the shortest possible for both the customer and the organisation delivering the service, right first time. Engagement – The manner in which services are delivered should be seen as customer centric i.e participatory and trustworthy with the customer's needs in focus. Responsiveness – There should be an 'intelligent' mechanism in place to address any variation in meeting service levels and to drive changes in the service delivery organisation. Value – The customer needs to believe that the service delivery mechanism is cost effective, and value is driven by customer outcomes, not organisational processes. Integration – The service delivery mechanism should be integrated. There should be no wrong door policy for the customer. Choice – There should be multiple networks for service delivery, so that customers can have links of choice, depending on specific needs at specific times. Experience – Personalisation of service is necessary to ensure that customers' experiences are on a par with what they are used to receiving from the private sector.

This paper addresses the influence of corruption and service delivery on students' academic performance in south-south Universities in Nigeria, indicators of corruption are: Bribery – This is the act of students offering, giving, accepting or soliciting of an advantage as an inducement for an action that is illegal. This form of corruption is also known as sorting

Grading – Students pay money to a lecturer to influence him/her to award unmerited scores, also internal manipulation of ICT staff in order to favour their candidate. Furthermore, lecturers who handle students' charts compel students to pay money and change scores awarded by course lecturers for the students to graduate with better grades. This type of corruption is also called sorting in higher institutions. Torulagha (2013) opines that there is a relationship between corruption and the poor state of academic standards in Nigerian universities.

Sexual gratification - Male lecturers harass the female students with demands for sex in return for high grades and also the female students offer their body as a means to gratify a superior or lecturer in order to be awarded a favour. Uzochukwu (2015) observed, that the most painful part is that majority of the female students harassed are married.

Admission – This is a situation whereby non-teaching staffs in tertiary institutions collect money from parents and award their children admission even when they are not qualified thereby depriving those who are qualified the opportunity of gaining admission. Some even go to the extent of requesting students to give them money before they can give them lecturers' phone numbers. Some rich men bribe Admission officers and Head of Departments to secure admission. Those who are supposed to be admitted are by-passed (Uzochukwu, 2015).

Plagiarism – This is committed by both lecturers and students in writing academic papers and by faculty in scholarly writing and research. This is the exposition of a written work, texts expressions, data hypothesis theories etc. without mentioning or making reference to its original source.

Favouritism – A kind of patronage in which students/persons are selected or given admission regardless of qualification or entitlements because of the students' political affiliation or connection to Vice –Chancellor or Government on seat.

Nepotism – This is the process whereby students are favoured because of family relationship with the university authority. The result of this as noted by Ololube (2016), is the declining quality of Nigerian higher education.

Higher Education in Nigeria

The first institution of higher education was the Yaba Higher College, established in 1934. This became the nucleus of the first university college, established in 1948 at Ibadan. At independence in 1960 there was need for expansion, the university of Nigeria, Nsukka was established in 1960, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria, University of Lagos, and the University of Ife in 1962 and much later, the University of Benin (1970). These are known as the first generation universities. In 1975, with the twelve states structure, and the agitation for more universities by Nigerians, the Federal Government established seven additional universities at Jos, Maiduguri, Kano, Sokoto, Ilorin, Calabar and Port Harcourt. These universities became known as the second-generation universities (Olaniyan and Adediji, 2007). Virtually, all states have either a higher institution or a Federal one located there. The establishment of Higher Institutions was to train various crop of people. Nigeria

now has a crop of well-educated graduates despite the now popularly taunted falling standard. They are readily making contributions in all spheres of the country's development.

The growth in higher education and expansion, especially in universities, widening participation and increasingly diverse student body are all signals of a radically changing educational landscape (Christie, 2012). Aside from this, the nature of students' experience and changing students' expectations in the ever-changing academic environment are eloquent indications that there is need for academic service delivery. Academic service delivery strengthens students' learning experiences and enables staff to be alive to their responsibilities of ensuring that quality education is bestowed on students. As such, it could be an effective solution to developing skills and attitudes of students as it would enable them to begin to conceptualize themselves as future professionals and stakeholders with the service learning experiences. The principal contribution of a university to society turns out on the quality of knowledge generated, impacts, habits in critical thought, problem solving qualities institutionalized and inculcated in its graduates, with values of openness and democratic governance it promotes and demonstrate. The easiest way to ascertain these contributions is the caliber and commitment of lecturers to continuous improvements in teaching, research and community interactions; range of quality in curriculum and pedagogy; quality and extent of educational facilities; commitment to evaluation and review of activities to seek continuous improvements (Liston, 1999; Sawyerr, 2004). National education transformation has to do with the process in which the outdated education is replaced with efficient system to leverage significant advances in the global environment and therefore, enabling educational institutions to serve more number of people in a better manner (Babalola, 2010). This implies changing university education into a new order whereby it is placed in a better pedestal to serve students, stakeholders and the nation better

The major purpose of the huge investment in university education is the belief that socio-economic and political problems of the country will be solved through education. This seems not be true, because our experience so far show indiscipline in high places, examinations malpractice, corruption, laziness and immoral practices. Regrettably, the university education has not freed Nigerians from the bondage of parochialism, ethnicity, tribalism, oppression and injustice. Disappointingly those who fan the embers of tribalism and ethnicity, and are dangerously corrupt are the educated class. Many have argued that education has not transformed Nigerians Development (Aghenta,1983). The quality of university education in Nigeria is looking vague because the six inputs into learning are poor; Proprietary responsibility, Marketability of products of the university, Subjects taught,

the teacher capable of teaching the subjects, Strikes in Nigerian universities and Morality of the student

In Nigeria, there are three clear cut marks that submit to the prerequisite for more attention to innovation in both curricula and pedagogy. Firstly, the success of students appears to be narrow and the rate of dropouts seems to be high. In 2002, the NUC tried to compute dropout rates within the federal university organisation and its initial findings showed that dropout rates were as high as 30% (NUC, 2002). Secondly, the employers of labour (public and private) including the government, sees the worth of graduates from tertiary institutions as insufficient. After a study was conducted on graduates in the labour market, results showed the belief of employers in the poor training of tertiary institutions graduates and their unproductivity ability on the job, and the inadequacies are mainly severe in oral and written communication, and in applied technical skills (Dabaleni, Oni & Adekola, 2001). Thirdly, the curricula of the tertiary institutions are deficient in quality (NUC, 2002). In the opinions of Oni (2000), the causes that are responsible for the poor quality of tertiary institutions programs including graduates seem to be both internal and external to the institutions.

The internal factors are summed up with absence of employees' motivation, strikes and weak accountability for educational performance while the external factors involves corruption, lack of teachers', and the uneven funding efforts by government, likewise the use of quota system in admissions instead of merit. Quality control practices in Nigeria education principally centres on educational supervision, monitoring and control Academic and social support has to do with helps rendered to strengthen close relationship, promote interaction, enhance friendly coexistence and sharing of information by students on academic and group matters. The value of any management is centred on its strength to produce quality products and satisfy clients and other stakeholders. Its responsibility, consequently, embraces the identification and solving of any problem which hinders quality delivery. Such a problem-solving method should be resolute on taking preventive measures against wastage. The identification of learners' needs should be an all-inclusive effort, as problems are identified and the primary causes addressed (Ijaiya, 2001).

Statement of the Problem

Corruption in the Nigeria education system has permeated every aspect – students, lecturers, non-teaching staff and the administration of the institutions and its victims are the young people, and this may affect the educational quality and learning outcomes of the young adults and corruption will be seen as an indispensable means for getting ahead

in education, they are more likely to engage in corrupt behaviors well into adulthood. It is therefore important to note that in order for higher institutions to meet up with the yearnings of the people/students concerning merit in relation to admission and quality education, the service delivery of such institutions must be in consonance with quality. Therefore this paper seeks to investigate the influence of corruption and service delivery on students’ academic performance in south-south Universities in Nigeria vis –a- vis bribery, plagiarism, grading, sexual gratification, admission, favouritism and, nepotism.

Research Questions

Based on the problems highlighted, the following research questions were derived:

1. To what extent will corruption (plagiarism, grading, sexual gratification, admission, favouritism and, nepotism) influence students’ academic performance south-south universities in Nigeria?
2. To what extent will service delivery (plagiarism, grading, sexual gratification, admission, favouritism and, nepotism) influence students’ academic performance in south-south universities in Nigeria?

Methodology

The ex-post facto design of the survey type was used in this study. The population of this study comprised of three universities randomly selected from the South- South geopolitical zone (Rivers/Bayelsa, Akwa Ibom/ Cross Rivers and Delta/Edo). One instrument was used for this study which is corruption and service delivery questionnaire for university students (r = 0.81). Copies of the instruments were delivered personally by the researcher with the help of three research assistants from each university chosen for the study. A total of one hundred and fifty copies of the instruments were administered to the students who expressed their opinion on the influence of corruption and service delivery on their performance and all the copies were retrieved.

Data Collection Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using descriptive statistics of frequency and percentages.

RESULTS

Table 1: The extent of corruption and service delivery on academic performance

S/N	ITEMS	SA	A	D	SD	Total
<i>PLAGIARISM</i>						
1.	Copy other people’s work verbatim is not ideal in academic.	65(43.3)	60(40)	15(10)	10(6.7)	150(100)

2.	It may be difficult to progress in academic if an individual want to rely on his own personal idea.	22(14.6)	20(13.3)	36(24)	72(48)	150(100)
3.	Anybody caught in the act of plagiarism should be expelled from the institution.	12(8)	33(22)	60(40)	45(30)	150(100)
4.	Plagiarism is not only peculiar to students, even lecturers also involve.	20(13.3)	17(11.3)	55(36.6)	58(38.6)	150(100)
5.	Plagiarism is an academic robbery	60(40)	55(36.6)	20(13.3)	15(10)	150(100)
	GRADING	SA	A	D	SD	
6.	University grading system encourages examination malpractices.	10(6.7)	35(23.3)	52(34.6)	53(35.3)	150(100)
7.	The high grading system in the university system is a strategy to keep the children of poor away from schooling.	65(43.3)	40(26.6)	17(11.3)	28(18.6)	150(100)
8.	The university grading system encourages witch-hunting from the lectures.	05(3.3)	15(10)	70(46.6)	60(40)	150(100)
9.	The university grading system hinders sex for mark.	57(38)	63(42)	20(13.3)	10(6.7)	150(100)
10.	The university grading system encourages hard working rather than crafty mean of getting mark.	68(45.3)	65(43.3)	10(6.7)	07(4.6)	150(100)
	SEXUAL GRATIFICATION	SA	A	D	SD	
11.	It is rampant among university female students nowadays to offer their bodies for exam score.	25(16.6)	30(20)	43(28.6)	52(34.6)	150(100)
12.	The "sex for mark" issue is not a new thing in Nigeria university system.	70(46.6)	40(26.6)	13(8.6)	27(18)	150(100)
13.	It is impossible to scale through in academic as a female student without having a male lecturer as your man-friend	15(10)	12(8)	57(38)	66(44)	150(100)
14.	A times lecturer work automatic carry over for male students	18(12)	14(9.3)	58(38.6)	60(40)	150(100)

	because they think they are their rivalry					
15.	Many students drop out from the university because of sexual issue.	5(3.3)	10(6.7)	62(41.3)	73(48.6)	150(100)
	ADMISSION	SA	A	D	SD	
16.	It is only people who are financially buoyant that can secure admission in university.	10(6.7)	13(8.6)	50(33.3)	77(51)	150(100)
17.	If you are not ready to offer bribe you may find it difficult to gain admission.	25(16.6)	20(13.3)	61(40.6)	44(29.3)	150(100)
18.	The university admission officers are men and women of integrity.	50(33.3)	65(43.3)	20(13.3)	15(10)	150(100)
19.	Admission processing is not difficult for female students compare to their male counterpart.	07(4.6)	17(11.3)	69(46)	57(38)	150(100)
20.	University admission is basically on merit.	29(19.3)	20(13.3)	50(33.3)	51(34)	150(100)
	FAVOURITISM	SA	A	D	SD	
21	Favouritism can treat quality assurance in university education system.	10(6.7)	10(6.7)	65(43.3)	65(43.3)	150(100)
22	Favouritism has graduated into the employment of sub-standard workers in the university system.	43(28.6)	40(26.6)	43(28.6)	24(16)	150(100)
23	Favouritism is only peculiar to junior workers in the university.	52(34.6)	35(23.3)	35(23.3)	28(18.6)	150(100)
	BRIBERY					
24	Bribery gives students access to penetrate the lecturers.	44(29.3)	56(37.3)	11(7.3)	39(26)	150(100)
25	The university system acknowledges money or higher scores	02(1.3)	08(5.3)	78(52)	62(41.3)	150(100)
26	Offering of money in the university for inducement of action is illegal	63(42)	60(40)	18(12)	09(6)	150(100)
	NEPOTISM	SA	A	D	SD	

27	Nepotism inhibit the attainment of university educational objectives.	56(37.3)	59(39.3)	20(13.3)	15(10)	150(100)
28	Nigeria university system is not free from ethnic rivalry.	57(38)	58(38.6)	24(16)	11(7.3)	150(100)
29	Nepotism increases quality in universities	23(15)	20(13.3)	45(30)	62(41.3)	150(100)

Results

Table 1 reveals that for item 1 which says that copying other people’s work verbatim is not ideal in academic. 125(83.3%) respondents agree to the statement while 25(16.7%) did not agree. The table also reveals that for item 2 which states that it may be difficult to progress in academic if an individual want to rely on his own personal idea, 42(27.9%) respondents agreed while 98(72%) did not agree. Again the table reveals that for item 3 which says that anybody caught in the act of plagiarism should be expelled from the institution; 45(30%) of the respondents agreed while 105(70%) disagreed. In the same vein, item 4 which states that anybody caught in the act of plagiarism should be expelled from the institution; 37(24.6%) respondents agreed while 113(75.2) did not agree. For item 5 which says that plagiarism is an academic robbery; 115(76.6%) respondents agreed while 35(23.3%) disagreed. Furthermore, the table reveal for item 6 which states that university grading system encourages examination malpractices; 45(30%) of the respondents agreed while 105(69.9%) disagreed.

Again item7 which states that the high grading system in the university system is a strategy to keep the children of poor away from schooling; 105(69.9%) of the respondents agreed while 45(29.9%) disagreed. Also item 8 which says that the university grading system encourages witch-hunting from the lectures; 20(13.3%) of the respondents agreed while 110(86.6%) did not agree. Also for item 9 which states that the university grading system hinders sex for mark; 120(80%) of the respondents agreed while 30(20%) disagreed. The table for item 10 which states that the university grading system encourages hard working rather than crafty means of getting mark; 133(90.6%) of the respondents agreed while 17(11.3%) did not agree.

Also, for item 11 which says that it is rampant among university female students nowadays to offer their bodies for exam score; 55(36.6%) of the respondents agreed while 95(63.2%) disagreed. Furthermore, item 12 which says the “sex for mark” issue is not a new thing in Nigeria university system; 110(73.2%) of the respondents agreed while 40(26.6%) disagreed. Item 13 which states that it is impossible to scale through in academic as a female student without having a male lecturer as your man-friend; 27(18%) of the respondents agreed while 123(82%) did not agree. For item 14 which says that a times

lecturer work automatic carry over for male students because they think they are their rivalry; 32(12.3%) of the respondents agreed while 118(78.6%) disagreed. In the same vein, item 15 which says that many students drop out from the university because of sexual issue; 15(10%) of the respondents agreed while 135(89.9%) did not agree. Again item 16 which states that it is only people who are financially buoyant that can secure admission in university; 23(15.3%) of the respondents agreed while 127(84.3%) disagreed. Also for item 17 which states that if you are not ready to offer bribe you may find it difficult to gain admission; 45(29.9%) of the respondents agreed while 105(69.9) did not agree. Again for item 18 which says that the university admission officers are men and women of integrity; 115(76.6%) of the respondents agreed while 35(23.3%) disagreed. Furthermore, for item 19 which states that admission processing is not difficult for female students compared to their male counterpart; 24(15.9%) of the respondents agreed while 126(84%) did not agree. In the same vein, item 20 which says that university admission is basically on merit; 49(32.6%) of the respondents agreed while 101(67.3%) disagreed. For item 21 which says that favouritism can treat quality assurance in university education system; 20(13.4%) of the respondents did not agree while 130(86.6%) agreed.

For item 22 which says that favouritism has graduated into the employment of sub-standard workers in the university system; 83(55.2%) of the respondents agreed while 67(44.6%) did not agree. Again, for item 23 which states that favouritism is only peculiar to junior worker in the university; 87(57.9%) of the respondents agreed while 63(41.9) did not agree. For item 24 which states that bribery gives students access to penetrate the lecturers; 100(66.6%) of the respondents agreed while 50(33.3%) disagreed. Also for item 25 which states that the university system acknowledges money for higher scores; 10(6.7%) of the respondents agreed while 140(93.3%) disagreed. Furthermore for item 26 which says that offering of money in the university for inducement of action is illegal; 123(82%) of the respondents agreed while 27(18%) did not agree. For item 27 which states that nepotism inhibit the attainment of university educational objectives; 115(76.6%) of the respondents agreed while 35(23.3%) did not agree. Again, for item 28 which states that Nigeria university system is not free from ethnic rivalry; 115(76.6%) of the respondents agreed while 35(23.3%) did not agree. Finally, for item 29 which says that nepotism increases quality in universities; 43(28.3%) of the respondents agreed while 107(71.3%) disagreed.

Discussion

The study x-rays Bribery, Plagiarism, Grading, Sexual gratification, Admission, Favouritism and Nepotism as some of the sub-variables of corruption and service delivery amongst others in south-south higher institutions. From the results of the data analysis, it is obvious that Bribery, and Admission are indicators of graft. This finding is in consonance

with Torulagha (2013) that there is a relationship between corruption and the poor state of academic standards in Nigerian universities.

Again, the results revealed that Sexual gratification, Favouritism and Nepotism are indices of corruption and service delivery which influences students' academic performance in south-south universities. This finding agrees with Ololube (2016), that the above mentioned sub-variables declines quality of Nigerian higher education.

Conclusion

Higher education is delivered at universities, academies, colleges, seminaries, conservatories and institute of technology among others. It is also available through certain college –level institutions, including vocational schools, trade schools, and other career colleges that award academic degrees of professional certification. It is therefore important that higher education should be made accessible to all students who are interested in it and should be devoid of all forms of vices such as bribery and corruption. It is pertinent to note that there are social vices that emanate from the society that is making things unworkable in the universities, among these are service delivery and corruption. The results of this study have proved beyond reasonable doubt that our academic institutions cannot thrive except they embark upon quality service delivery devoid of corrupt practices.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, it is therefore important to recommend to all stakeholders that:

1. Higher institutions should enact laws stopping the act of plagiarism in their domains
2. The grading system in higher institutions should be moderated and monitored by the school authority
3. Awareness and sensitization programmes should be organized by higher institutions on the implication of female students offering their body for marks from male lecturers and also lecturers requesting for sexual gratification from female students
4. Equal opportunity should be given to male and female students who desire higher education
5. Higher institutions in Nigeria should be a place set aside for acquisition of knowledge devoid of ethnicity and nepotism

References

- Okafor, C., Fatile, J. O. & Ejalonibu, G. L. (2014). Public Service Innovations and Changing Ethos in Africa. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 2(4), 46-71.
- Oronsaye, S. (2010). *Creating the Service Delivery of Our Dreams*. Office of the Head of the Civil Service on the Federation, Federal Government of Nigeria.
- Aladegbola, I. A. & Jaiyeola, F. (2016). Critique of Public Administrative Reform System: Post Independence in Nigeria. *Africa's Public Service Delivery and Performance Review*, 4(1), 147-171.
- Coopers, P. (2014). *The Road Ahead for Public Service Delivery: Delivering on the customer promise*. Retrieved from: https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/psrc/pdf/the_road_ahead_for_public_service_delivery.pdf Assessed May 12, 2017.
- Ohemeng, F. (2010). The Dangers of Internationalization and "One-Size-Fits-All" in Public Sector Management: Lessons from Performance Management Policies in Ontario and Ghana. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 23(5), 456-478
- Mitel, I. (2007). *Simplifying and Transforming Service Delivery in Government Citizen Interaction Centres*. White Paper, October.
- Adekunle, A.A., S. Tayo-Subair and A.O. Olugbenro, 2012. Effective management of tertiary education and national transformation in Nigeria.
- Akuegwu, B.A., A.O. Edet and C.C. Uchendu, 2012. Managing research output for knowledge creation in South-South Nigerian universities. *African Higher Education Review*, 5: 87 – 100.
- Babalola, J.B., 2010. *Economics of transforming higher education in Africa*. Ibadan: His Lineage Publishing House.
- Christie, P., 2012. *Review of academic support services: Report for academic board*. Available from <http://www.arts.ac.uk/>
- Peck, J., L. Chilvers and Y. Lincoln, 2010. Learning support: Student perceptions and preferences. *Art, Design and Communication in Higher Education*, 9(2): 135 –136.
- Price, J., n.d. *Academic services*. Available from <http://www.otago.ac.nz/administration/otago000846.html>.
- Sawyerr, A., 2004. Challenges facing African universities: Selected issues. *African Studies Review*, 47(1): 1-59
- Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 with Amendments 2011.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Policy on Education (NPE)*, Yaba, Lagos: NERDC Press. Retrieved from <http://www.uzochukwumike.hubpages.com> Retrieved 10th May, 2015

- Gurgur T., & Shah A. (2000). Localization and Corruption: Panacea or Pandora's Box. Retrieved from <http://www.ceade.imf.org/.../2000/.../gurgur:p...>
- IMF (2000): *Corruption Cost and mitigating strategies*. Retrieved from <https://www.....imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/...../sdn1605>
- Independent Corrupt Practices and other related offences Commission, ICPC Act (2000). Abuja, Nigeria. Retrieved from; <http://icpc.gov.ng/wp-content/uploads/.../2012/.../corrupt-practices-Act-2010.pdf>
- Iyayi, F. (2010). Economic Reforms University Autonomy/Funding and Industrial Relations in Nigerian University System In Sustaining Effective Leadership in the Nigeria University System. *Leadership Training Manual of Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU) National Secretariat Flat 2, Mellanby Hall University of Ibadan*, <http://wjss.sciedupress.com> World Journal of Social Science Vol. 4, No. 2; 2017