

STAFF AND STUDENTS RESPONSES TO UNIVERSITY MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES FOR PREVENTING UNETHICAL BEHAVIOURS, CORRUPT PRACTICES, GENDER AND RELIGIOUS DISCRIMINATION: IMPLICATIONS TO MENTAL HEALTH

Kazeem Ibrahim AMINU (Ph.D)
*Department of Educational Foundations,
Faculty of Education, National Open University of Nigeria,
University Village, Jabi, Abuja Nigeria.*

Ekundayo Fehintola OCHOLI (Ph.D)
*Department of Guidance and Counselling,
Faculty of Education,
University of Abuja.*

Abstract

This study investigates staff and students' responses to university management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations with implications on mental health. The study used an ex-post facto descriptive survey design. The population consisted of three thousand (3,000) staff and one hundred thousand (100,000) of Open and Distance University system. Random sampling technique was used to select 360 samples of staff and students. A scale created by the researchers was used to collect data. titled: "Preventing University Unethical Behaviours, Corrupt Practices, Gender and Religious Discrimination Scale. The scale was validated through the use of face and content validity and test re-test reliability with reliability coefficient of 0.97. Statistical mean and t-test statistic at $P \leq 0.05$ were utilized to examine the information gathered. Among the findings of the study were that staff and students agreed on the availability of management strategies in the university, a significant difference between staff and students' responses on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination given a high profile in the university. The study recommended that equal protection should be given to both staff and students irrespective of gender and religious affiliation, overt and covert university strategies should be created for identifying all forms of unethical behaviours corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination with continuous and timely review of existing university management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations

Keywords: University management strategies, unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations

Introduction

Human organizations and institutions usually have set of rules and regulation to which members are expected to adhere to in their intection and socialization processes (UN General Assembly. 2015). In similar view, universities are expected to have rules and regulations that regulate and protect individual from behavioural exploitation in terms of practices, gender and religious association developed for staff, students and other university stakeholders toward achieving institutional goals,

missions and objectives. Universities with laid down rules and regulations are also expected to have effective and timely strategies for management of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination within the system and structures. That is, among individual such as staff and students belonging to or benefitting from such universities. Therefore, university management strategies can be describing as administrative decisions, policy, rules and regulations applied by the management of the university towards preventing and protecting staff and students' unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination (Nurul, Hasnah & Ishak, 2018).

From a wider perspective, university managerial strategies form part of laws of the university condition of service and student's expected behaviour usually printed handbook form. Although, in Nigeria, the strategies of ensuring ethical behaviours, non-corrupt practices, gender friendly and freedom of religious association can be described as regulations derived from the Nigeria constitution, which is the supreme law of Nigeria (FRN, 1999, amended 2018). In a normal situation, learning environment are expected to be free from any unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations.

Research has shown that unethical behaviours have many negatives consequences on university education and among universities staff and students. Unethical behaviours may be in form of false research and failure to attribute credit to original source, giving false information in student's recommendation letter, giving higher marks to students without considering the quality of the assignment, come to class late or university management refuse to take action when teaching staff or students use abusive words on staff or peers, abuse of research grant, sex abuse with students or staff, refusal to carry out the administrative work given and not following the universities' rules and regulation (Rossilah, Jihad & Maalinee, 2019; Nurul, Hasnah & Ishak, 2018; Ben, Hans, Frans & Don, 2018).

Transparency International, which was quoted by Ben, Hans, Frans, and Don (2018), found that the perception of corrupt practices in the Middle East was particularly high, with 70% of respondents in that region describing their country's educational institutions as either corrupt or extremely corrupt. For instance, students in Georgia buy their admissions, grades, and degrees. Students in Bosnia and Herzegovina pay bribes in order to pass exams, purchase required textbooks written by professors, and buy and sell diplomas. Following further discovery by Transparency International still cited in Ben, Hans, Frans and Don, in the United State, according to several research papers that were discovered to have the same content and a six-year duration of significant duplication, fabrication, falsification, and plagiarism, unethical behaviors and corrupt practices led to the resignation of three people, including a faculty administrator, a dismissal, and a retirement.

In Nigeria, many staff and students including university administrators were reported to involve in corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination (Transparency International, 2021). Other reviews such as Rossilah, Jihad & Maalinee (2019), It was discovered that moral philosophies and subjective norms had positive and significant influence on intentions for unethical behavior, and that a student's status at their university may help to explain those intentions. Ofojebe, (2018) reported prevalence of unethical practices that influence the effective management of Colleges of Education in Delta State, Mohammed (2014) suggests that high and rising corrupt practices decreases access to schooling and observed that a unit increase in corruption reduces enrollment rates by almost 10 percentage points. However, Sergio (2006) observes some common characteristics of corrupt practices in education to include public officials overpaying for educational materials in exchange

for bribes; the reproduction of inequalities in the distribution of educational opportunities by determining who gets access to educational services and finally, the dissemination of practices and values among students.

Daisy (2011) reported that academic corruption, a form of corrupt practices was prevalent, especially among male lecturers, and that it involves parents, students, lecturers and administrators. The survey revealed that students' poor study habits (68.8%) and inadequate entry qualifications were the main reasons of academic corruption (66 percent). It further demonstrated that the consequences of this corruption include slow graduate integration into the labor market (91.5%) and subpar university graduates (87 percent). Sakiemi (2015) discovered that higher education institutions are not only ill-equipped to deal with higher education student corruption but actually drive the phenomenon and sometimes without readiness from the university management to apply or develop strategies that will prevent or stop cases of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations.

In a related finding by CMIU4: According to the Anti-Corruption Resource Centre (2019), fraud and unethical behavior in higher education are a global scourge that prevents the development of human capital. This includes everything from political control of universities to preferential admissions, financial mismanagement, academic dishonesty, and sextortion. In Joseph (2015), two major types of university corruptions were identified and they include, administrative and academic that manifested in admissions process, procurement, leadership influence in recruitment, promotions/appointment, academic dishonesty, cheating, leaking examination papers, plagiarism, favoritism and many more.

Gender discrimination in universities, Daniel, Adewale, Adeniji & Olumuyiwa, (2014) recorded that managerial roles based on gender discrimination against women in government universities in Lagos State have affected employee job performance negatively. Similarly, Shauka, Siddiquah & Pell (2014) submitted that gender disparity is a worldwide phenomenon with respect to opportunities, resources and rewards, and exists in all regions and classes as well as in the field of education as males represent the majority of the faculty of higher education institutes across the globe, managerial positions held by males, who not only have more decision making power but also have more opportunities of social networking and concluded that gender contributes only in decision making, where females tend to be excluded. Furthermore, Farhan, Kanwal, Saifullah & AbdulJabbar (2020) revealed that any kind of Gender discrimination has a direct impact on how well employees perform.

To prove the positive role of freedom of religion among staff and students in any given university, Ana (2014) proved that when staff and students are allowed to practice their choice of faith positive self-esteem are developed, serves as a source of strength and hope, greater satisfaction with life and spiritual well-being and increase the capacity for forgiveness, promote and provide emotional, social and prosocial values. Other benefits of allowing staff and students to be religiously free includes, positive psychological health, decrease depression, anxiety, and these contribute to a better adaptation. Mienah, Mand, Oishee, Kevin, Jacqueline, Anne, Yin and Naomi (2021) reported that 27% of students interviewed reported experiences of direct total religious discrimination with higher levels being reported by students identifying as a religious minority with strong evidence of experiences of religious discrimination which linked to all measures of socioemotional adjustment and sleep outcomes.

The Equality Act of 2010 by the Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010) states that discrimination based on one's religion or philosophical beliefs is prohibited, as is discrimination based on someone else's perception of one's religion or belief. It also prohibits discrimination based on one's relationship to someone who practices a religion or holds a particular belief (this is known as discrimination by association). In a comprehensive study by Paul, Tristram and Nicki (2011) on religion and belief in higher education using staff and students' experiences, it was reported that majority of students reported themselves satisfied with both the content and the teaching of their courses; dietary matters, most staff and students have no dietary requirements related to their religion or belief, and are satisfied with provision at their institution with few staff and students for whom the availability of appropriate catering is an issue.

In universities where staff and students right to freedom of association such as religion, Folami, & Musolihu (2020) revealed that many religious identities have been denied of university admission, securing job opportunities, professing religion of their choice, finding it difficult to receive health care services, denied of equal rights of citizens, get political appointments, among others. Rachel, Deidra, Denise & Elaine, C.E. (2022) in an in-depth interview with Jewish, Christian, Muslim and nonreligious groups identified several perceived discriminations in form of verbal microaggressions, stereotyping, social exclusion around religious symbols and celebrations. The authors also discovered that while Muslims, Jews, and nonreligious people tend to link perceived discrimination to group-based stereotypes and describe a sense of being seen as religiously foreign or other, Christians tend to link perceived discrimination to personal piety or taking a moral stand in the workplace. According to Zoua, Feng, and Katharine (2018), the consequences of several significant life events, such widowhood and unemployment, are comparable to the negative impact of religious discrimination on life satisfaction.

Following the above positive and negative influences of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations in many institutions of learning, it is therefore necessary to investigate the responses of staff and students to university managerial strategies for preventing unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination by drawing Implications to Mental Health

Statement of the Problem

Unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination are strong obstacles to university staff and students' interpersonal relation, effective learning and achievement of university goals. From the researchers' personal experiences, many forms of unethical behaviours and corrupt practices can be linked to gender and religious discrimination; as gender and religious discriminations have a disproportionate impact on certain groups and as discrimination may prevent university strategies or procedures for fighting corruption, while corruption may obstruct staff and students exposed to discrimination from accessing justice.

In more available cases, strategies for prevention and management of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination are theoretically available in some universities but not in practice and in some cases, the strategies are developed by universities when cases of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination are reported by staff or students. However, there is need to find out from staff and students in an open and distance learning university if the management have in place developed strategies for prevention and management of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination. In addition, the extent to which

these strategies are given high profile (applicability of the strategies) when cases of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination are reported or experienced by staff or students. More importantly, investigating the presence and applicability of management strategies for prevention of unethical, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations in a single mode open and distance learning university in Nigeria faced with complex structure in terms of administrative policies of resources and human with over one hundred (100) study centres across thirty-six states in all the six geo-political zones of Nigeria with over one hundred (100,000) and estimate of three thousand (3,000) students (NOUN Study Centre, 2022) calls for more concern and attention.

Research Objectives

The following research objectives were stated to guide this study:

1. To find out from staff and students if there are management strategies for prevention and management of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations in the university.
2. To find out from staff and students the extent to which management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours have been given a high profile in the university.
3. To find out from staff and students the extent to which management strategies for prevention of corrupt practices have been given a high profile in the university.
4. To find out from staff and students the extent to which management strategies for prevention of gender discrimination have been given a high profile in the university.
5. To find out from staff and students the extent to which management strategies for prevention of religious discrimination have been given a high profile in the university.

Research Questions

The following research questions were posed to guide this study:

1. Are there management strategies for prevention and management of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations?
2. What is the extent to which management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours given a high profile among staff and students of the university?
3. What is the extent to which management strategies for prevention of corrupt practices given a high profile among staff and students of the university?
4. What is the extent to which management strategies for prevention of gender discrimination given a high profile among staff and students of the university?
5. What is the extent to which management strategies for prevention of religious discrimination given a high profile among staff and students of the university?

Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance.

1. There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours given a high profile in the university.
2. There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of corrupt practices given a high profile in the university.

3. There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of gender discrimination given a high profile in the university.
4. There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of religious discrimination given a high profile in the university.

Methodology

Research Design

Ex post facto descriptive survey methodology was used in this investigation. Nuhu and Salman (2022), Ex-facto design examines the degree of relationships between two or more variables, but not causal relationships. Four independent variables unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender discrimination and religion discrimination and one dependent variable, university managerial strategies were measured by the aggregate score of each staff and student (respondent) on the Preventing University Unethical Behaviours, Corrupt Practices, Gender and Religious Discriminations Scale (PUUBCPGRDS).

Population of the Study

A total of 100,000 students and 3,000 staff members from the National Open University of Nigeria, the sole open and distant learning institution in Nigeria, are projected to be involved in the study. The University's main campus is in Abuja, and there are more than 100 Study Centers dispersed throughout Nigeria's 36 states and six geopolitical zones.

Sample Size and Sampling Technique

From the population, total of three hundred and sixty (360) were used in the study. One hundred and eighty (180) staff and one hundred and eighty (180) students. Female staff, ninety (90), Male staff, ninety (90), Female students, ninety (90) and Male students, ninety (90) formed the sample size. Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for determining sample size from a given population was used in projecting the number of samples. Purposive sampling techniques was used.

Instrument for Data Collection

The researcher developed a scale that was used to collect data for the study. The scale's items were taken from a literature review on unethical behavior, corrupt behavior, gender discrimination, and religion discrimination in higher education institutions, and they were modified accordingly. The scale was created to provide answers to the issues posed in this study endeavor and had items that were framed in the reverse form. The modified Likert scale, which measures responses on a four-point scale of Strongly Agreed (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagreed, served as the basis for all scale items (SD). These were rated on a scale of 1 (strongly agree), 2 (agree), 3 (disagree), and 4 (not at all agree) (strongly disagree).

Validity of the Instrument

Three experts from the Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, National Open University of Nigeria determined the validity of the data collection tool, Preventing University Unethical Behaviours, Corrupt Practices, Gender and Religious Discriminations Scale (PUUBCPGRDS), by taking the scale at face value and determining its suitability for measuring what was studied. They also determined the contents; they checked the extent to which the items on the scale were representative of the contents and the behaviours specified by the theoretical concepts

being measured. This implies that face and content validation were done.

Reliability of the Instrument

For the reliability of Preventing University Unethical Behaviours, Corrupt Practices, Gender and Religious Discrimination Scale (PUUBCPGRDS), A pilot study that involved twenty-five (25) staff and twenty-five (25) students given a total of fifty (50) traditional/convention university staff and students in Abuja metropolis involved in the pilot study. After the third week following the initial dosage, a reliability coefficient for tests repeated was found to be 0.97. The result indicated a significant correlation at 0.01 level (2 tailed). Therefore, the above reliability coefficient was considered adequate and adjudged appropriate for the study.

Procedure for Data Collection

The researchers manually obtained the data for the pilot study, but they completed and collected the actual data for the study using both online and manual methods. The National Open University of Nigeria's Media unit provided the researchers with assistance in the efficient management of the online portion of the data collecting. All these processes were to ensure comprehensive coverage and participation of the entire staff and students of the study University.

Data Analysis

Frequency counts, statistical means, standard deviation, and t-test for independent samples were all used in the study.

Results

Question One: Are there management strategies for prevention and management of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations?

Table 1: Staff and Students Responses on Management Strategies for prevention and management of Unethical Behaviours, Corrupt practices, Gender and Religious Discriminations

S/N	Item	\bar{X}	SD	Decision
1.	Staff Response on Unethical Behaviours	2.70	.90	Agreed
2.	Students Response on Unethical Behaviours	2.70	.85	Agreed
3.	Staff Response on Corrupt Practices	2.88	.84	Agreed
4.	Students Response on Corrupt Practices	2.70	.82	Agreed
5.	Staff Response on Gender Discrimination	2.89	.91	Agreed
6.	Students Response on Gender Discrimination	2.65	.88	Agreed
7.	Staff Response on Religious Discrimination	2.92	.68	Agreed
8.	Students Response on Religious Discrimination	2.61	.89	Agreed

Hypothesis One: There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours given a high profile in the university.

Table 1: t – Test Analysis of Difference between Staff and Students Responses on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours given a high profile in the university (N=360)

Variables	N	\bar{X}	SD	df	t-Cal	t-table
Staff Reponses	180	22.50	8.11	358	4.699	2.101
Students Responses	180	18.89	6.99			

Table 1 above shows that t – cal., 4.699 and t - table, 2.101 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant difference between staff and students' responses on given a high profile to the university management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours. Staff responses in regards to the extent which university gives high profile to managerial strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours is more favorable than the responses of the students.

Hypothesis Two: There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of corrupt practices given a high profile in the university.

Table 2: t – Test Analysis of Difference between Staff and Students Responses on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of Corrupt Practices given a high profile in the university (N=360)

Variables	N	\bar{X}	SD	df	t-Cal	t-table
Staff Responses	180	38.84	15.68	358	2.905	2.101
Students Responses	180	32.78	18.07			

Table 2 shows that t – cal. 2.905 and t – table, 2.101 at 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is therefore disproved. The opinions of employees and students on giving the university administration tactics for preventing corrupt activities a high profile varies significantly. Staff responses are more positive than student reactions when it comes to how much prominence the university provides administrative strategies for preventing dishonest practices.

Hypothesis 3: There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of gender discrimination given a high profile in the university.

Table 3: t – Test Analysis of Difference between Staff and Students Responses on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of gender discrimination given a high profile in the university (N=360)

Variables	N	\bar{X}	SD	df	t-Cal	t-table
Staff Responses	180	40.00	14.029	358	0.737	2.101
Students Responses	180	36.79	19.910			

Table 3 shows that t – cal. 0.737 and t – table, 2.101 at 0.05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is therefore accepted. Responses from faculty, staff, and students are all in agreement that the university management initiatives for combating gender discrimination should be given prominent visibility. Staff responses are more positive than student responses when it comes to how much prominence the university pays to management initiatives for preventing gender discrimination.

Hypothesis 4: There is no significant difference between staff and students on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of religious discrimination given a high profile in the university.

Table 4: t – Test Analysis of Difference between Staff and Students Responses on the extent to which management strategies for prevention of religious discrimination given a high profile in the university (N=360)

Variables	N	\bar{X}	SD	df	t-Cal	t-table
Staff Responses	180	21.14	2.82	258	0.270	2.101
Students Responses	180	21.22	2.32			

Table 4 shows that t – cal. 0.270 and t – table, 2.101 at 0.05 level of significance. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted. There is no significant difference between staff and students' responses on given a high profile to the university management strategies for prevention of religious discrimination. Staff responses in regards to the extent which university gives high profile to management strategies for prevention of religious discrimination is more favorable than the responses of the students.

Discussion of Findings

Finding on research question one shows that staff and students' responses on given high profile to the university management strategies for prevention of unethical behaviour differs as indicated in the statistical mean of the two groups (22.50 > 18.89) and the research hypothesis one proved the difference indicated in the t-test analysis ((t – cal., 4.699 and t - table, 2.101) at 0.05 level of significance. The difference recorded between staff and students on given high profile to the university managerial strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours was in line with Rossilah, Jihad and Maalinee (2019); Nurul, Hasnah and Ishak (2018); Ben, Hans, Frans and Don (2018) in which university unethical behaviours varies based on gender, level of experience and status.

The difference also confirms the report of Transparency International cited in Ben, Hans, Frans and Don (2018) that level of respondents such as students, teaching and non-teaching staff experiences of university unethical behaviours varies across individual, institutions and locations and this may influence their responses and satisfaction to strategies and mechanisms put in place for prevention of unethical behaviours within the university environment. The differences identified between staff and students' responses on given high profile to university managerial strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours supported Ofojebe, (2018) that reported that there are numerous unethical behaviors that affect how effectively Delta State's colleges of education are managed.

Finding on research question two shows that staff and students' responses on given high profile to the university managerial strategies for prevention of corrupt practices also differs as indicated in the statistical mean of the two groups (38.84 > 32.78) and the research hypothesis two proved the difference indicated in the t-test analysis (t – cal. 2.905 and t – table, 2.101) at 0.05 level of significance. This finding seems related to the findings of Ofojebe, (2018) and Rossilah, Jihad and Maalinee (2019) based on the influences of moral philosophies and subjective norm that exert positive and significant effects on corrupt practices and unethical behaviour intention in terms of university staff status and student's intentions towards discriminations. This finding looks similar to the finding of Daisy (2011) that academic corruption, a form of practices was prevalent, particularly with male lecturers. Following the analysis of staff and students' responses in the study, the differences in response supported the finding of Sakiemi (2015) that higher education institutions are not only ill-equipped to deal with higher education student and staff corruption but actually drive

the phenomenon. In a related findings by CMIU4: Anti-Corruption Resource Centre (2019) reported that corruption and fraud in higher education is a global scourge that hinders human capital formation.

Analysis of the third research question shows that staff and students' responses on given high profile to the university managerial strategies for prevention of gender discrimination also differs as indicated in the statistical mean of the two groups ($40.00 > 36.79$) and the research hypothesis three proved the difference indicated in the t-test analysis ($t - \text{cal. } 0.737$ and $t - \text{table, } 2.101$) at 0.05 level of significance. This finding was in line with the finding of Daniel, Adewale, Adeniji and Olumuyiwa, (2014) that reported respondents agreeing that managerial roles based on gender discrimination against women in government universities in Lagos State and similarly, Shauka, Siddiquah and Pell (2014) respondents reported gender disparity as a worldwide phenomenon with respect to opportunities, resources and rewards. Furthermore, the third finding of this study supported the findings of Farhan, Kanwal, Saifullah and AbdulJabbar (2020) in which respondents reported different kinds of discrimination among genders which directly affects the performance of employees. Mohamed (2014) that reported students and staff high responses on high and rising corruption practices and in Sergio (2006) identified some common characteristics of corrupt practices in education in area of reproduction of inequalities in the distribution of educational opportunities by determining who gets access to educational services and finally, the dissemination of practices and values among students.

The fourth research also indicated that differences existed between staff and students' responses on given high profile to the university managerial strategies for prevention of religious discrimination as indicated in the statistical mean of the two groups ($21.14 < 21.22$) and the research hypothesis four proved the difference shows in the t-test analysis ($t - \text{cal. } 0.270$ and $t - \text{table, } 2.101$) at 0.05 level of significance. This is in line with Ana (2014) which shows that when staff and students are allowed to practices their choice of faith, positive equal feeling of belongingness with positives responses will be developed and also in Mienah, Mand, Oishee, Kevin, Jacqueline, Anne, Yin and Naomi (2021) reported variations of responses in students interviewed on experiences of direct total religious discrimination in their institution. The decision is also consistent with the Equality Act of 2010, which states that you cannot be subjected to discrimination because of your affiliation with a particular religion, your philosophical beliefs, or someone else's perception of your affiliation (a practice known as discrimination by perception), or because you are related to someone who practices a particular religion or holds a particular belief.

The finding also supported Paul, Tristram and Nicki (2011) on religion and belief in higher education using staff and students' experiences, as majority of students reported themselves satisfied with both the content and the teaching of their courses; dietary matters, satisfied with provision at their institution with few staff and students for whom the availability of appropriate catering is an issue. The study finding on given high profile to university managerial strategies for prevention on religion discrimination is in line with Folami, and Musolihu (2020) reported that numerous academic positions and chances have been withheld from numerous religious identities. In another similar finding supported by this study finding is Rachel, Deidra, Denise and Elaine, C.E. (2022) in which it was reported that depth interview with Jewish, Christian, Muslim and nonreligious groups identify several perceived religion discriminations and also Zoua, Feng and Katharine (2018), of how religious prejudice has a similar detrimental impact on life satisfaction as unemployment and widowhood.

Implication of the Study to Staff and Students Mental Health

The burden of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations and related mental health are enormous, underappreciated and under resourced, particularly in the developing nations. The effects of unethical behavior, corrupt behavior, and discrimination based on gender and religion on worker mental health, students and the image of university are profound and must be addressed in efforts to fulfil positive contributions of the university to staff and students' personality and wellbeing: respect for individuals, justice and interpersonal relations. Gender and religious discrimination against or perpetrated by staff or students affects their education, psychological wellbeing, productivity and all these hampers' staff and students' capacity to contribute to the realization of university vision, mission, goals and objectives. Thus, unresolved mental health problems created by unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations contribute to dropout rates among students, staff work absenteeism and non-productivity. Therefore, preventing all forms of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations will require development of up-to-date and review of university managerial strategies, overt and covert mechanisms for identifying all forms of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations in the university system.

Conclusion

The findings indicated that there are university managerial strategies for the prevention of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination in NOUN. However, the direction of the findings revealed that individual or group experiences on the four independent variables (unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discrimination) differs. Differences were recorded following responses of staff and students and on the position that individual occupies in the university. This pattern or direction identified from staff and students' responses suggest treating and investigating individual on their peculiarities, such as, male, female, students, staff, age level, positions and so on. This research is limited in this capacity and calls for investigations that will treat variables and individual on singular basis.

Recommendations

On the basis of the study's findings, the following suggestions were made:

1. At all times, efforts should be made to give equal protection to both staff and students by paying more attention and resolving students and staff complain related to unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations.
2. Overt and covert mechanisms should be created for identifying all forms of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations in the university system.
3. Constant and timely review of existing university managerial strategies for prevention of unethical behaviours, corrupt practices, gender and religious discriminations should be part of university culture.
4. When planning university activities or programmes efforts should be made to take into consideration staff and students' diverse faith or religion inclinations.

References

- Abanobi, C. C. (2017). "Undergraduates' Perception of Unethical Practices Among Lecturers in Higher Institutions in Delta State." *Journal of Educational Research*, <file:///C:/Users/Usher/Downloads/454-Article%20Text-819-1-10-20171230.pdf>
- Ana C. Salgado1a (2014). Review of empirical studies on impact of religion, religiosity and spirituality as protective factors. *Propósitos y Representaciones*.

- <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1135263.pdf>Aminu, K. I. (2010). Psychosocial Determinants of Socially Disapproved Sexual Behaviours and Efficacy of Covert Psychotherapy among Senior Model Secondary School Students in Lagos State. Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Bayero University, Kano, Kano State.
- Aminu, K. I. and Williams, R. A. (2012). Psychosocial determinants of school violent behavior and the efficacy of systematic approach therapy among male students in Kano State. *NJSE: Nigerian Journal of Sociology of Education*. 161-170.
- Aminu, K. I., Nuhu, Z. A. & Salman, N. (2022). Students of Open and Distance Learning University Responses on Examination Misconducts: Implications for Examination Process. *NOUN Journal of Education (NJE)*. 8: 2022. ISSN 2504 – 8945. Published by: Faculty of Education, National Open University of Nigeria, Jabi Abuja.
- [Azhar Aziz](#), [Anitawati Mohd Lokman](#) and [Zawiyah Mohammad](#) (2013). An Empirical Study of Unethical Behavior in a Tertiary Institution in Malaysia. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/301046938_An_Empirical_Study_of_Unethical_Behavior_in_a_Tertiary_Institution_in_Malaysia
- Ben Jongbloed, Hans Vossensteyn, Frans van Vught & Don F. Westerheijden (2018). Transparency in Higher Education: The Emergence of a New Perspective on Higher Education Governance https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-77407-7_27.
- Bystydzienski, N. Thomas, S. Howe, A. Desai, (2017). "The leadership role of college deans and department chairs in academic culture change." *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(12), 2301–2315. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2016.1152464>
- CMIU4: Anti-Corruption Resource Centre (2019). Better understanding of anti-corruption issues and approaches in international development. <https://www.cmi.no/projects/1130-anti-corruption-resource-centre-u4>
- Daisy, Y. (2011). Business and Economic Research. https://www.academia.edu/9632034/Business_and_Economic_Research
- Daniel, E.G., Adewale, O. O., Adeniji, A. A. and Olumuyiwa, A.O. (2014). An Empirical Study of Gender Discrimination and Employee Performance among Academic Staff of Government Universities in Lagos State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Social, Human Science and Engineering* Vol:8 No:1, 2014. <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/32225062.pdf>
- Equality and Human Rights Commission (2010). The Equality Act 2010 says you must not be discriminated against because: <https://www.equalityhumanrights.com/en/advice-and-guidance/religion-or-belief-discrimination>
- Krejcie, V R. and Morgan, W.D. (2016). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities Educational and Psychological Measurement 30, 607-610.
- Far Farhan, A. S, Kanwal, S., Saifullah, S., Abdul Jabbar, D., han, Kanwal, Saifullah and AbdulJabbar (2020). An Empirical Study of Gender Discrimination and Employee Performance among Academic Staff of Government Universities: Evidence from Pakistan. *International Journal of Disaster Recovery and Business Continuity*, pp. 2336–2344. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/344366591_An_Empirical_Study_Of_Gender_Discrimination_And_Employee_Performance_Among_Academic_Staff_Of_Government_Universities_Evidence_From_Pakistan
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). The Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999. Lagos. FGN Press.
- Folami Ahmadu Bolanle & Musolihu Majeed Olayori (2020). Discrimination against Religious Minorities in Nigeria: An Analysis with Reference to Human Development in the 21st Century. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/349203908_Discrimination-

- [against Religious Minorities in Nigeria An Analysis with Reference to Human Development in the 21st Century](#), DOI:10.46600/almilal.v2i2.89
- Hamilton, R.R. (2016). *The Law of public education*. 2nd Ed. Mineola, New York. The Fountain Press.
- Nwagwu, N.A. (1987). *Education and the Law in Nigeria: The rights of teachers and students*. Enugu. Keybeecee Publications Ltd.
- Dhiviya and Paula (2019) identified gender equality within the University of Gävle and Patrician college and those policies and the gender wage gap has a large impact on gender equality.
- Joseph, A-A (2015). An Integrative Review of the Antecedents and Consequences of Lateral Hiring. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2615492
- Krejcie, V R. and Morgan, W.D. (2016). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities *Educational and Psychological Measurement* 30, 607-610.
- Mienah Z. Sharif, Mandy Truong, Oishee Alam, Kevin Dunn, Jacqueline Nelson, Anne Kavanagh, Yin Paradies, and Naomi Priestb, I (2021). The association between experiences of religious discrimination, social-emotional and sleep outcomes among youth in Australia. Published online 2021 Jul 28. doi: 10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100883. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8350065/>
- Mienah, A. K., Mand, T., Oishee A, Kevin, D., Jacqueline, Anne, Yin, P., Francis, K.L. and Naomi, C.P. (2021). Promoting proactive bystander responses to racism and racial discrimination in primary schools: A mixed methods feasibility and acceptability study of the 'Speak Out Against Racism' program. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/346753250_Promoting_proactive_bystander_responses_to_racism_and_racial_discrimination_in_primary_schools_A_mixed_methods_feasibility_and_acceptability_study_of_the_Speak_Out_Against_Racism_program
- Mohamed, D. (2014). "Corruption and Education: Empirical Evidence," *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *Econjournals*, 4(3), <https://ideas.repec.org/a/econ/journ1/2014-03-4.html>
- National Open University of Nigeria (2022). Population of Study Centres. <https://edusportal.com/list-national-open-university-nigerianoun-study-centres-locations/>
- Nurul Khair binti Ishak, Hasnah binti Haron & Ishak bin Ismail (2018). UNETHICAL BEHAVIOUR IN HIGHER LEARNING INSTITUTIONS. NCON-PGR_Proceeding, <https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/227002984.pdf>
- Ofojebe, (2018). Ofojebe, W. N. (2018). Influence Of Unethical Practices On The Effective Management Of Colleges Of Education In Delta State. *UNIZIK Journal of Educational ...* [https://www.google.com/search?q=Ofojebe%2C+\(2018\)&oq=Ofojebe%2C+\(2018\)&aqs=chrome..69i57.6053j0j9&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8](https://www.google.com/search?q=Ofojebe%2C+(2018)&oq=Ofojebe%2C+(2018)&aqs=chrome..69i57.6053j0j9&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8)
- Ogunu, M. (2015). Fundamentals of education law for effective operation of school and how to improve teacher-student relationships. Benin city. Mahogan Publishers.
- Paul G Weller, Tristram Hooley and Nicki Patricia Moore (2011). Religion and Belief in Higher Education: The Experiences of Staff and Students, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279484726_Religion_and_Belief_In_Higher_Education_The_Experiences_of_Staff_And_Students
- Rachel C. Schneider, Deidra Carroll Coleman, Denise Daniels and Elaine, C.E. (2022). How Religious Discrimination is Perceived in the Workplace: Expanding the View. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/23780231211070920>
- Rossilah, Jihad and Maalinee (2019). Antecedents of Unethical Behaviour Intention: Empirical Study: Empirical Study in Public Universities in Malaysian Context. <https://www.google.com/search?q=Rossilah%2C+Jihad+and+Maalinee%2C+2019&oq=>

- Rossilah%2C+Jihad+and+Maalinee%2C+2019&aqs=chrome..69i57j33i16013.6001j0j4&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8 Shauka, S., Siddiquah, A., and Pell, W.A (2014). Gender discrimination in higher Education in Pakistan: A Survey of University Faculty. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, Issue 56*, 2014, 109-126. Educational Research, 56, 109-126. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1060457.pdf>
- Sakiemi A. I-O (2015). Corruption in Higher Education in Nigeria: Prevalence, Structures and Patterns Among Students of Higher Education Institutions in Nigeria. https://books.google.com.ng/books/about/Corruption_in_Higher_Education_in_Nigeri.html?id=AxTkjgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y
- Sergio, C. (2006). Corruption in Education: A Review of the Literature. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/264275109_Corruption_in_Education_A_Review_of_the_Literature
- Shauka, S., Siddiquah, A., and Pell, W.A (2014). Gender discrimination in higher Education in Pakistan: A Survey of University Faculty. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, Issue 56*, 2014, 109-126. Educational Research, 56, 109-126. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1060457.pdf>
- Transparency International (2021). Defying Exclusion: Stories and Insights on the Links Between Discrimination and Corruption. <https://www.transparency.org/en/publications/defying-exclusion-corruption-discrimination>
- United Nations General Assembly (2015). Transforming our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. UN General Assembly. 2015. 21 October. UN Doc. A/RES/70/1.
- Wan, C. D. Da, Chapman, S. Hutcheson, M. Lee, A. Austin, A. N. Ahmad (2017). "Changing higher education practice in Malaysia: the conundrum of incentives." *Studies in Higher Education*, 42(11), 2134–2152. <http://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2015.1134475>
- Zoua M. Vang, Feng Hou & Katharine Elder (2018). Perceived Religious Discrimination, Religiosity, and Life Satisfaction. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s10902-018-0032-x>. <https://www.thestar.com.my/news/.../syndicate-producing-fake-qualifications-busted/>. <http://www.thesundaily.my/news/2018/03/08/usm-lecturer-accused-getting-job-fake-cert>