# Acceptability of Online Examinations and Educational Development in Nigerian Universities: Experience from Distance and E-learning Practice

**Yinus, S.O*[1] Adeoye O.O*[2], Osunniyi J.S*[3] , Oyedeji, Y.O*[4] *[1,2,3,4]Ladoke Akintola University of Technology**
Open and Distance Learning, Oyo state, Nigeria.
*[1]Faculty Fellow, UNICAF, Larnaca, Cypros.
Email: s.yinusa@faculty.unicaf.org
Corresponding author email: ooadeoye47@lautech.edu.ng
DOI: 10.56201/wjimt.v8.no5.2024.pg56.70

## Abstract

*The adoption of online examinations in tertiary institutions, particularly during and after the COVID-19 era, has gained traction due to its potential to enhance learning outcomes. However, its adaptability and flexibility also make it susceptible to misuse, posing challenges to widespread acceptance and adoption. The extent to which online examinations influence educational development within Nigerian universities, especially in the context of distance and eLearning practices remains underexplored. This study examines stakeholders' perceptions of factors influencing the acceptance and adoption of online examinations and their impact on educational development in Nigerian universities. Using a purposive sampling technique, an online survey was conducted with 216 staff members of Ladoke Akintola University, Distance and eLearning Centre, including LSS, IAG, Technical Support, e-tutors/lecturers, and center administrators. A total of 197 valid responses were obtained, representing a 91% retrieval rate. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, correlation, and multiple regression at a 95% confidence level. The findings reveal that variables such as Performance Expectancy, Social Influence, and Personal Innovativeness significantly influence online examination adoption and are positively correlated with educational development (P < 0.0001). This underscores the importance of these factors in driving the acceptance and effective implementation of online examination practices. By prioritizing these variables, educational institutions can foster greater adoption of online examinations, ultimately enhancing learning outcomes and contributing to the broader goals of educational development. Consequently, it is recommended that Nigerian universities, particularly those embracing distance education, prioritize improving technology infrastructure and investing in capacity building to strengthen online examination systems and practices*

*Keywords: Online Examination, Nigerian Universities, eLearning, Technology Acceptance, Educational Development*

## Introduction

Examination plays a crucial role in the learning process, it gives tangible proof of what is learned, gauges student progress, and indicates a grasp of the subject content. For centuries, pen-to-paper has been the most employed mode of assessment delivery to evaluate learners and measure educational achievements in all forms of education, from elementary to tertiary. However, the past three decades have witnessed a sporadic yet progressive transition in the modalities and structures of assessments. The arrival and introduction of computers in the early 90s and their generational evolution over time, introducing new features and capabilities, have led to the development and usage of what is now popularly referred to as "digital assessment". As technology develops, new and creative digital assessment approaches are being created to evaluate learners utilizing various digital tools at different learning levels (Boitshwarelo *et al*., 2017). In addition to the technological advancements, studies have linked a rise in student enrolment in educational institutions as another factor contributing to the transition from paper-based assessments to digital ones, as the resources required (time, money, and effort among others) for grading and delivering high-quality feedback rise along with the number of learners in the learning groups or courses  (Jonsdottir *et al*., 2017). Research have shown that digital technologies may assist to revolutionize education, as it tends to be a more student-centred and technology-mediated method of learning (Alessio *et al*., 2017; Boldyrevskii *et al*., 2022; Keane *et al*., 2022; Mari State University *et al*., 2022). It offers potentially advantageous qualities such as affordances and provides more individualized, flexible, and palatable experiences to the learners (Keane *et al.*, 2022).

Online education activities are increasingly used in educational setting, and it is aimed to develop traditional educational methods (White & Hammer, 2000) and to contribute to solutions of some problems encountered in traditional education such as difficulties experienced due to education in very crowded classrooms or inability to listen to lesson again (Ocak & Karakuş 2021)). Moreover, online education both changed basic structure of information exchange and enabled teachers to make changes in teaching techniques (White & Hammer, 2000). Today qualified online education is much more important that it should be at same level as face-to-face education . Online education has benefits such as flexibility, ease of access to education at appropriate time, and learning anytime, anywhere (Robles & Braathen, 2002; Keskin & Guneş, 2015). However, in addition to these facilities, it has some shortcomings also. In online education, since instructor and students are not physically in same environment and face-to-face communication cannot be achieved, assessment is done differently. This situation requires use of alternative assessment methods and assessment process needs to be more transparent and support learning since assessment helps determining quality of learning (Arend, 2007).

Online examination (OE) is digital assessment format where students can participate in exams remotely, from any location with internet access. To prevent cheating, this mode of exam is usually invigilated either by a human via a webcam, microphone, and other digital tools (Cherry et al., 2021) or through the use of an artificial intelligence (AI) powered agent that monitors examinee activities (Paredes et al., 2021).  Digital assessments gained popularity due to their ability to address the aforementioned lockdown constraints as well as the benefits it provides such as remote administration, personalization of learning resources, automation of learning processes, and instant feedback to all stakeholders (Alruwais et al., 2018). As a result, within minimal time, educational institutions began utilizing robust forms of online assessments such as simulation-based assessments and proctored exams to evaluate educational

outcomes and assess students' knowledge and skills. Proctored assessments became a crucial technology for evaluating students during and after the pandemic, resulting in a "new normal" that transformed the educational experience for future generations (Kharbat & Abu-Daabes, 2021).

In recent years, the integration of Online examination has emerged as a crucial component in enhancing the educational experience within Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) worldwide, aiming to accommodate the learning preferences of digital natives. Despite this trend, as highlighted by Mayhew (2018), the transition to institutional Online examination remains intricate and challenging. Educators in HLIs are confronted with the task of developing and implementing pedagogical strategies that effectively cater to the learning needs of digital natives, as emphasized by Jönsson & Eriksson (2019). According to Ndibalema (2021), the successful implementation of Online examination necessitates not only technological proficiency but also a thoughtful pedagogical shift towards individualized facilitation to align with the learning expectations of 21st-century digital natives.

Existing literature on technology adoption has introduced various models aimed at elucidating the patterns of acceptance and adoption behavior towards emerging technologies. One prominent model is the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) proposed by Venkatesh et al., (2003). According to UTAUT, the determinants of acceptance and adoption of emerging technologies are influenced by variables such as Performance Expectancy, Effort Expectancy, Social Influence, and Facilitating Conditions. However, there remains a gap in the literature concerning the extent to which variables like Performance Expectancy, Social Influence, and Personal Innovativeness contribute as determinants of acceptance and adoption specifically in the context of online examination within distance education settings.

**Statement of Problem**

Previous research has focused on various aspects of online education, including instructor and student perspectives on online education applications (Tanyıldızı & Semerci, 2005; Torkul, Kibar & Tasci, 2004; Tufekci, Ekinci & Kose, 2013), factors influencing online education (Aragon & Johnson, 2008), student learning strategies in online courses (Arend, 2007), challenges in online education (Çelen, Çelik & Seferoglu, 2011), technology in online education (Hillier & Fluck, 2017), and motivation in online education (Kawachi, 2003). These studies commonly highlight issues such as instructor time constraints, ethical concerns in online education, lack of information about online education, and deficiencies in technology literacy. However, the potential of online examination to enhance educational development in the Nigerian University context, particularly in distance education and blended learning, remains underexplored and warrants further investigation.

Research has delved into the comparability of online examinations with traditional face-to-face assessments, revealing that online examinations can offer similar levels of security and validity (Weiner & Hurtz, 2017; Smith., Clarke, Carmona & Cerimagic,2017). Nevertheless, concerns persist regarding technical challenges such as internet connectivity and power availability, particularly in developing nations, which may compromise the validity of examination results (Ryznar, 2020). Additionally, issues related to privacy and human rights infringement have been raised (Tello, 2007; Williamson, 2018). Addressing these concerns within the context of distance education in Nigerian tertiary institutions constitutes a gap in the current study

**Research Hypotheses**

**Ho1:** Identified determinant variables has no positive influence on online examination adoption in open and distance education in Nigerian sampled University

**Ho2:** There is no relationship between Acceptability of Online Examination Practice and Educational Development in open and distance education in Nigerian sampled University

**Literature Review**

**Concept of Online Examination Practice**

Online examination describes the assessment of students learning with methods including information and communication technologies (Conrad & Openo, 2018). This does not restrict Online examination to fully online courses and can also be implemented in a blended learning format (Gikandi et al., 2011). Online assessments may take on different pedagogical functions as part of online learning environments (Webb & Ifenthaler, 2018), for example, scaffolding students to complete a task and measuring how much support they need or providing students with semantic rich and personalized feedback, as well as adaptive prompts for reflection (Gikandi et al., 2011). Other examples of online assessments include a pedagogical agent acting like a virtual coach tutoring learners and providing feedback when needed (Çelen, Çelik & Seferoglu, 2011) as well as an analysis of a learner's decisions during a digital game or simulation. Other online assessments use multimedia-constructed response items for authentic learning experiences or provide students with an emotionally engaging virtual world experience that unobtrusively documents the progression of a person's leadership and ethical development over time (Tufekci et al, 2013). Thus, online assessments offer a broad range of pedagogical functions including a medium for communication, a learning assistant, a judge, a test administrator, a performance prompt, a practice arena, or a performance workspace (Tufekci et al, 2013). Online assessment can be performed formatively throughout the learning progress or in a summative way at the end of a learning segment (Gikandi et al., 2011).

Post covid, research has found that faculty and academic administrators are becoming hesitant to continue adopting RPE due to concerns about the validity and security of the assessment process (Akaaboune et al., 2021; Paredes et al., 2021). While adopting these technologies is necessary during the covid-19 pandemic period, researchers believe it is vital to pause and think about the broader effects of implementing such technological "solutions" and examine how technology and assessment processes intersect with the broader objectives of education (Fawns & Schaepkens, 2022). Students, on the other hand, have mixed opinions, with some commending the flexibility, convenience, and positive exam experience availed by online examination (Anderson & Gades, 2017; Paredes et al., 2021), while others felt that OE is invasive and uncomfortable (Alessio et al., 2017; Kharbat & Abu-Daabes, 2021; Vasiliki et al., 2021). The effects of Online examination on student outcomes, including performance, motivation, and engagement, have also been studied. Some of these studies have found that online examination has a favourable effect on student motivation and engagement (Alessio et al., 2017; Cherry et al., 2021; Hall et al., 2021; Boldyrevskii et al., 2022), Others, however, have found no discernible difference between a remote and a conventional proctored exam (Vasiliki et al., 2021).

In the absence of coercion, the adoption of complex, new technologies such as OE is always slow, uncertain, and sometimes risky (Cho & McCardle, 2009). Most of the time, these

technologies are implemented with an expectation that is weighed against the cost, which might not necessarily be monetary (Heidenreich & Talke, 2021). The degree of ignorance, reluctance to change, worry about making the wrong decision, technological inadequacy, and other strange factors can also have an odd impact on how people accept new technologies.

**Types, Modes, and Formats of Online Assessments/Examination**

In the course of drawing inferences about students' learning process, online assessment can include different types of assessments, ranging from single- and multiple-choice quizzes, written exams or essays, and oral presentations to authentic assessments including project-based cases, games and simulations, or e-Portfolios (Conrad & Openo, 2018). (Audience Response Systems are not included in our definition of online assessment) The assessment process can be performed by different individuals or groups, i.e., different modes of assessment. Peers have the potential to take on the role of the assessor and provide each other with feedback. Learners might also self-assess by evaluating their learning process and outcome themselves or by reflecting on their learning (Conrad & Openo, 2018). Furthermore, the possibilities in online assessment also allow for automated assessment providing automated feedback (Gamage et al., 2020). In this systematic review, an online assessment format can either be formative or summative. An online assessment mode may be self-assessment, peer-assessment, teacher-assessment, or automated-assessment (system-based). An assessment type refers to the implemented task of the assessment. This might include for example quizzes, essays, e-Portfolios, project-based tasks, or others.

**Empirical Study**

Several studies have been conducted on stakeholder perceptions and attitudes towards the blended learning practice toward quality education in the context of distance education. Yinus *et al*. (2023) study Learner's Perception and Attitude toward Blended Learning Practice**.** questionnaire were administered to learners. The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, while the formulated hypotheses were tested through the use of Chi-Square at a 95% confidence level. The results of the study showed positive student perceptions toward blended learning practice. It is concluded that learners have a positive attitude towards the practice and quality of blended learning, but the problem of Internet access and the learner's lack of commitment outside the university campus form a major hindrance.

According to the study conducted by Okocha, Eyiolorunshe, and Oguntayo (2017) on student acceptance of blended learning in Nigeria, The research was carried out at the Centre for Learning Resources at Landmark University Omu-aran, Kwara State. The study explains the factors that influence the acceptance of blended learning and the level of acceptance of the features of blended learning by undergraduate students at Landmark University. Questionnaires were used as the instrument for data collection. The study found that performance expectations and facilitating conditions significantly influenced the acceptance of blended learning. In understanding the acceptance of blended learning features, the student shows more interest in course-related readings and course materials available on the learning management system and less interest in discussion with lecturers and discussion with classmates. It was also discovered that there is no relationship between the learning styles of students and their intention to adopt blended learning.

In Nangawe's study (2015), the adoption of ICT tools in Tanzanian Higher Learning Institutions (HLIs) was found to be closely linked to the attitudes of academic and non-

academic staff, with web-based assessment being moderately utilized to support student learning. However, despite its numerous advantages, online assessment remains underutilized in HLIs due to various challenges such as security concerns, lack of institutional e-assessment policies, and insufficient preparation and experience among instructors to effectively manage e-assessment systems (Appiah & Tonder, 2018). While integrating ICT into teaching is widely regarded as beneficial, progress in this area has been slow. Furthermore, the impact of online assessment on student learning in Tanzanian HLIs has not been extensively researched. Even when instructors attempt to leverage online assessment, they often encounter obstacles that impede implementation. Thus, there is a pressing need to identify and address the barriers to online examination within the context of distance education in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

Suleiman, Salaudeen, and Falode (2017) explored the effects of a computer-based blended learning strategy on chemistry students' retention in individualized and collaborative settings in Minna, Nigeria. Using a quasi-experimental design, they compared outcomes among three groups: individualized, collaborative, and lecture methods, finding collaborative settings yielded better retention. Similarly, Marchalot et al. (2017) evaluated blended learning's impact on medical residents' performance in France, showing improved scores post-intervention compared to traditional teaching. Shorey et al. (2017) studied blended learning's influence on nursing students' communication skills in Singapore, reporting positive effects on satisfaction, attitudes, and self-efficacy.

**Gaps in the Literature**

These studies collectively highlight the effectiveness of distance and eLearning across diverse disciplines and educational contexts. This study contributes to the existing literature by exploring stakeholder perceptions of distance education while emphasizing the critical role of learning feedback in ensuring quality education within the context of open and distance learning in Nigerian tertiary institutions. Specifically, it evaluates the acceptance and adoption of online examination practices and their influence on educational development, addressing a significant gap in the literature. By integrating the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) as a theoretical framework, the study provides deeper insights into the factors influencing the acceptance and use of online examinations. Key constructs such as performance expectancy, effort expectancy, social influence, and facilitating conditions are explored to understand their impact on the adoption of online examination practices. Furthermore, the study contributes to the education and digital economy by focusing on the integration of technology to enhance educational development and accessibility, filling a notable gap in research on technology-driven educational practices in Nigerian tertiary institutions.

**Methodology**

An online survey design was employed, the population of the study comprises of all 216 staff members of LODLC ranging from Learner Support Services (LSS), Information and Guidance (IAG), Technical Support (TS), etutor/Lecturers for both online and face-to-face lecture facilitation and the centre administrators purposively. This is based on their active involvement in an online examination exercise. The selection of Ladoke Akintola University (LAUTECH) is based on the fact that they are stakeholders in educational sector especially in distance education. Also based on their forefront participation in an online examination practice among

Nigerian university that embrace open and distance education. A total of 197 questionnaires were completed and returned, yielding a 91% retrieval rate. The collected data were analysis with aid of descriptive analysis like table and percentage while inferential statistics such as correlation, multiple regression analysis and ANOVA were employed to analyse the formulated hypothesis. All analysis were done at 95% confidence level.

## Results and Discussion

### Analysis of Economic Demographic data of the Respondents

As presented in Table 1 the total number of participants in this study was 197, 59.4% of the participants were male and 40.6% were female. The largest age group was found to be in the 20 to 30 range, representing 34% of the respondent. Almost all participants (96.4%) had prior experience with OEP. LSS/Etutor/Lecturers formed the largest group based on their academic rank (38.1%), followed by IA&G officers (24%) and the administrators (14%) while professors, facilitators, technical support and help desk officers account for the remaining 22%. These findings indicated that the majority of the stakeholders in the selected higher institutions were represented.

**Table 1: Demography**

|  |  | Frequency | Percentage |
|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | Male | 117 | 59.39 |
|  | Female | 80 | 40.61 |
| Age | 20 – 30 | 67 | 34.01 |
|  | 31 – 40 | 65 | 32.99 |
|  | 40 – 50 | 55 | 27.92 |
|  | Above 51 | 10 | 5.08 |
| Have you done or involve in an OEP? | Yes | 190 | 96.44 |
|  | No | 7 | 3.55 |
| Rank | Professors | 10 | 5.08 |
|  | LSS/Etutor/Lecturers | 75 | 38.07 |
|  | Facilitators | 22 | 11.17 |
|  | Technical Support | 9 | 4.57 |
|  | Administrators | 29 | 14.72 |
|  | IA&G officer | 48 | 24.37 |
|  | Help Desk officer | 4 | 2.03 |

OEP: Online Examination Practice

**Source: Author's** Computation, (2024).

**Table 2: Responses on Stakeholders Perception on Variable of** Online Examination
Adoption Components

| Variable | Response |
|----------|----------|
| Effort expectancy | Effort expectancy positively affects the behavioural intention to use Online Examination |
| Social Influence | Social Influence positively affects the behavioural intention to use Online Examination |
| Performance expectancy | Performance expectancy positively affects the behavioural intention to use Online Examination |
| Price Value | Price Value positively affects the behavioural intention to use Online Examination |
| Personal innovation | Personal innovation positively affects the behavioural intention to use Online Examination |
| Facilitating condition | Facilitating condition positively affects the behavioural intention to use Online Examination |

**Reliability test of the study variables**

**Table 3: Reliability Test**

| Factors | Cronbach's Alpha |
|---------|------------------|
| Performance Expectancy | 0.929 |
| Effort Expectancy | 0.925 |
| Social Influence | 0.831 |
| Facilitating Condition | 0.148 |
| Price Value | 0.741 |
| Personal Innovation | 0.679 |

**Source:  Author's** Computation, (2024).

The findings of the reliability study as presented in tables show that the variables under consideration exhibit various degrees of internal consistency. Performance Expectancy (0.929), Effort Expectancy (0.925), Social Influence (0.831), Price Value (0.741) are high reliability variables with values that are near to 1. Although Personal Innovation (0.679) has a value below the generally agreed lower limit of 0.70 for Cronbach's alpha, it is still considered acceptable based on  agitation of  Hair et al., (2006), who stated that it can decrease to 0.60 and still be acceptable. Therefore, Personal innovativeness is acceptable in this study. Cronbach's alpha value for the Facilitating Conditions factor is 0.148, which is well below the generally accepted lower limit of 0.70. Consequently, it will not be considered in our analysis.

**Correlation Analysis**

**Table 4: Correlation matrix**

| | PE | EE | SI | PV | PI |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PE | 1 | | | | |
| EE | .838** | 1 | | | |
| SI | .772** | .701** | 1 | | |
| PV | .761** | .746** | .761** | 1 | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PI | .497** | .506** | .587** | .546** | 1 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

**Source: Author's** Computation, (2024).

Based on the values in the correlation matrix presented Table 4, The correlation coefficients range from .497 to .838, such that the highest correlation coefficient is between PE and EE, SI and PV (.838, 0.772 and 0.801). This indicates that there is correlations between the dependent and independent variables and they all had positive linear associations that were significant at 0.01 (p<0.01).

**Multiple regressions analysis**

Analysis in Table 5 showed the regression model summary, it was observed that the R Square ($R^2$) value is 0.692, which means that 69.2% change in online examination behavioural intention toward acceptance and adoption due to changes in the PE, EE, PV, PI and SI. The result of multiple regression model presented in table 5b further in indicate a unit increase in all the identify variables such as PE, EE, PV, PI and SI increase adoption of online examination practice by 0.4, 0.1, 0.1, 0.8, 0.1, and 0.1 respectively, this indicate that all the independent variables incorporated into the model were significantly related to online examination practice.

**Table 5a: Regression model summary**

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | .832a | 0.692 | 0.680 | 0.77629 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Personal Innovativeness, Performance Expectancy, Social Influence, Price Value, Effort Expectancy

**Source: Author's** Computation, (2024).

**Table 5b: Regression model**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | T | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 0.355 | 0.166 | | 2.141 | 0.034 |
| | Performance Expectancy | 0.113 | 0.038 | 0.270 | 3.015 | 0.003 |
| | Effort Expectancy | 0.003 | 0.034 | 0.008 | 0.100 | 0.921 |
| | Social Influence | 0.083 | 0.035 | 0.177 | 2.355 | 0.020 |
| | Price Value | 0.124 | 0.067 | 0.142 | 1.844 | 0.067 |
| | Personal Innovativeness | 0.137 | 0.047 | 0.161 | 2.944 | 0.004 |

**Source: Author's** Computation, (2024).

**Stakeholder Perception on relationship between Online Examination Practice and Educational Development.**

The descriptive analysis results presented in Table 6 shows stakeholders perception on relationship between Online Examination Practice and Educational Development in the selected university. The result shows that (71%) of the stakeholders of the selected university in ODL unit were opined that Acceptability of online education practice easy education development. Also, (99%) of the respondent is also of the opinion that distance learning Practice align with the standard of education system. (81.22%) of the stakeholders opined that Academic performance will be better with effective online education practice than the traditional system of Education. These results highlight a strong consensus among stakeholders regarding the positive impact of online education practices on educational development and performance. The high level of agreement suggests that stakeholders recognize the potential of online examination systems to enhance learning outcomes, align with global educational standards, and provide a viable alternative to traditional methods. This underscores the need for universities to invest in and prioritize the development of robust online education infrastructures and policies. Such investments could improve academic performance, foster broader acceptance of online education, and contribute to achieving educational goals in line with international best practices

**Table 6: Analysis of relationship between Online Examination Practice and Educational Development**

| Variable | Strongly agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly disagree | Undecided |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Acceptability of online education practice easy education development | 105(53.3) | 35(17.77) | - | - | 57(28.93) |
| Distance Learning Practice align with the standard of education system | 166(84.27) | 30(15.23) | - | 1(0.51) | - |
| Academic performance will be better with effective online education practice than the traditional system of Education | 92(46.7) | 68(34.52) | 20(10.15) | 17(8.63) | - |

**Source:  Author's** Computation, (2024).

**Test of Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1**, which states that identified determinant variables have no positive influence on online examination adoption in open and distance education in Nigerian sampled universities, was tested using multiple regression analysis. The results, as shown in Table 5, indicate an $R^2$ value of 69.2%. This implies that 69.2% of the variation in online examination behavioral intention toward acceptance and adoption can be attributed to changes in the identified determinant variables, namely Performance Expectancy (PE), Effort Expectancy (EE), Perceived Value (PV), Perceived Interactivity (PI), and Social Influence (SI). Additionally, the analysis demonstrates that a unit increase in each of these variables results in a corresponding increase in the adoption of online examination practices. This finding underscores the significance of these independent variables in influencing online examination adoption. Consequently, the null hypothesis is rejected, confirming that the identified determinant variables have a positive influence on online examination adoption in open and distance education. **The hypothesis 2**, which posits that there is no relationship between the acceptability of online examination practices and educational development, was tested using ANOVA. The results reveal an F-statistic value of 30.078, with a significance level ($p < .001$), as presented in Table 7. The high F-value indicates that the variability between group means is significantly larger than the variability within groups, providing strong evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

**Table 7: Test of Hypotheses 2 Using ANOVA**

|  | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Between Groups | 97.357 | 4 | 24.3393 | 30.078 | .000 |
| Within Groups | 98.826 | 192 | .7065 |  |  |
| Total | 196.183 | 196 |  |  |  |

**Source: Author's** Computation, (2024).

**Discussion of Findings**

The findings reveal that Performance Expectancy (PE), Social Influence (SI), and Personal Innovativeness (PI) significantly influence the adoption of online examination practices in Nigerian universities. Among these factors, Performance Expectancy emerged as the most significant predictor of stakeholders' behavioral intentions toward online examinations. This underscores the perception among stakeholders that online examinations provide an effective, secure, and reliable means of assessing knowledge and skills, contributing to a streamlined and efficient examination process. Furthermore, the study confirms that all the identified determinant variables positively influence the adoption of online examinations in open and distance education settings. These findings align with previous research (Alwahaishi & Snasel, 2013; Shorey et al., 2017), which highlights the importance of these factors in driving the acceptance and implementation of online assessments. The results also demonstrate a significant relationship between the acceptability of online examination practices and

educational development. This implies that adopting online examination practices is positively associated with enhanced educational outcomes, reinforcing the need for uniformity in policies, standards, and practices to ensure effective implementation. The findings align with the perspectives of Yinus et al. (2023) and Suleiman, Salaudeen, and Falode (2017), who emphasized that distance and eLearning practices incorporating online assessments and feedback significantly enhance learners' performance and align with educational standards, outperforming traditional teaching methods.

**Conclusion and Recommendation**

Based on the findings, the study concludes that Performance Expectancy, Social Influence, and Personal Innovativeness are critical determinants of online examination adoption and are positively associated with educational development. These factors play a vital role in fostering the acceptance and successful implementation of online examination practices, ultimately enhancing educational outcomes. Accordingly, it is recommended that Nigerian universities, particularly those embracing distance education, prioritize improving technology infrastructure and investing in capacity building to strengthen online examination systems and practices.

**References**

Akaaboune, O., Blix, L. H., Carrington, L. G., & Henderson, C. D. (2021). Accountability in Distance Learning: The Effect of Remote Proctoring on Performance in Online Accounting Courses. *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting*. https://doi.org/10.2308/jeta-2020-040

Alessio, H. M., Malay, N. J., Maurer, K., Bailer, A. J., & Rubin, B. (2017). Examining the Effect of Proctoring on Online Test Scores. *Online Learning*, *21*(1). https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v21i1.885

Alruwais, N., Wills, G., & Wald, M. (2018). Advantages and challenges of using e-assessment. *International Journal of Information and Education Technology*, *8*(1), 34–37.

Anderson, C., & Gades, P. (2017). *Proctoring exams in an online environment*.

Appiah, M., & Tonder, F. V. (2018). E-Assessment in Higher Education: A Review. *IJBMER*, *9*(6), 1454–1460.

Arend, B. D. (2007). Course assessment practices and student learning strategies in online courses. Journal of Asynchronous Learning Networks, 11(4), 3-17.

Boitshwarelo, B., Reedy, A. K., & Billany, T. (2017). Envisioning the use of online tests in assessing twenty-first century learning: A literature review. *Research and Practice in Technology Enhanced Learning*, *12*(1), 1–16.

Boldyrevskii, P., Vinnik, V., Zalessky, M., Grigoryan, M., & Pravodelova, E. (2022). Evaluation of the effectiveness of the use of digital educational technologies in the educational process of a university. *Human Resource Management within the Framework of Realisation of National Development Goals and Strategic Objectives*. Human resource management within the framework of realisation of national development goals and strategic objectives. https://doi.org/10.56199/dpcsebm.pegw5399

Cherry, G., O'Leary, M., Naumenko, O., Kuan, L.-A., & Waters, L. (2021). Do outcomes from high stakes examinations taken in test centres and via live remote proctoring differ? *Computers and Education Open*, *2*, 100061.

Cho, S.-H., & McCardle, K. F. (2009). The Adoption of Multiple Dependent Technologies. *Operations Research*, *57*(1), 157–169. https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.1080.0534

Çelen, F. K., Çelik, A., & Seferoglu, S. S. (2011). Yükseköğretimde çevrim-içi öğrenme: Sistemde yaşanan sorunlar ve çözüm önerileri. Journal of European Education, 1(1), 25-34.

Conrad, D., & Openo, J. (2018). *Assessment strategies for online learning: Engagement and authenticity*. Edmonton: Athabasca University Press.

Fawns, T., & Schaepkens, S. (2022). A matter of trust: Online proctored exams and the integration of technologies of assessment in medical education. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine*, *34*(4), 444–453.

Gamage, K. A. A., De Silva, E. K., & Gunawardhana, N. (2020). Online Delivery and Assessment during COVID-19: Safeguarding Academic Integrity. *Education Sciences*, *10*(11), 301. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci10110301

Gikandi, J. W., Morrow, D., & Davis, N. E. (2011). Online formative assessment in higher education: A review of the literature. *Computers & Education*, *57*(4), 2333–2351. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2011.06.004

Hair, J., Black, W., Babin, B., Anderson, R., & Tatham, R. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis Prentice Hall Pearson Education*.

Hall, E. A., Spivey, C., Kendrex, H., & Havrda, D. E. (2021). Effects of Remote Proctoring on Composite Exam Performance Among Student Pharmacists. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 8410. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe8410

Heidenreich, S., & Talke, K. (2021). Consequences of mandated usage of innovations in organizations: Developing an innovation decision model of symbolic and forced adoption. *Academy of Marketing Science Review*, *10*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00164-x

Hillier, M., & Fluck, A. (2017). Transforming exams-how IT works for BYOD e-Exams. In H. Partridge, K. Davis, & J. Thomas (eds.), Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Innovation, Practice and Research in the Use of Educational Technologies in Tertiary Education – ASCILITE 2007 (pp. 100-105). University of Southern Queensland. Retrieved 3 January 2021, from https://2017conference.ascilite.org/program/conference-proceedings.

Jonsdottir, A. H., Bjornsdottir, A., & Stefansson, G. (2017). Difference in Learning Among Students Doing Pen-and-Paper Homework Compared to Web-Based Homework in an Introductory Statistics Course. *Journal of Statistics Education*, *25*(1), 12–20. https://doi.org/10.1080/10691898.2017.1291289

Jönsson, A., & Eriksson, U. (2019). Formative Assessment in Higher Education: An Example from Astronomy. In *Handbook of Formative Assessment in the Disciplines*. Routledge.

Keane, T., Linden, T., Hernandez-Martinez, P., & Molnar, A. (2022). University Students' Experiences and Reflections of Technology in Their Transition to Online Learning during the Global Pandemic. *Education Sciences*, *12*(7), 453. https://doi.org/10.3390/educsci12070453

Kharbat, F. F., & Abu-Daabes, A. S. (2021). E-proctored exams during the COVID-19 pandemic: A close understanding. *Education and Information Technologies*, *26*(6), 6589–6605.

Keskin, Ö. G. K., & Güneş, A. (2015). Online sınav sistemlerinde güvenlik sorunları ve güvenli online sınav giriş uygulaması. Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi, 4(4), 48-54.

Kawachi, P. (2003). Initiating intrinsic motivation in online education: Review of the current state of the art. Interactive Learning Environments, 11(1), 59-81.

Mari State University, Fedorova, S. N., Golikova, N. D., & Mari State University. (2022). Digital competence of the educational process parties. *Vektor Nauki Tol'yattinskogo Gosudarstvennogo Universiteta. Seriya Pedagogika i Psihologiya*, 2, 36–42. https://doi.org/10.18323/2221-5662-2022-2-36-42

Marchalot, A., Dureuil, B., Veber, B., Fellahi, J. L., Hanouz, J. L., et al. (2017). Effectiveness of blended learning in comparison with traditional teaching: A study on first-year medical residents. *Journal of Education and Training*, 4(2), 120-133.

Mayhew, E. (2018). Implementing electronic management of assessment: Four key barriers faced by higher education providers moving to online submission and feedback. *Research in Learning Technology*, *26*. https://doi.org/10.25304/rlt.v26.2083

Nangawe, A. G. (2015). Adoption of web-based assessment in higher learning institutions (HLIs). *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, *7*(1), 113–122. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-03-2014-0036

Ndibalema, P. (2021). Online Assessment in the Era of Digital Natives in Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, *4*(3), Article 3. https://doi.org/10.46328/ijte.89

Ocak, G., & Karakuş, G. (2021). Undergraduate students' views of and difficulties in online exams during the COVID-19 pandemic. Themes in eLearning, 14, 13-30.

Okocha, F.O., Eyiolorunshe, T. & Oguntayo, S. (2017): Student Acceptance of Blended Learning In Nigeria Advances in Multidisciplinary & Scientific Research Journal. Vol. 3. No.1, Pp 43-50

Paredes, S. G., de Jesús Jasso Peña, F., & de La Fuente Alcazar, J. M. (2021). Remote proctored exams: Integrity assurance in online education? *Distance Education*, *42*(2), 200–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/01587919.2021.1910495

Ryznar, M. (2020). Giving an online exam. Indiana University Robert H. McKinney School of Law Research Paper No. 2020- 16, Retrieved 3 January, from https://ssrn.com/abstract=3684958.

Smith, E., Clarke, L., Carmona, P., & Cerimagic, S. (2017). Academic fraudulence in online degrees and exams at Australian universities. International Journal of Research and Development Organization, 3(2), February 2017

Shorey, S., Kowitlawakul, Y., Devi, M. K., & Chen, H. (2017). Blended learning's impact on nursing students' self-efficacy, satisfaction, and attitudes towards communication skills. *Nurse Education Today*, 57, 50-54.

Suleiman, A., Salaudeen, A., & Falode, O. C. (2017). Effects of computer-based blended learning strategy on secondary school chemistry students' retention in collaborative and individualized settings. *Journal of Educational Technology & Innovation*, 10(3), 45-58

Tanyıldızı, M., & Semerci, Ç. (2005). Çevrimiçi eğitim uygulamalarına ilişkin öğretim elemanı ve öğrenci görüşlerinin belirlenmesi. Türk Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi, 3(2), 192-216.

Torkul, O., Kibar, A., & Tasci, T. (2004). Web tabanlı sınav sistemleri [Web Based Examination Systems], Paper presented at the 1st International Conference on Informatics, Çeşme, Turkey.

Tufekci, A., Ekinci, H., & Kose, U. (2013). Development of an internet-based exam system for mobile environments and evaluation of its usability. Mevlana International Journal of Education, 3(4), 57-74.

Tello, S. F. (2007). An analysis of student persistence in online education. International Journal of Information and Communication Technology Education, 3(3), 47–62.

Williamson, M. H. (2018). Online exams: The need for best practices and overcoming challenges. The Journal of Public and Professional Sociology, 10(1), Art. 2.

White, R. J., & Hammer, C. A. (2000). Quiz-o-Matic: A free Web-based tool for construction of self-scoring on-line quizzes. Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers, 32(2), 250-253.

Yinus S .O, Oyedeji. Y.O and Arulogun, O.T (2023) Learners Perception and Attitude toward Blended learning Practice : Experience from Ladoke Akintola University of Technology .Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR), Volume 10 (9).