A latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for national development
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This study seeks to discover the latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for national development. Document analysis, literature review, research questions and hypothesis were used. Also, questionnaire were administered on 500 randomly selected research students and staff of 5 (20%) of federally funded conventional universities in Nigeria. It discovered accountability on the part of the researcher(s) as the latent source and a significant difference in opinion between research students and staff who accepted accountability. It concludes that the latency of accountability as a source of fund needs exposition to every researcher. Hence recommends that basic principles of accountability should be included in educational research curriculum and a section on accountability in all research reports.
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INTRODUCTION

All over the world, education is generally regarded as the main instrument for growth and development. In Nigeria, the Federal Government has adopted education as an instrument “par excellence” for effecting national development, Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN) (2004:4) and accordingly specified three levels of education as primary, secondary and tertiary. The tertiary or the higher level is the highest level where the other levels draw their middle and top management personnel from (Azuzie, 2001; Becker, 2002; Glatthorn, 2005; Briman et al., 2006). The functions of this level of education according to Jibril (2000), FRN (2001, 2004), Fullman (2009) and Fanton (2010) include teaching, research and development, virile staff development, generation and dissemination of knowledge etc. Management experts [Sheldrake (2000), Mathis and Jackson (2006)], Economists [Obasi (2000) and Gbosi (2003)], Educationists [Igwe (2000), Sallis (2001), Babalola (2003), Obi (2003) and Obanya (2008)] as well as tertiary educational managers including Mgbeke (2004), Ekpo (2005), Lassa (2001) and Ajienka (2012) all share the opinion that the effective and efficient performance of functions results in the achievement and realization of goals and objectives. To the above, Babdu (2003), Ibadin (2004) and the Catholic Secretariat of Nigeria (2012) add that finance is a very essential ingredient in educational goals achievement whereas Babalola (1997), Adebunle (2001), Okebukola (2003) and Akintayo (2004) conclude that in the case of university education, finance or funding has to be adequate. Sequel to all the above, Ibiab (2004), Adebola and Ademola (2004), Akpan et al. (2005), Federal Ministry of Education (FME) (2006) and Chukwu and Chukwu (2009) supplied the funding of education in Nigeria by the Federal Government as shown in the Table 1.

Additionally, the FRN (2004) welcomes and encourages the participation of local communities, well meaning individuals, the private sector and other organizations including the state and local governments in the joint responsibility and financing of education. Such would mean by implication that the effective and efficient achievement of educational goals and objectives in Nigeria would not experience shortage and lack of funds. However, it is not very uncommon to read and hear in various communication media, conferences, workshops and seminars about lack of finance and inadequate funding as a factor militating against the effective and efficient achievement of educational goals and objectives.
Table 1. Federal Government Funding of Education in Nigeria (1983-2005).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/n</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Federal Government Recurrent + Capital Expenditure (₦'M)</th>
<th>Funds actually granted to education sector (₦'M)</th>
<th>Percentage of budget allocation to Education % (*)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>11,525.4</td>
<td>440.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>11,686.7</td>
<td>745.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>15,369.1</td>
<td>823.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>12,642.0</td>
<td>999.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>22,018.7</td>
<td>448.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>27,749.5</td>
<td>1,786.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>41,028.0</td>
<td>3,399.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>61,149.1</td>
<td>2,819.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>66,584.4</td>
<td>1,166.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>93,835.5</td>
<td>2,756.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>191,228.9</td>
<td>6,331.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>160,893.2</td>
<td>9,434.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>248,768.1</td>
<td>12,172.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>337,257.6</td>
<td>14,882.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>428,215.2</td>
<td>16,791.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>487,113.4</td>
<td>24,614.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>947,690.0</td>
<td>31,563.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>701,059.4</td>
<td>49,563.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>894,200.0</td>
<td>62,600.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,554,139.7</td>
<td>45,455.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,297,095.9</td>
<td>63,470.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,291,686.8</td>
<td>90,317.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,925,353.2</td>
<td>106,731.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Extractions from cited literature


STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The provision and availability of funds is very important for the achievement of goals and objectives by any individual, organization and nation according to Robert (2003), Akpama (2007), Akpan (2008), Garet (2009) and Ajumogobia (2011). For the tertiary institutions in Nigeria, the government continues to claim that education receives the highest allocation of funds in the budget of every fiscal year (Obanyan, 1999; Peril and Promise, 2000; Akpan et al., 2005; FME, 2006; Chukwu and Chukwu, 2009). Also, Banks, Multinational and other companies as well as philanthropists and non-governmental organizations (NGO’s) show very high amounts as donations to higher educational institutions annually (Samuel, 2003; All Africa News: Nigeria, 2006; Ahiakwo, 2011; Ejiofor, 2012). Despite the above and other sources of funds available, the hue and cry by the various categories of tertiary educational workers about inadequate funding of education appears a recurring decimal (Afianmagbon, 2007; Academic Staff Union of Universities (ASUU), 2009; Anikpo, 2011; Tombori, 2012). It is therefore the general intention of this paper to focus on other sources of fund, if any, that has or has not been widely known for the purpose of enhancing the effective and efficient achievement of tertiary educational goals in Nigeria.

Objective of the study

To find out the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for national development.

i.) To find out which of the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development, if any, is latent.

ii.) To determine the level of acceptability if any, of this identified latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development by students researchers and staff researchers.

Research questions

i.) What are the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development?
ii.) Which of the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development is or are latent?

iii.) What is the level of acceptability of the identified latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development by student researchers and staff researchers?

**Hypothesis**

There is no significant difference in opinion between the student researchers and staff researchers who accepted the identified as a latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development and those who did it.

**Review of related literature**

The Federal Republic of Nigeria (FRN) (1969, 1999) clearly requires the financing and finance or funding and funds as contributed by each individual(s) or group(s) of individuals to be speit out from the onset in the establishment of organizations and companies. The implication of the above is to avoid possible causes of confusion and misunderstanding at the long last: In the case of education, particularly higher education, FRN (2004) specifies the various sources of funds to include the Federal Government, the State Government, the Local Government, the individuals and other organizations etc. According to Babalola (1977), Asechemie (1999), Peril and Promise (2000), Bako (2002), Samuel (2003), Oghenekohwo (2004), All Africa News Nigeria (2006) and Afianmagbon (2007), there are other sources including internally generated funds and income which UNESCO (2002), Fanton (2010) and Ajumogobia (2011) believe that together with the other sources named above, there will always be enough and sufficient funds for the effective and efficient running of these institutions. But on the contrary, Anikpo (1994, 2011), Deng (2006) and ASUU (2009) maintained that one of the prime reasons for frequent industrial actions and strikes by ASUU and SSANU (Moses, 1999; Dagogo, 1995) is inadequate funding and lack of funds availability. These industrial actions also involve the students (Ahiauzu, 1994; Eziwo, 1995; Ade-Ajayi, 2001) to riot, go on rampage and be violent.

It should be pointed out that a critical appraisal of the literature reviewed reveals that no mention or no emphasis has been obvious about the management of available funds, (Adeyemo, 2000; Afonwa, 2004; Akindutire, 2004; Gowon, 2005). Although Francis (1986) and Oke (1988) had specifically mentioned and explained that accountability – the arts and/or science which compels an individual or a group of individuals who has earlier accepted a responsibility to render an account of stewardship to the person or persons that gave the responsibility irrespective of whether it is demanded or not (the view of this paper) – is very obligatory in the discharge of assigned functions, Asobie (2006), Mamadu (2006), Bassey et al. (2007), Akpan (2008) and Alemu (2012) added that corruption militates against accountability without the knowledge of those involved.

The implication of the above findings is that there is yet an undisclosed source of fund which will eradicate the said inadequacy. This undisclosed, undiscovered or latent source of fund is heralded by the expression and opinion of Asechemie (1999:69) that "a good amount of revenue collected is not accounted for by the personnel responsible for their management". Thus, even though Bush (1994:309) had earlier stated that "Teachers have a responsibility to explain and justify their decisions to …. educational authorities … government … which fund their activities", it appears that the clarion calls for accountability made to Civil Servants (Randle, 1988; Oke, 1988) and especially to teachers and researchers (Eke, 1998; Burgess, 1992) are being treated with levy.

**METHODOLOGY**

The descriptive survey design was used in this study. This was because the intention was to elicit information on the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development from the sampled population. The target population of this study consisted of the 25 federally funded conventional universities according to the Joint Admission and Matriculation Board (2012). Five of which represents 20% were randomly selected to cover the Northern, Southern, Eastern, Western and the Federal Capital Territory of Nigeria. By applying the stratified random sampling technique, 50 each of research students and teaching staff, making a total of 100 respondents were selected from each of the chosen universities. Thus, 500 respondents were given the self-developed questionnaire that was validated by senior colleagues who were experts in research instrumentation. The questionnaire was also tested for reliability using the test-retest reliability technique to have a reliability coefficient of 0.8855 before they were administered by the researchers and trained research assistants. Using descriptive statistics, by careful sorting and counting, the frequencies were expressed in percentages in order to answer the research questions. But using inferential statistics, in the case of testing the hypothesis, the chi-squared statistical technique was applied at 0.05 significant level of confidence and the appropriate degree of freedom.

**Presentation and analysis of results**

**Research question 1**

What are the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development?
Table 2. Sources of fund for educational research and evaluation for national development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>SOURCES OF FUND</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual researcher (self)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public Limited liability Companies (PLC) and multinational corporations</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Private Limited Liability Companies (LTD) and Private Enterprises</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Accountability on the part of the researcher(s)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Government (Federal, State and Local)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Philanthropists and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Level of accountability acceptability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency (f)</th>
<th>Strongly Agreed, (SA)</th>
<th>Agreed (A)</th>
<th>Undecided (U)</th>
<th>Disagreed (D)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagreed (SD)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (%)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (%)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency (f)</td>
<td>Acceptability</td>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>Unacceptability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage (5)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows the various sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development. Specifically, it shows that (1) the individual researcher him/herself has a frequency of 10 which is 2% of the total respondents of 500. (2) Public Limited Liability Companies (PLC) and Multinational Corporation have a frequency of 445 which is 89% of the total respondents. (3) Private Limited Liability Companies (LTD) and Private Enterprises has 315 and 63%. (4) None or zero frequency is recorded for accountability on the part of the researcher(s). While (5) the Government has 225 or 45% and (6) 110 or 22% for philanthropists and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s). Thus, the known sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development are 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6 above. Therefore, the latent, unknown, undiscovered or undisclosed source is item number 4, which is accountability on the part of the researcher(s).

Research question 2

Which of the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development is or are latent?

Table 2 also shows, inter alia, that item number 4, which is accountability on the part of the researcher(s) has a zero frequency and nil percentage. Thus, this source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development is latent. In other words accountability on the part of the researcher(s) is a source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development that has not yet been disclosed by educational researchers and evaluators.

Research question 3

What is the level of acceptability of the identified latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development by student researchers and staff researchers?

Table 3 shows the level of acceptability of accountability as a source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development. Specifically, it shows that 270 or 54% of the 500 respondents accepted, 10 or 2% undecided and 220 or 44% did not accept. Therefore, it is concluded that accountability on the part of the researcher(s) is, to a greater extent, a source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development.

Testing the hypothesis

\( H_0: \) There is no significant difference in opinion between the student researchers and staff researchers who accepted accountability as a latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development and those who did not.

Table 4 shows that at 5% significant level of confidence, with 2 degree of freedom, the 17.84 computed value of chi-squared is greater than the table value of 5.99. Hence, the decision is that the hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, it is concluded that there is a significant difference in opinion between the student researchers and staff researchers who accepted accountability as a latent source of funding educational
research and evaluation for National Development and those who did not.

**Discussion of findings**

The discussion of the findings of the study entitled a latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for national development shall be done in four parts. Firstly, the study revealed the sources of funding educational research and evaluation for national development pointing out that the most providers are public limited liability companies and multinational corporations as well as private companies and enterprises. This particular finding confirms FRN (2004), All Africa News Nigeria (2006) that educational funding should not be left alone in the hands of government. However, it does not agree with the view of Babalola (1997), Obasi (2000) and Babdu (2003) that if educational funding is left in the hands of companies and private enterprises, market forces will determine the cost of education which may price education out of the reach of most citizenry.

Secondly, the study identified accountability on the part of the researcher(s) as the latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for national development. This is not surprising in view of the facts that the calls by Randle (1988) and Oke (1988) as well as Burgess (1992) and Obasi (2000) in respect of accountability were not adhered to. Moreover, corruption, fraud, misappropriation of funds and other forms of mismanagement as pointed out by Alonwa (2004), Gowon (2005), Akpan (2008) and Alemu (2012) would imply that accountability will continue to be latent. Thirdly, the study gave a high level of acceptability of accountability as a latent source of funding educational research and evaluation for national development by students and staff researchers of tertiary institutions. This very finding is in line with the declarations and assertion of management experts [Sheldrake (2000), Fanton (2010) etc], including tertiary educational managers [Lass (2001), Ekpo (2005) and Ajienka (2012)] that accountability plays a vital role in the effective and efficient management of organizations in order to achieve the desired goals and objectives. Finally, the study revealed that there is a significant difference in opinion between the students and staff researchers of tertiary institutions on the acceptability of accountability as a source of funding educational research and evaluation for national development. This is indicative of the differences in the claims and counter claims as exposed in the study by Akpan et al. (2005), FME (2006), ASUU (2009), Anikpo (2011), Ahiauzu (1994), Dagogo (1995) and many others in respect of funds, funding management, teaching and research methodology and many other activities and functions in tertiary educational institutions.

**Conclusion**

Accountability (which is the arts and/or science of compelling an individual or group of individuals who has earlier accepted a responsibility to render an account of stewardship to the person(s) that gave the responsibility irrespective of whether it is demanded or not) plays a very significant role in the effective and efficient performance of functions for goals achievement of individuals, organizations and nations. The contribution of accountability in funding or financing operations and institutions needs not be overemphasized as it regenerates the urging ability and capability for further and additional provision of funds or finance not only in that particular operation or institution but also in others.

**Recommendations**

i.) The latency of accountability as a source of funding educational research and evaluation for national development should be x-rayed, exposed and explained thoroughly to every educational researcher.

ii.) Training in educational research and evaluation or research method and statistics by tertiary institutions should include the basic principles or tenets of accountability. In other words, the curriculum of educational research and evaluation or research methods and statistics should include the basic principles or tenets of accountability.

iii.) Accountability on the part of the researcher(s) should be made very compulsory to the extent that every research report should have a section on accountability.

### Table 4. Decision particulars for the hypothesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers/frequencies</th>
<th>Accepted/Agreed</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Not accepted/Disagreed</th>
<th>Σ</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>X² Value</th>
<th>Ho</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td>Observed</td>
<td>Expected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>17.84</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis confirms that the hypothesis was not true.
APPENDICES

Appendix 1

LETTER TO THE RESPONDENT

Department of Educational Management, 
Faculty of Education, 
University of Port Harcourt, 
P.M.B. 5323, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

GSM: 08037 453 140
Email: jndaccountability@yahoo.com

Day, Date, Month, Year.

Dear Sir/Madam

SPECIAL REQUEST FOR PARTICIPATION

Please, kindly help to respond by completing the attached questionnaire which will be used to determine

The latent source of funding educational research AND evaluation for national development.

You are very assured that your response will be treated as most confidential.

Yours faithfully,

Catechist (Dr.) J.N.D. Meenyinikor FCAI
Chief Researcher

Appendix 2

QUESTIONNAIRE

SECTION A

Please tick (✓) as appropriate

Sex:                                                                                   Male                          Female

Status:                                                                                   Student                          Staff

SECTION B

1) Which of the following is/are the source(s) of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development?

Please tick (✓) as many as you think

1. The Researcher him/herself
2. Public Limited Liability Companies (PLC) and Multinational Companies
3. Private Limited Liability Companies (LTD) and Private Enterprise
4. Accountability on the part of the researcher(s)
5. The Government (Federal, State and Local)
6. Philanthropists and Non-Governmental Organizations (NGO’s)

2) Accountability on the part of the researcher(s) is a source of funding educational research and evaluation for National Development (please tick (✓) only).

Strongly Agree AGREE UNDECIDED DISAGREEED STRONGLY DISAGREEED
SA A U D SD

APPENDIX 3

CALCULATION OF DEGREE OF FREEDOM FOR CHI-SQUARED

The degree of freedom (df) from a row (r) x column (c) contingent table for chi-squared is determined thus:

\[ df=(r-1)(c-1) \]

Where \( r \) = Number of Rows (vertical: North to South, Head to Toe, Up to Down)

\( c \) = Number of columns (horizontal: East to West, Left to Right, Sideways)

\[ df=(3-1)(2-1) \]

\[ = 2 \]

Ukweije (1992:169)

APPENDIX 4

CHI-SQUARED FORMULA

Where \( X^2 \) = Chi-squared
\[ \Sigma = \text{Sum/Total of} \]
\[ O = \text{Observed frequency} \]
\[ E = \text{Expected frequency calculated for each cell as Row Total x Column total, divided by grand total} \]

\[ X^2 = \Sigma (O-E)(0-E)/E \]

Harper (1980-240)
Owen and Jones (1978-350)
Okwuije (1992-165)

**APPENDIX 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of freedom (df)</th>
<th>Significant Level of Confidence (0.05)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**APPENDIX 6**

**Calculation for the hypothesis**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>U</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expected frequency E = Row total x Column Total/Grand Total

178 \times 287/500 = 155
97 \times 213/500 = 115

6 00
6
00
4
4
103
126
117
94

Observed frequency O
Expected frequency E
(O-E) (O-E)/E

17.8390
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