

scoring a very poor mark. They cannot even write. If we desire sanitation of our educational system it does not make sense for anybody to be against the post-UME. If there are other built in mechanisms to purify the admission process it should be a welcome idea." Nigeria has a body that regulates educational qualifying examinations. Four prominent public examination bodies in Nigeria are the Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB), the National Business and Technical Examination Board (NABTEB), the National Examination Council (NECO), and the West African Examination Council (WAEC),

It is mandatory that candidates seeking admission to any of the university in Nigeria, whether federal, state, or private, take and pass the Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (JAMB) Examination before being considered for the Post-University Matriculation Examination screening, conducted by each university before the admission of these who qualify or pass. There are cut off points that will be used to determine the candidate who are qualified to be admitted. However, the Post-Jamb exercises are being conducted and coordinated by the University Admission Committee, who decides the cut-off point on which candidates are admitted to the institution of learning. The methods of standard settings employed by the Universities are unknown to the public. It is on this basis that the study used two method of standard setting to analysis the 2014 Post-UTME score of prospective candidates in the University of Ibadan to set cut off points.

Many candidates who prepared for Post-UTME in Nigeria are not aware of the methods of setting standards being adopted by the Universities of their choice to determine cut off point for admissions, but they only prepare for the examination. A lot of the candidate did not get admitted by the Universities because they failed to pass the institution Post-UTME and this could be as result of them not reaching the cut-off points established by the institution of learning Admission Committee. Because the outcome of assessments is determined by the standard-setting method used and because different methods of setting standards result in different standards, the choice and process of the method used is of utmost importance. The failure to meet the cut-off points might be as a result of the method adopted by the Admission Committee of Universities. This study therefore analyzed the 2014 Post-UTME scores of candidates with two methods of setting standards.

Aim of the present study is to determine and analyse the methods of standard setting being adopted by higher institution for the admission of candidates through Post-UTME. Within the framework of this general aim, answers to the following questions have been sought: 1.What is the agreement between the two standards when used to analyze the candidate scores in Post UTME? 2. What is the pass rates resulting from the application of the two standard setting methods on candidate scores in Post -UTME

METHOD

The study employed expo facto research design of the survey reasech type. This was employed, since the data involved in the study were collected from the source (University Website) without any manipulation involving the use of 2014 Post-UTME scores of candidates in the University of Ibadan. To test the supposed research questions of the proposed framework, the researcher used two method of setting standard, norm-reference method and modified Angolf method. The total population .Simple randon sampling was used to select six hundred and eighty four (648) candidates who choose courses in the Faculty of Education as sample for the study.

Material

Using the two different standard-setting methods, the norm-reference method and modified Angolf method. Two standards were determined. The two methods were compared by their pass rates. In the norm-reference method, the standard was determined by calculating the mean of the scores and standard deviation (SD). The standard was set as the adjusted mean minus 1.0 SD. For the modified Angolf method, the researcher assumed that the Admission Committee of the institution served as the panel of judges who participate in the standard-setting round. A consensus on the definition of a minimally acceptable cut-off point that is borderline candidate was reached.

Data Analyses

Statistical analysis was done using SPSS version 20 to analyse the frequency, percentages, mean and standard deviation of candidates' scores. The pass rates were calculated based on the pass rates scores set for each of the method.

Table 1: Gender Distribution of Candidates

| Gender | Frequency | Percentage (%) |
|--------------|------------|----------------|
| Male | 222 | 34.3 |
| Female | 426 | 66.7 |
| Total | 648 | 100 |

Table 1 revealed that out of the six hundred and forty eight candidate who choose courses of study in education 34.3% were male and 66.7 were female. This indicates that the numbers of prospective female who are interested in becoming teachers and research fellow are more than their male counterpart.

Table 2: Score Distribution of Candidates

| Score | Frequency | Percentage (%) | | | |
|-------|-----------|----------------|----|----|-----|
| 9 | 1 | .2 | 39 | 20 | 3.1 |
| 16 | 1 | .2 | 40 | 17 | 2.6 |
| 18 | 2 | .3 | 41 | 13 | 2.0 |
| 19 | 1 | .2 | 42 | 14 | 2.2 |
| 20 | 1 | .2 | 43 | 20 | 3.1 |
| 21 | 1 | .2 | 44 | 13 | 2.0 |
| 22 | 4 | .6 | 45 | 19 | 2.9 |
| 23 | 2 | .3 | 46 | 35 | 5.4 |
| 24 | 1 | .2 | 48 | 16 | 2.5 |
| 25 | 4 | .6 | 49 | 28 | 4.3 |
| 26 | 4 | .6 | 50 | 29 | 4.5 |
| 27 | 1 | .2 | 51 | 28 | 4.3 |
| 28 | 6 | .9 | 52 | 26 | 4.0 |
| 29 | 1 | .2 | 53 | 18 | 2.8 |
| 30 | 6 | .9 | 54 | 21 | 3.2 |
| 31 | 4 | .6 | 55 | 25 | 3.9 |
| 32 | 6 | .9 | 56 | 29 | 4.5 |
| 33 | 7 | 1.1 | 57 | 29 | 4.5 |
| 34 | 9 | 1.4 | 58 | 15 | 2.3 |
| 35 | 5 | .8 | 59 | 18 | 2.8 |
| 36 | 4 | .6 | 60 | 20 | 3.1 |
| 37 | 11 | 1.7 | 61 | 19 | 2.9 |
| 38 | 13 | 2.0 | 62 | 14 | 2.2 |
| | | | 63 | 10 | 1.5 |
| | | | 64 | 12 | 1.9 |
| | | | 65 | 9 | 1.4 |

| | | | | | |
|----|---|----|-------|-----|-------|
| 66 | 2 | .3 | 72 | 1 | .2 |
| 67 | 6 | .9 | 73 | 3 | .5 |
| 68 | 5 | .8 | 74 | 1 | .2 |
| 69 | 2 | .3 | 75 | 2 | .3 |
| 70 | 3 | .5 | 77 | 1 | .2 |
| 71 | 1 | .2 | Total | 648 | 100.0 |

Table .2 shows the scores of candidate with the mode score of 50,56 and 57 ,This indicates that majority of the candidates scored between 50 and 57.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics of Candidates

| No of Candidates | Minimum score | Maximum Score | Mean Score | Standard Deviation |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------------------|
| 648 | 9 | 77 | 49.38 | 10.78 |

Table 3 shows the mean score of candidate as 49.38 with the standard deviation of 10.78. It also indicates the minimum score of candidate to be 9 and maximum score of candidate to be 77. Using the above result to calculate the norm-reference method of standard-setting we have mean score minus 1 SD. That is $49-10 = 38.6$ approximately 39. The Angolf modified method reached for the cut-off point according to the University Admission Committee was 50.

FINDINGS

Research Question 1: What is the agreement between the two standards when used to analyse the candidate scores in Post UTME?

Table 4: Passing Scores and Rates for the two Methods

| Parameter | Angolf Method | Norm Reference Method |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------------|
| Passing Score | 50 | 39 |
| Passing Rate | 54% | 85% |
| Percentage Agreement | 5% | |

Table 4 revealed that passing rate for Angolf modified to 54% whilst the Norm-reference method was 85%. It also indicates the percentage agreement of the two methods to be 5%.

Research question 2: What is the pass rates resulting from the application of the two standard setting methods on candidate scores in Post -UTME?

Table 5: Percentage of Candidates that Passed and Failed the Post-UTME

| Methods | Pass Rate | Fail Rate |
|-----------------|-----------|-----------|
| Angolf Modified | 54% | 46% |
| Norm-reference | 85% | 15% |

Table 5 under the Angolf modified method revealed that the percentage of candidates that passed the Post-UTME was 54% and 46% failed the examination. Also, under the Norm-reference, the percentage of candidates that passed the Post-UTME was 85% and 15% failed the examination.

RESULT, DISCUSSION, AND SUGGESTIONS

The results of the study revealed that there was very little agreement between the two methods used to determine the cut-off point. The pass rate was found to be 54% with the Angolf modified method, whilst by the norm-reference method was 85%. Thus, these two different standard of settings yielded different standards and the percentage agreement between the two methods was 5%. It shows that the best method of setting cut-off point was the Angolf method. This finding is similar to the reported study (Elfaki and Salih, 2015) when two methods of standard-setting in a medical students MQC exam in internal medicine were compared and found them to be significantly different with failure rates of 61% and 12% respectively.

Also, Verhoeven, et al (2002) compared the pass/fail rates derived from the modified Angolf method and norm-reference method (mean minus 1 SD) and found them to be significantly different with failure rates of 56.5% and 10.1% respectively. However, it has been fairly well established that different standard setting methods result in different cut-off points or passing scores, they can be made credible, defensible and acceptable by ensuring the credibility of judges and using a systematic approach. to collect their judgments (Downing, Tekian and Yudikowsky 2006). Similarly, researchers who had worked on methods of standard settings have not agreed on the most appropriate number of judges, but they all agreed that larger numbers of judges might yield more valid and reliable results.

The findings of this study made the researcher to conclude that percentage agreement of the pass rates by the two methods is very low and this means that the methods are significantly different. Also the research support and recommend the use of Angolf modified method to determine Post-UTME cut-off points by the Universities.

REFERENCES

- Ado, A.B (2015) .*Analysis of UTME and Post-UTME scores of Education students at Northwest University Kano-Nigeria*. Paper delivered at a Conference: 1st International Conference On Education, Beijing China 2015, At Beijing China
- Amatareotubo, M. (2006). Post-UME screening: Matters arising. Posted to the Web: 8/30/2006
- Angoff WA. (1971). *Educational Measurement*. Washington DC:American Council on Education;
- Elfaki, O.M and Salih K,M,A (2015). Comparison of Two Standard Setting Methods in a Medical Students MCQ Exam in Internal Medicine. *American Journal of Medicine and Medical*. 5(4): 167 DOI; 10.5923i).ajmms.20150504.04
- Kane M. (2003). Validating the performance standards associated with passing scores. *Rev Educ Res.*,64:425–61. doi: 10.2307/1170678.
- Norcini J.J. (2003). Setting standards on educational tests. *Medical Education*,37:464–469. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.01495.x.

- Boursicot K, Roberts T. (2006). Setting standards in a professional higher education course: Defining the concept of the minimally competent student in performance based assessment at the level of graduation from medical school. *Higher Education Quarterly*,60:74–90. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2273.00308.x.
- Case SM, Swanson DB. (1998).Constructing written test questions for the basic and clinical sciences. Philadelphia: National Board of Medical Examiners;
- Cusimano M. (1996). Standard-setting in medical education. *Acad Med.*;71:112–120. doi: 10.1097/00001888-199610000-00062.
- Downing SM, Tekian A, Yudkowsky R. (2006). Procedures for establishing defensible absolute passing scores on performance examinations in health professions education. *Teaching and Learning in Medicine.*;18:50–57. doi: 10.1207/s15328015tlm1801_11.
- Kilminster S, Roberts T.(2004) Standard setting for OSCEs: Trial of borderline approach. *Advances in Health Sciences Education.* 2004;9:201–209. doi: 10.1023/B:AHSE.0000038208.06099.9a.
- Impara JC. (1997).*Setting standards using Angoff's method: Does the method meet the standard?* Invited address to Division D of the Midwestern Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Impara JC, Plake BS. (1998).Teachers' ability to estimate item difficulty: A test of the assumptions in the Angoff standard setting method. *Journal of Educational Measurement*, 35:69–81. doi: 10.1111/j.1745-3984.1998.tb00528.x.
- Isaac O.B.(2010). *Post-UME Screening Examination in Nigerian Universities: The University of Education, Ikeri-Ekiti (Tunedik) Experience.* Library Philosophy and Practise
- National Research Council (1999). *Setting reasonable and useful performance standards.* In: Pelligrino JW, Jones LR, Mitchellw KJ, editor. *Grading the Nation's report card: Evaluating NAEP and transforming the assessment of educational progress.* Washington, DC: National Academy Press; pp. 164–184.
- Olayemi, I. K. &Oyelekan, O. S (2009). Analysis of Matriculation and Post-Matriculation Examination Scores of Biological Science Students of Federal University of Technology, Minna Nigeria.*Ilorin Journal of Education*, 28 pp.11-18
- Oyedele, A. (2008). *Post-UME should not be scrapped-UNAD VC.* *The Punch* (December 30): 41.
- Searle J. (2000). Defining competency-the role of standard setting. *Medical Education.*;34:363– 366. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.2000.00690.x.
- Talente G, Haist SA, Wilson JF. (2003). A model for setting performance standards for standardised patient examinations. *Evaluation and the Health Professions*, 26:427–446. doi: 10.1177/0163278703258105.
- Ume, T. A. (1979). "Centralization of University Co-ordination in Nigeria. Environmental Analysis". *African Journal of Educational Research*, 2(2), 41-56. Busa
- Verhoeven BH, Van der Steeg AFW, Scherpbier AJJA, Muijtjens AMM, Verwijnen GM, van der Vleuten CPM. (1999). Reliability and credibility of an Angoff standard setting procedure in progress testing using recent graduates as judges. *Medical education*, 33:832–837. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.1999.00487.x.

Verhoeven BH, Verwijnen GM, Muijtens AMM, Scherpbier AJJA, van der Vleuten CPM. (2002).Panel expertise for an Angoff standard setting procedure in progress testing: item writers compared to recently graduated students. *Medical Education*, 36:860–867. doi: 10.1046/j.1365-2923.2002.01301.x.