



**Perception of Lecturers and Students On Utilization of Summative Assessment in Nursing Training Institutions, South Eastern Nigeria.**

**Perception Des Enseignants Et Des Étudiants Sur L'utilisation De L'évaluation Sommative Dans Les Institutions De Formation Infirmière Au Sud-Est Du Nigeria.**

**Ndie E. C**

Department of Nursing Science, National Open University of Nigeria,  
Plot 91, Cadastral Zone, Nnamdi Azikiwe Expressway Jabi, Abuja.

**Uzoegbo H. C**

Nnamdi Azikiwe University Teaching Hospital, Nnewi  
Anambra State, Nigeria.

**Abstract**

---

*This study was designed to identify the perception of lecturers and students on utilization of summative assessment in nursing training institutions South Eastern, Nigeria. Descriptive survey design was used. Multistage sampling technique was used and six training institutions were randomly selected for the study. 358 students and 82 lecturers were purposively selected to participate in the study. Questionnaire which was validated and pretested with a reliability index of 0.84 respectively was used for data collection. Hypothesis was tested using Mann-Whitney U-test at 0.05. Results show good utilization of SA by Lecturers ( $2.70 \pm 0.44$ ) and good perception of utilization of SA by students ( $2.63 \pm 0.29$ ) in their training institutions. Lecturers perceive SA as being done at the end of course ( $3.35 \pm 0.67$ ), to evaluate academic achievements compared to set standards ( $3.37 \pm 0.55$ ) while students perceive SA as end of semester exams ( $3.20 \pm 0.74$ ), use for promotion ( $3.11 \pm 0.75$ ). In conclusion, there is no significant difference in the perception of the use of SA ( $P=0.919$ ) between lecturers and students, lecturers and students have good perception of SA. Nursing and Midwifery Council of Nigeria should always monitor standards in the use of SA. Heads of departments and/or administrators should motivate subordinates towards maintaining the recording of marks obtained from all SA.*

---

**KEYWORDS:** perception, lecturers, students, continuous assessments, nursing training institutions

## Résumé

*Cette étude a été conçue pour identifier la perception des enseignants et des étudiants sur l'utilisation de l'évaluation sommative (ES) dans les établissements de formation infirmière du sud-est du Nigéria. Un plan d'enquête descriptif a été utilisé. Une technique d'échantillonnage à plusieurs degrés a été employée et six établissements de formation ont été sélectionnés au hasard pour l'étude. 358 étudiants et 82 professeurs ont été sélectionnés à dessein pour participer à l'étude. Un questionnaire validé et prétesté avec un indice de fiabilité de 0,84 respectivement a servi à la collecte des données. L'hypothèse a été testée en utilisant le test U de Mann-Whitney à 0,05. Les résultats montrent une bonne utilisation de l'ES par les enseignants ( $2,70 \pm 0,44$ ) et une bonne perception de l'utilisation de l'ES par les étudiants ( $2,63 \pm 0,29$ ) dans leurs établissements de formation. Les enseignants perçoivent l'ES comme étant effectuée à la fin du cours ( $3,35 \pm 0,67$ ), pour évaluer les résultats académiques par rapport aux normes établies ( $3,37 \pm 0,55$ ) tandis que les étudiants perçoivent l'AS comme des examens de fin de semestre ( $3,20 \pm 0,74$ ), à utiliser pour le passage en classe supérieure ( $3,11 \pm 0,75$ ). En conclusion, il n'y a pas de différence significative dans la perception de l'utilisation de l'ES ( $P = 0,919$ ) entre les enseignants et les étudiants, les enseignants et les étudiants ont une bonne perception de l'ES. Le Conseil de l'Ordre des infirmiers et des sages-femmes du Nigéria devrait toujours surveiller les normes d'utilisation de l'ES. Les chefs de service et / ou les administrateurs doivent inciter les subordonnés à maintenir l'enregistrement des notes obtenues de toutes les ES.*

**Mots-clés:** perception, enseignants, étudiants, évaluations continues, établissements de formation infirmière

## Introduction

Educational assessment is vital in teaching and learning process and it provides the necessary feedback required in order to evaluate effectively the outcome of educational efforts and objectives. It is in support of this view that Lyons (2012) described assessment as a validation of teaching and learning in planned instructional condition. Educational assessment may generally be used for formative or summative purposes. Summative Assessments are used to evaluate student learning, skill acquisition, and academic achievement at the conclusion of a defined instructional period.

The tests, assignments or projects are used to determine whether students have learned what they were expected to learn. In other words, what makes an assessment “summative” is not the design of the test, assignment, or self-evaluation, per se, but the way it is used—i.e., to determine whether and to what degree students have learned the material they have been taught

(Amanda, 2015). Summative assessments are appropriately used to determine learning progress towards improvement of goals, make course placement decision and for certification, among other possible applications. Summative assessment results are often recorded as scores or grades that are then factored into a student's permanent academic record, whether they end up as grades on a report card or test scores used in the college admission process. While summative assessments are typically a major component of the grading process in most districts, schools and courses, not all assessments considered to be summative are graded (Knight, 2016). Summative assessments are commonly contrasted with formative assessment, which collect detailed information that educators can use to improve instruction and students learning while it's happening. In other words, formative assessment are said to be for learning, while summative assessment are of the learnt.

While most summative assessments are given at the conclusion of an instructional period, some summative assessments can still be used diagnostically. By reviewing this data, teachers may be able to identify students more likely to struggle academically in certain subject areas or with certain concepts. In addition, students may be allowed to take some summative tests multiple times, and teachers might use the results to help prepare students for future administrations of the test (Coffey, 2015).

Nurse educators need to be aware of the paramount role of summative assessment in promoting students learning. Consequently, examinations within nursing schools need to be closely matched to the desired learning outcomes. Shifting resources from costly teaching formats to implementing innovation and designing more high quality summative examinations is needed. According to Joughin (2010) in a descriptive survey to determine the perception of summative assessment and learning in a higher education. Students perceived summative assessment as one of the most important aspect of teaching and learning. Harlen, (2008) in his descriptive survey research concerns the use of assessment for learning (formative assessment) and assessment of learning (summative assessment), and how one can affect the other in either positive or negative ways. It recommended greater use of summative assessment since summative examinations serve as students' motivation for learning and encourage the teacher to follow the curriculum as well as making effort to cover it. According to Machingambi and Wadesango (2011) in their descriptive survey on university lecturers' perception of students summative evaluation recommended that students' summative evaluation should be merge with other multidimensional evaluation methods so as to increase the validity and reliability in the teaching and learning.

Colbert (2017) in his study recommended that administrators should encourage teachers to uphold the use of Summative since it is reliable in overall assessment of the students' achievements. Since nursing training

institutions are working hard to maintain standard in the profession, there is a need to examine the perceptions and utilization of summative assessment by Lecturers and their students in nursing training Institutions in South Eastern States of Nigeria.

### Research Hypotheses

There is no significant difference in the perception of summative assessment between the students and the lecturers in nursing training institutions South Eastern Nigeria.

### Methods:

Cross sectional descriptive survey design was used for the study. This study was conducted in the South Eastern Nigeria;

There are twenty three (23) federal, state and mission basic nursing training institutions in the South East Nigeria. The total population for students is 3413 and 342 lecturers during the period of data collection.

The sample size was determined using Taro Yamane's formular. This formula is normally used for sample size determination for estimating proportion in a finite population.

$$n = \frac{N}{1 + N(d)^2}$$

n = Sample size

N = Population Size

d = Level of precision (assumed to be 0.05 at 95% confidence level)

Using this formula, the sample size 358 was obtained for students and 82 for lecturer.

Six training institutions were randomly selected form the 24 institutions while the students and lecturers were purposively selected from the six school.

.Section A & B contain item designed to generate data to address the research questions. In both Lecturers and Students questionnaire, Section A contains 11 items that addresses the utilization of summative assessment, Section B that contains 6 items that addresses the perception of summative assessment, all scored on a five point likert type scale ranging from strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree and strongly agree in answering the questions.

The face and content validity were carried out by expert on test construction who made necessary modifications in the items and their input and suggestions were effected.

A pilot test of the items was carried out to establish the reliability of the instrument in Delta State, because they have similar background with the group under study. Split half method was employed to determine the reliability of the instrument using Spearman Brown correlation formula. And it yielded correlation co-efficient of 0.84 which are quite high. The instruments are therefore reliable. Ethical approval for this study was given by the Human Research and Ethics Committee of the six institutions used for the study. Informed consent was also obtained from respondents individually.

The researchers administered the instruments to the lecturers and students who met the inclusion criteria. The data collection lasted for one week. Students responded to their own questionnaire in their classrooms during break period while lecturers filled their own in their offices.

The data generated were collated, tallied and computed descriptively using frequencies, percentages, means and standard deviation. The descriptive analysis was done using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) version 20. The mean and standard deviation of the responses were determined item by item and subscale by subscale. The inferential statistics specifically Mann – Whitney U-test was employed for testing of the hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance because two independent groups (mean) were being compared in a non-parametric statistics.

**Results:**

**Table 1: Lecturers' utilization of summative evaluation in nursing training institutions in South Eastern Nigeria.**

SA Assessment Measures	Strongly Disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly Agree N (%)	Mean Score†	SD
SA is done in my school.	2 (2.4)	7 (8.5)	28 (34.1)	45(54.9)	3.41*	0.75
Only cognitive domain is covered during assessment.	16(19.5)	46(56.1)	14 (17.1)	6 (7.3)	2.12	0.80
Only affective domain is covered during assessment.	24(29.3)	48(58.5)	8 (9.8)	2 (2.4)	1.85	0.68
Only psycho motor domain is covered during assessment.	23(28.0)	41(50.0)	15 (18.3)	3 (3.7)	1.97	0.78
Cognitive, affective and psycho motor domain are covered during assessment	2 (2.4)	10(12.2)	35 (42.7)	35(42.7)	3.25*	0.76
SA is done at the beginning of the semester	14 (17.1)	45 (54.9)	16 (19.5)	7 (8.5)	2.19	0.82
SA is done at the middle of the semester	11(13.4)	45(54.9)	23 (28.0)	3 (3.7)	2.21	0.72
SA is done at the end of the semester	0 (0)	15(18.3)	28 (34.1)	39(47.6)	3.29*	0.76
Projects are used as SA	7 (8.5)	23(28.0)	33 (40.2)	19(23.2)	2.78*	0.90
End of the year exams are given as SA	3 (3.7)	7 (8.5)	35 (42.7)	37(45.1)	3.29*	0.77
Reports are used as SA	13(15.9)	23(28.0)	33 (40.2)	13(15.9)	2.56*	0.94
Total Mean Assessment Score					2.63*	0.29

†Mean assessment score was based on Likert scale of 1-4. Cut off score for utilization of summative assessment method: < 2.5 = Poor utilization; ≥ 2.5 = Good utilization indicated by asterisks (\*). Effectively utilized measure of summative assessment (mean score ≥ 2.5).

The results of lecturers utilization of summative assessment is shown on Table 1. The results show that lecturers mean score utilization of SA in their school is 3.41. The mean score for SA being used for cognitive domain only, affective domain only and psychomotor domain only are 2.12, 1.85 and 1.97 respectively but for the use to assess the three domains, the mean score is 3.25 showing good utilization. Lecturers mean score for having SA done at the beginning of the semester is 2.19, at the middle of the semester is 2.21 and at the end of the semester is 3.29 in form of projects 2.78, end of the year examination 3.29 and reports 2.56. So based on the mean cut off score of ≥ 2.5, the total mean assessment score is (2.63±0.29) which indicated good utilization of summative assessment by the lecturers in nursing training institutions in South Eastern Nigeria.

**Table 2: Students' utilization of summative evaluation in nursing training institutions in South Eastern Nigeria.**

SA Assessment Measures	Strongly Disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly Agree N (%)	Mean Score†	SD
SA is done in my school.	20 (5.6)	58 (16.2)	174(48.6)	106(29.6)	3.02	0.82
Only cognitive domain is covered during assessment.	28 (7.8)	174(48.6)	116(32.4)	40(11.2)	2.46	0.79
Only affective domain is covered during assessment.	37 (10.3)	198(55.3)	95(26.5)	27(7.5)	2.36	1.28
Only psycho motor domain is covered during assessment.	35 (9.8)	181(50.6)	111(31.0)	29(8.1)	2.51	2.04
Cognitive, affective and psycho motor domain are covered during assessment	31 (8.7)	87(24.3)	171(47.8)	69(19.3)	2.77	0.85
SA is done at the beginning of the semester	54 (15.1)	160(44.7)	108(30.2)	36(10.1)	2.35	0.85
SA is done at the middle of the semester	36 (10.1)	147(41.1)	128(35.8)	46(12.8)	2.57	1.41
SA is done at the end of the semester	12 (3.4)	78(21.8)	168(46.9)	100(27.9)	2.99	0.79



Projects are used as SA	27 (7.5)	87(24.3)	154(43.0)	90(25.1)	2.85	0.88
End of the year exams are given as SA	20 (5.6)	63(17.6)	177(49.4)	98(27.4)	2.98	0.82
Reports are used as SA	22 (6.1)	99(27.7)	152(42.5)	85(23.7)	2.84	0.85
Total Mean Assessment Score					2.70*	0.44

†Mean assessment score was based on Likert scale of 1-4. Cut off score for perception of utilization of summative assessment method: < 2.5 = Poor utilization; ≥ 2.5 = Good perception of utilization indicated by asterisks (\*). Effectively utilized measure of summative assessment (mean score ≥ 2.5).

The results of students' utilization of summative assessment is shown on Table 2. The results show that students mean score of utilization of SA in their school is 3.02. The mean score for SA being used for cognitive domain only, affective domain only and psychomotor domain only are 2.46, 2.36 and 2.51 respectively but for the use of SA to assess the three domains, the mean score is 2.77, showing good utilization. Students mean score for having SA done at the beginning of the semester is 2.35, at the middle of the semester is 2.57 and at the end of the semester is 2.99, in form of projects 2.85, end of the year examinations 2.98 and as reports 2.84, Therefore based on the mean cut off score ≥ 2.5, the total mean assessment score is (2.70±0.44) which indicated good perception of utilization of summative assessment by the students in nursing training institution in South Eastern Nigeria

**Table 3. Lecturers' perception of summative assessment evaluation in nursing training institution South Eastern Nigeria.**

	<b>Strongly Disagree</b> N (%)	<b>Disagree</b> N (%)	<b>Agree</b> N (%)	<b>Strongly Agree</b> N (%)	<b>Mean Score</b> †	<b>SD</b>
SA is done at the end of a course	1 (1.2)	6 (7.3)	38 (46.3)	37 (45.1)	3.35*	0.67
SA is used for promotion	0 (0)	15 (18.3)	34 (41.5)	33 (40.2)	3.21*	0.73
SA helps to evaluate academic achievement compared to set standards	0 (0)	3 (3.7)	45 (54.9)	34 (41.5)	3.37*	0.55

SA is used for certification	0 (0)	11 (13.4)	44 (53.7)	27 (32.9)	3.19*	0.65
End of semester exam is a form of summative assessment	1 (1.2)	14 (17.1)	30 (36.6)	37 (45.1)	3.25*	0.78
SA marks can be used in place of CA marks	13 (15.9)	50 (61.0)	15 (18.3)	4 (4.9)	2.12	0.72
Total Mean Assessment Score					3.08*	0.38

†Mean assessment score was based on Likert scale of 1-4. Cut off score for utilization of summative assessment method: < 2.5 = Poor utilization; ≥ 2.5 = Good utilization indicated by asterisks (\*). Effectively utilized measure of summative assessment (mean score ≥ 2.5).

The results of lecturers' perception of summative assessment is shown in Table 3. The results show that lecturers mean score for SA being done at the end of a course is 3.35. The mean score for SA being used for promotion is 3.21, SA help to evaluate academic achievement compared to set standards is 3.37, SA being used for certification 3.19, end of semester examination being used as a form of SA 3.25 and SA marks being used in place of CA marks is 2.12. Based on the mean cut off score ≥ 2.5, the total mean assessment score (3.08±0.38) indicated high rating of the lecturers perception of the SA method of evaluation in these institutions except in the last item, 'SA marks can be used in place of CA' because the lecturers knows that SA marks cannot be used to replace CA marks.

**Table 4. Students' perception of summative assessment evaluation in nursing training institutions South Eastern Nigeria.**

	Strongly Disagree N (%)	Disagree N (%)	Agree N (%)	Strongly Agree N (%)	Mean Score†	SD
SA is done at the end of a course	16 (4.5)	45 (12.6)	179 (50.0)	118 (33.0)	3.11*	0.78
SA is used for promotion	9 (2.5)	55 (15.4)	179 (50.0)	115 (32.1)	3.11*	0.75
SA helps to evaluate academic achievement compared to set standards	6 (1.7)	26 (7.3)	183 (51.1)	143 (39.9)	3.29*	0.67



SA is used for certification	14 (3.9)	50 (14.0)	158 (44.1)	136 (38.0)	3.16*	0.80
End of semester exam is a form of summative assessment	10 (2.8)	40 (11.2)	174 (48.6)	134 (37.4)	3.20*	0.74
SA marks can be used in place of CA marks	43 (12.0)	151 (42.2)	113 (31.6)	51 (14.2)	2.5*	0.88
Overall Mean Assessment Score					3.06	0.45

†Mean assessment score was based on Likert scale of 1-4. Cut off score for lecturers' perception of summative assessment method: < 2.5 = Poor; ≥ 2.5 = High. \* Highly rated measure of summative assessment (mean score ≥ 2.5).

The results of the students' perception of summative assessment is shown in Table 4. The results show that students mean score for SA being done at the end of a course is 3.11. The score for SA being used for promotion is 3.11, SA help to evaluate academic achievement compared to set standards is 3.29, SA being used for certification 3.16, end of semester examination being used as a form of summative 3.20 and SA marks being used in place of CA marks is 2.5. Based on the mean cut-off score ≥ 2.5, the overall mean assessment score (3.06 ± 0.45) indicated high rating of all the SA measures used in assessing students' perception of the summative assessment method of evaluation in nursing training institutions, South Eastern Nigeria.

**Hypothesis :** There is no significant difference in the perception of summative assessment between the students and the lecturers in nursing training institutions South Eastern Nigeria.

TABLE 5: Comparison of mean perception of summative assessment between lecturers and students in nursing training institutions

STATUS	NUMBER OF SUBJECTS	Mean ± SD	MEAN RANK
Students	358	3.06 ± 0.45	220.79
Lecturers	82	3.08 ± 0.38	219.21
Total	440		
Mann-Whitney U			14572.50
Z			-0.102
P-Value			0.919

Mann-Whitney U test indicated no significant difference ( $p = 0.919$ ) in mean ranking of the perception of summative assessment between the lecturers (219.21) and students (220.79) in nursing training institutions South Eastern Nigeria. This finding therefore accepts the above hypothesis, which states that 'there is no significant difference in the perception of summative assessment between the students and the lecturers in nursing training institutions South Eastern Nigeria'.

### **Discussion**

The findings shown in Table 1 and 4 indicated an overall mean assessment score of  $(2.63 \pm 0.29)$  for lecturers utilization of SA and  $(3.08 \pm 0.38)$  for lecturers perception of SA which showed that lecturers utilize SA very well and also have a good perception of SA because the overall mean assessment score are both above the cut off score of  $\geq 2.5$ . The explanation to the findings could be that every being surveyed had a good knowledge that SA provide overall judgment of academic achievement and comes as a standardized examinations at the end of every section or semester and SA has been in practice long before the introduction of CA, so SA cannot be taken to be CA. This findings is supported by the findings of Rauach, Brown & Anders (2013) which showed that SA promote students learning when comparing objectives to desired outcome.

The finding also agrees with the findings of Mohabuth & Ahmed (2015) which reveals that lecturers confirmed that SA is a valid and reliable strategy in practice enabling them to better monitor and coach students to achieve the expected learning outcomes.

Colbert (2017) in his study also agrees that SA remains the most reliable way of assessing achievement of the students in school; he recommended that administrators should encourage teachers to uphold the use of SA in all courses being taught.

Harlen (2008) in his findings disagrees with the findings of the study by stating that SA by teachers have serious detrimental defect and suggest that actions should be increase to support more effective use of SA to help learning.

Machigambi and Wadesango (2011) in their findings reported that lecturers do not support the use position as a way of knowing students capability in summative assessment but average marks to encourage them more not to focus on grades but on impaction of learning.

In another study by Schnaz (2012) he agrees by stating that practicing teachers are more aware and knowledgeable of SA and types of SA than the prospective teachers.

The findings shown in Tables 1 to 4 indicated an overall mean assessment score of  $(2.70 \pm 0.44)$  for the students perception of the use of SA by the lecturers and  $(3.06 \pm 0.45)$  for students actual perception of SA which showed that students have a good perception of the SA utilization by their lecturers and they also have a good perception of what SA entails and this can be seen in the table because all the items measured scored above the cut off score of  $\geq 2.5$ . This means that the students have a very good knowledge of what summative assessment is all about because majority (3.29) is of the view that SA helps to evaluate academic achievement compared to set standards. The students nurses normally undergo so many SA before they graduate and all help them in their nursing council examination and this will help them to appreciate all assessments especially SA.

The findings of this study is supported by Mohabuth and Ahmed (2015) who found out that most students have positive experiences about their SA in practice learning. They felt comfortable in their placement settings and wished that the efforts and time that they devoted to their learning be recognized and valued. The findings of Joughin (2010) seeks the other alternative forms of assessment to foster effective learning processes in students apart from SA which can be misinterpreted by the students most times. Lynam and Cachria (2017) in his study on students perception of the role of summative assessment at higher education level showed that the strategies to promote academic maturity and reduce stress and fear in students could foster a more constructive approach to learning.

### **Conclusion**

The lecturers and students have a very good perception of SA and this makes them not to relent in maintaining the standard of nursing education. Therefore both the lecturers and student do not wait for final exam to reach before reading intensively to pass.

### **Recommendations**

Lecturers in Nursing Training Institutions should adopt more internal motivational measures that encourage their students more towards doing any assessment giving to them so as to further enhance their academic achievement.

## References

- Amanda, R (2015). Every teachers' Guide to Assessment. Retrieved 25<sup>th</sup> Sep, 2016 from [www.edudemic.com](http://www.edudemic.com)>Articles.
- Coffey, H. (2015). Summative Assessment. Retrieved 30<sup>th</sup> Sep, 2016 from [www.learnnc.org](http://www.learnnc.org)> pages.
- Colbert, M. (2017). The use of summative assessment in science courses mathematical modeling. Retrieved July 10<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from <https://caas.confex.com>>paper20623
- Harlen, W. (2008). Teachers' Summative Practices and Assessment for learning tensions and synergies. Retrieved 28<sup>th</sup> Oct, 2016 from Assessment and Evaluation in Higher education ,2006 related articles.
- Joughin, G. (2010). The hidden curriculum revisited: a critical review of research into the influence of summative assessment on learning. Retrieved 5<sup>th</sup> Oct, 2016 from Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education, 2010 related articles.
- Lynam, S. & Cachia, M. (2017). Students Perception of The role of summative assessment at higher education. Retrieved June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from <https://www.tandfonline.com>>dol>abs
- Lyons, P.R. (2012). Assessing Classroom participation. Retrieved May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2016 from [www.edu.classpart.25/..ut](http://www.edu.classpart.25/..ut).
- Machingambi, S & Wadesango, N. (2011). University Lecturers Perceptions of Students summativeEvaluation of their instruction practices in Walter Sisulu University, centre for learning and Teaching Development, Republic of South Africa. Retrieved July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018 from <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org>
- Mohabuth, A. Q. & Ahmed, S. M. (2015). The use and effectiveness of Summative assessment in practice learning. Retrieved June 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018 from <https://ideas.repec.org>>sek>iacpro
- Sahnaz, S. (2012). The Role of Teaching Experience on Teachers' Perception of Language Assessment. Retrieved 19<sup>th</sup> Sep, 2016 from [www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812026377](http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877042812026377)