Preprints.org

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Challenges and Determinants of Exit Exam Success among Students at Jinka University

Abraham Shiferaw Kume * , Kusse Gudishe Goroya , Mulat Melkie Yeshaneh , Addisu Melkamu Hunegnaw

Posted Date: 6 August 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

Keywords: exit exam; passing rate; challenges; Jinka University

Preprints.org is a free multidisciplinary platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This open access article is published under a Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license, which permit the free download, distribution, and reuse, provided that the author and preprint are cited in any reuse.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions, and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions, or products referred to in the content.

Article

Challenges and Determinants of Exit Exam Success among Students at Jinka University

Abraham S. Kume [1,*], Kussie G. Goroya [2], Mulat M. Yeshaneh [3] and Addisu M. Hunegnaw [4]

[1] Department of Statistics, College of Natural and Computational Sciences, Jinka University, Ethiopia
[2] Department of Physics, College of Natural and Computational Sciences, Jinka University, Ethiopia
[3] Department of Psychology, College of Social Science and Humanities, Jinka University, Ethiopia
[4] Department of Management, College of Business and Economics, Jinka University, Ethiopia
* Correspondence: abrshiferaw@gmail.com

Abstract

Jinka University, like many higher education institutions in Ethiopia, faces challenges with exit exam passing rates. This study aimed to identify key challenges and determinants affecting student success in exit exams at Jinka University, South Ethiopia. Both primary and secondary data sources were used. Primary data were gathered through focus group discussions, while secondary data came from the University Registrar Directorate. Data analysis was performed using SPSS version 29, using descriptive statistics and inferential methods, including Pearson's chi-square tests and binary logistic regression. The findings revealed several challenges impacting exam success, such as limited tutorials, inadequate campus facilities, teaching-learning gaps, blueprint relevance issues, students' academic backgrounds, and psychological readiness. Multivariable logistic regression showed that gender, cumulative grade point average, and field of study were significantly associated with passing rates. Addressing these challenges requires strengthening academic support systems, improving the alignment of departmental placements with student preferences, and ensuring equitable access to learning resources, especially for vulnerable groups.

Keywords: exit exam; passing rate; challenges; Jinka University

INTRODUCTION

Higher education is pivotal for the socio-economic development of any nation, as it produces skilled professionals necessary for various sectors of the economy. In Ethiopia, the rapid expansion of higher education has led to the establishment of numerous universities, including Jinka University.

In the majority of educational systems worldwide, exit exams are a major concern. The review highlights that exit exams are widely used across the globe to standardize assessment, certify student competency, and ensure accountability. They are especially important in countries with limited job opportunities and no unemployment support, as they often serve as a gateway to employment (Teshome, 2025). Improve human capital in addition to their conventional roles of certification and selection; this would have the power to considerably boost the long-term economic prosperity of a nation (Hanushek & Woessmann, 2011).

The growth of higher education institutions (HEIs) in Ethiopia led to a significant rise in student enrollment. As anticipated, the number of students in the higher education system, including accredited private programs, increased substantially from approximately 35,000 in 1996 to over 100,000 by 2003. Eighteen percent of the general enrollment in 2003 came from private higher education institutions (Yizengaw, 2003). However, this rapid expansion, combined with inadequate human and investment capital, has affected the quality of education in Ethiopia. The government's education reform and expansion agenda in the mid-1990s was so ambitious that concerns arose regarding its potential impact on educational quality (Yirdaw, 2016).

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

When evaluating the quality of education, stakeholders have expressed dissatisfaction with graduates' competencies. Many graduates struggle to secure gainful employment without additional training to meet the demands of applied technical and communication skills (Yirdaw, 2016). Consequently, assessment and monitoring mechanisms are necessary to evaluate learning outcomes. Recently, exit exam competency tests have gained increasing attention as a crucial requirement for undergraduate students to obtain certification (Marsidi, 2021).

Jinka University, like many Ethiopian higher education institutions, has adopted exit examinations as part of its academic quality assurance framework. However, a considerable number of students face difficulties in passing these exams, raising concerns about the underlying challenges and determinants that affect their success. Research findings indicate a significant relationship between students' university cumulative grade point average (UCGPA), gender differences, place of origin, college of enrollment, mismatch between teaching and learning styles, and students' expectations about their future job opportunities. These factors are statistically significant determinants of academic performance (Legese, 2018).

A study assessing higher education exit exams in Ethiopia identified several major challenges, including inadequate student preparation, lack of motivation and commitment, limited access to teaching and reference materials, and poor quality of exam questions. Issues such as lack of conceptual clarity, uneven representation of course topics, ineffective correction processes, insufficient time for grading, lack of commitment from correctors, and inadequate supervision and feedback mechanisms were also highlighted (Ayenew & Yohannes, 2022).

Given the critical role of exit exams in determining students' future careers and professional licensure, understanding the challenges and determinants affecting passing rates at Jinka University is essential. Identifying these factors can help policymakers and the University administrators to implement targeted interventions, such as academic support programs, curriculum enhancements, and mental health initiatives to improve student success rates. This study aims to explore the key determinants of exit exam performance among Jinka University students, contributing to the broader discourse on academic achievement and higher education quality improvement.

METHODS AND MATERIALS

2.1. Study Area Description

The study was carried out at Jinka University, which is situated in Jinka, Southern Ethiopia. Having established to promote national and regional development and increase access to high-quality education, Jinka University is a relatively new institution of higher learning: a fourth generation public University. Moreover, Jinka University is designated as a Comprehensive University that offers a wide range of undergraduate and graduate programs in numerous areas, considered as a major intellectual and research center in the region.

2.2. Research Period and Design

Both quantitative and qualitative research methods are used in this study to evaluate the variables affecting student success on exam. The study was carried out between June 15, 2024, and July 16, 2024, for a total of one month.

2.3. Study Population

The study population consists of students from the 2024 graduating batch at Jinka University who participated in the exit exam. This group includes students from various academic disciplines who were required to take the exam as part of their graduation requirements.

Inclusion criteria:

Students from the 2024 graduating cohort who took the exit exam for the first time were analyzed.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

Exclusion criteria:

Students who either did not attempt the exit exam or had incomplete records were excluded from the analysis.

Students who attempted the exit exam for the second time or more were excluded from the analysis.

A total of 1,765 students took the exit exam during the study year. However, 21 students who either did not take the exam or had incomplete records, along with 287 students who attempted the exam for the second time or more, were excluded based on the exclusion criteria. Consequently, 1,457 students who met the inclusion criteria were included in the study.

2.4. Source and Source and Data Collection Method

In this study, we used both primary and secondary sources of data. The primary data were collected using focus group discussions to capture relevant information. In addition, secondary data were obtained from the Jinka University Registrar Directorate Office.

2.5. Study variables

The following variables are the focus of the study:

The dependent variable is Passing status on the exit test (pass or fail). A student receives 50 or more points out of 100 to pass and if a student receives fewer than 50 out of 100, they are said to have failed.

The following are independent variables: year of study, college of study, cumulative grade point average (CGPA), gender, and enrollment type.

2.6. Methods

The statistical package for social science (SPSS) program was used to examine the data. Descriptive statistics, including frequency distributions was used to summarize the data. Additionally, inferential statistics, specifically, Pearson's chi-square test was applied to assess associations between variables. Furthermore, binary logistic regression was employed to identify factors significantly associated with the likelihood of passing the exit exam. Each variable was analyzed separately to test its association with the passing rate. The multivariable model contained variables with a p-value ≤ 0.05. The threshold of 0.05 was chosen to ensure that potential predictors were not excluded too early. The selected variables from the univariable analysis were then entered into a multivariable model, where they were analyzed together. A significance level of $p \leq 0.05$ was used to determine which variables were independently associated with the passing rate after adjusting for other factors.

3. Results and Discussions

3.1. Results

3.1.1. Descriptive Statistics

Table 1 presents the exam results based on various students' characteristics. Among 389 female students (26.7% of the total), 126 (32.4%) have passed, whereas among 1,068 male students (73.3% of the total), 600 (56.2%) were successful, indicating a higher pass rate for male students. Regarding enrollment type, among 1,336 regular students (91.7% of the total), 713 (53.4%) passed when compared to 121 weekend program students (8.3% of the total) only 13 (10.7%) passed the exam, suggesting relatively better performance among regular students. In terms of CGPA, students with higher cumulative GPAs had higher pass rates: only 18 (5.4%) out of 333 students with a CGPA of 2.0 – 2.49 passed, while 137 (29.9%) out of 458 with a CGPA of 2.50 – 2.99. In contrary, 381 (80.2%) out of

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

475 with a CGPA of 3.00 – 3.59, and 190 (99.5%) out of 191 with a Cumulative grade point average(CGPA) of ≥ 3.60 were successful.

Regarding study duration, out of 1,269 students who completed their studies in expected four years (87.1% of the total), 662 (52.2%) passed, compared to 188 students (12.9% of the total) who delayed for one or more years 64 (34%) passed the exam. Exam performance has also varied by fields of studies: 41 (93.2%) out of 44 students from Law, 225 (51.5%) out of 437 from Business and Economics fields, 192 (62.3%) out of 308 from the Agriculture and Natural Resource fields, 156 (50.5%) out of 309 from Natural and Computational Science fields and 112 (31.2%) out of 359 from Social Science and Humanities fields have got pass mark. Overall, male students, regular program admission, students with higher CGPAs, and those who completed their studies within the expected years had a greater likelihood of passing, with the School of Law showing the highest success rate.

Table 1. Frequency distribution of predictors for exit exam passing rates.

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Status	
				Pass(%)	Failed (%)
Gender	Female	389	26.7	126(32.4)	263(67.6)
	Male	1068	73.3	600(56.2)	468(43.8)
Enrollment Type	Regular	1336	91.7	713(53.4)	623(46.6)
	Weekend	121	8.3	13(10.7)	108(89.3)
Cumulative grade point average(CGPA)	2.0 - 2.50	333	22.9	18(5.4%)	315(94.6)
	2.51 – 3.00	458	31.4	137(29.9)	321(70.1)
	3.01 - 3.50	475	32.6	381(80.2)	94(19.8)
	3.51-4.00	191	13.1	190(99.5)	1(0.5)
Field of Study	Law	44	3.0	41(93.2)	3(6.8)
	Business and Economics	437	30.1	225(51.5)	212(48.5)
	Agriculture and natural Resources	308	21.1	192(62.3)	116(37.7)
	Natural and Computational Sciences	309	21.2	156(50.5)	153(49.5)
	Social Sciences and Humanities	359	24.6	112(31.2)	247(68.8)
Expected Year of Study	4 years	1269	87.1	662(52.2)	607(47.8)
	Five or more years	188	12.9	64(34)	124(66)

CGPA: Cumulative Grade Point Average.

3.1.2. Chi-square Test of Independence

Table 2 shows that p-values of gender, enrollment type, students' last CGPA, field of study, and year of study are all < 0.05. Based on these results, we can reject the null hypothesis at the 95% level of significance, indicating that all variables are statistically significantly associated with exit exam results.

Table 2. Pearson Chi-square test for association among Jinka University students of 2024 batch.

Variables	Value	Sig
Gender	64.548	.000
Enrollment Type	80.633	.000
CGPA	699.234	.000
Field of study	102.737	.000
Year of study	21.516	.000

CGPA: Cumulative Grade Point Average; Value: Chi-square test statistic value; Sig: Significance.

3.1.3. Binary Logistic Regression Analysis

The multivariable binary logistic regression analysis presented in Table 3 identifies key factors influencing the exit exam results at Jinka University. The findings indicate that gender plays a significant role, with female students being 1.78 times more likely to fail the exam as compared to male students (AOR = 1.78, 95% CI: 1.26 – 2.514; p = 0.001), highlighting a statistically significant gender disparity that may require further investigation. Similarly, enrollment type is strongly

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

associated with exam outcomes, as students in the weekend program have 9.083 times higher odds of failing as compared to regular students (AOR = 9.083, 95% CI: 2.298 – 35.90; p = 0.002), suggesting potential differences in learning environments or student preparedness.

Academic performance, measured by CGPA, also shows a strong correlation with exit exam results. Students with lower CGPAs have significantly higher odds of failing, with the highest risk observed at those with a CGPA of 2.00 – 2.50 (AOR = 609, 95% CI: 221.71 – 1673.4; p = 0.000), followed by students with a CGPA of 2.51 – 3.00 (AOR = 91.55, 95% CI: 36.65 – 228.7; p = 0.000), and those with a CGPA of 3.01 – 3.50 (AOR = 12.258, 95% CI: 4.86 – 30.87; p = 0.000). These findings indicate that students with lower CGPAs are at a substantially greater risk of failing, emphasizing the impact of academic performance on exam success.

Additionally, the field of study significantly influences exam outcomes. As compared to students who studied Law (reference category), those who studied Social Sciences and Humanities fields have the highest odds of failing (AOR = 16.44, p = 0.002), followed by students who studied Natural and Computational Sciences fields (AOR = 8.245, p = 0.022) and those who admitted to the fields Business and Economics (AOR = 6.988, p = 0.036); all of which are statistically significant.

Finally, the year of study significantly affects exit exam outcomes. The results show that students with one or more years of delay have increased odds of failing the exit exam (AOR = 2.113; p = 0.000) as compared to students who finished their studies within the expected years of study.

Table 3. Multivariable Binary logistic regression results obtained from secondary data.

Variables	Category	COR(CI)	Sig	AOR(CI)	Sig
Gender	Male (Ref)	1	1	1	1
	Female	2.67(2.09,3.41)	0.000	1.78(1.26,2.51)	0.001
Enrollment Type	Regular (Ref)	1	1	1	1
	Weekend	9.50(5.29,17.07)	0.000	9.083(2.29,35.90)	0.002
CGPA	2.00-2.50	845.81(311.5,2296.6)	0.000	609(221.71,1673.4)	0.000
	2.51-3.00	111.95(45.18,277.41)	0.000	91.55(36.65,228.7)	0.000
	3.01-3.50	13.37(5.346,33.446)	0.000	12.258(4.86,30.87)	0.000
	3.51-4.00(Ref)	1	1	1	1
Field of Study	Law(Ref)	1	1	1	1
	Business and Economics	12.88(3.93,42.208)	0.000	6.98(1.13,43.09)	0.036
	Agriculture and Natural Resources	8.27(2.51,27.26)	0.01	5.58(0.90,34.3)	0.064
	Natural and Computational Sciences	13.40(4.06,44.20)	0.000	8.24(1.35,50.06)	0.022
	Social Sciences and Humanities	30.14(9.13,99.40)	0.000	16.44(2.69,100.36)	0.002
Expected Year of Study	4 years(Ref)				
	Greater than or equal to 5 years	2.11(1.53,2.91)	0.000	0.59(0.18,1.96)	0.399

COR: crud odds ratio; AOR: adjusted odds ratio; CI: confidence interval; Sig: significance; Ref: reference; CGPA: cumulative grade point average.

3.1.4. Model Adequacy Checking

The model's appropriateness is assessed by examining its overall goodness of fit using tests and by evaluating significant observations after applying a logistic regression model to a dataset. The Hosmer-Lemeshow test (Archer, Lemeshow, & Hosmer, 2007) goodness-of-fit test, which is frequently used to assess the fit of logistic regression models, was used in this study.

Table 4. The Hosmer and Lemshow test for model adequacy checking.

Chi-square	df	Sig
5.546	8	.698

Sig: significant; df: degree of freedom.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

Had we had p-value for the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness of fit test greater than 0.05, we could have not rejected the null hypothesis. This shows that there is no difference between observed and model- predicted values, implying that the model estimates are sufficient to provide a satisfactory level of fit to the data. As can be seen from Table 4, results show that (Chi-square: $\chi 2 = 5.546$; $p = 0.698$) this suggests how well the model fits the data.

3.1.5. Focus Group Discussions

This focus group discussion is aimed at identifying challenges faced by JKU graduating students in 2024 for exit exam performance and exploring lessons learned from the results so as to determine a possible direction that should be followed or adopted for future action.

The researchers have conducted focus group discussions with students on the challenges faced by JKU students during the preparation time for the exit exam. Under this category, challenges related to the instructional process, campus facilities, instructional materials, students' academic background, psychological readiness, and overall students' academic support system were assessed.

1. Challenges related to the instructional process: Teachers' competency and experience, teaching methods and academic calendar duration are among mentioned factors.

Based on the focus group discussion, students argued that the instructional process has faced some challenges related to teachers' competency and experience, teaching methods, and the academic calendar during their study year. Students said that some teachers are inexperienced and lack deep knowledge and preparation in certain subjects. As a result, they struggled to teach complex concepts effectively, which in turn contributes to students' results. On the other hands, the method teachers have used has always been the same, which is the 'one-size-fits-all approach' because of insufficient time due to a packed academic calendar. Therefore, according to their discussion, the instructional process was run with rigid academic schedules that led to superficial coverage rather than in-depth understanding. This has also, in turn, impacted students' motivation and overall well-being to prepare themselves for the exit exam.

2. Challenges related to campus facilities: Internet, library, cafeteria service are among the factors raised under this category.

Students have also discussed challenges related to campus facilities, particularly internet access, library resources, and cafeteria services. Accordingly, they replied that the power outage on campus was the big problem and happened frequently, which in turn resulted in a total cutoff in library and internet services. More specifically, they agreed that inconsistent, slow internet connectivity and insufficient internet access points on the campus made students' exam preparation very difficult.

3. Challenges related to instructional materials: Textbook, teaching material and exam blue prints are among the factors mentioned by the respondents under this category.

In getting prepared for the exit exam, students have encountered some challenges related to instructional materials such as textbooks, teaching materials, and exam blueprints. Due to the use of varied teaching materials by teachers limited availability of textbooks, and insufficient copies of common teaching materials and references, students' faced challenges in preparing for the exit exam. Students said that the exam blueprints were prepared by the Ministry of Education in 2023 has led to confusion about what contents will be assessed, made it difficult to get prepared effectively. This uncertainty regarding the content and format of tests had contributed to increased stress and anxiety among students. Even now, most students during FGD agreed and believed that the exam questions did not align with the blue prints and instructional materials covered in class.

4. Challenges related to students' academic background: University and department placement, and cumulative grade point average are among the factors raised by the respondents in this section.

Students have faced a variety of challenges related to their academic background, University and department placement, and cumulative grade point average (CGPA) for exit exam performances, as respondents claimed. The discussion indicated that the University and program placement of students did not align with their interests, leading to disengagement and poor academic backgrounds. This, in turn, has contributed to their failure in the exit exam.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

5. Challenges related to students' psychological readiness: Confusion, fear, feeling of inadequacy are among the lists forwarded by the respondents under this category.

According the reply of the respondents, the nationally new transition shock for the exit exam of graduates, students' perceived failure, uncertainty regarding academic expectations and depression has led them to confusion, fear, and feelings of inadequacy for the exit exam.

6. Challenges related to overall students' academic support system: Exit exam performance plan, tutorial, and monitoring students' progress are among the factors mentioned by the respondents in this category.

The focus group discussion indicated that students encountered various challenges related to their overall academic support system, particularly in areas like exit exam performance plans, tutorials, and monitoring students' progress. As a result, the absence of a clear performance plan for students approaching the exit exam can result in a lack of targeted support and intervention for those who need it most. Students were not receiving adequate preparation for exit exams; rather, they were focused primarily on course work. The tutorial program was not accessible to all courses, and all students were not interested in attending tutorials because of its mode of delivery. There was no regular monitoring of student progress throughout their University years, which is leading to the late identification of students at risk of failing the exit exam.

3.2. Discussions

Our findings indicated that gender is a significant factor, with female students facing a higher risk of failing the exit exam than their male counterparts. This aligns with the research of (Salehi et al., 2019), which suggests that female students tend to experience greater test anxiety and fear of failure, potentially hindering their exam performance.

Furthermore, our study revealed that weekend program admitted students are nearly nine times more likely to fail the exam than those in regular programs admissions. This finding is consistent with the research findings of (Bishop, Mañe, & Bishop, 2001), which suggests that students admitted to weekend programs may have limited access to academic resources and support services as compared to their counterparts in regular programs admission.

The findings suggested that academic performance, as measured by CGPA, is a key predictor of success in the exit exam. This is consistent with the study by (Al-Alawi, Al Shaqsi, Tarhini, & Al-Busaidi, 2023), which utilized machine learning techniques to demonstrate that CGPA, along with factors such as high school exam scores and region, can effectively predict students' academic performance.

The analysis underscores that academic performance, as measured by CGPA, is a critical factor in determining success in the exit exam. This finding aligns with the study by (Yakubu & Abubakar, 2022), which employed machine learning techniques to demonstrate that CGPA, along with factors such as high school exam scores and region, can effectively predict students' academic performance. Similarly, (Alyahyan & Düştegör, 2020), highlighted that the importance of early identification of at-risk students, emphasizing that internal assessment grades and CGPA are key predictors of student performance, facilitating timely interventions.

The results also indicated that differences in the field of study have a significant impact on students' exit exam performance. This finding aligns with the study by (Legese, 2018), which highlighted that field of study has significant influence on student's academic achievement.

Additionally, our study revealed that students who delayed one or more years to complete their studies are more likely to fail the exam as compared to those who completed their studies within expected years. This result is consistent with the findings of (Koçak, Göksu, & Göktas, 2021), which suggested that students who take longer time to complete their degrees often encounter challenges such as financial stress, balancing work and study, and personal issues that can negatively affect their academic performance.

Findings from group discussion indicated that students have encountered difficulties with instructional materials, such as textbooks and other teaching resources, while preparing for exams.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

This outcome aligns with the study by (Yimer & Bishaw, 2023), which highlighted that Universities often face challenges in supplying sufficient study materials and resources, including textbooks, online materials, and access to past exam papers.

The findings suggested that students' academic background, along with the shock of transitioning to the exit exam, has contributed to feelings of perceived failure, uncertainty about academic expectations, and depression. These factors have resulted in confusion, fear, and a sense of inadequacy regarding the exam. This outcome is consistent with a study by(Grech, 2025), It found that students experienced depression, anxiety, low self-worth, and uncertainty about academic expectations. The shock of failure and the pressure of resetting the exam contributed to confusion, fear, and a sense of inadequacy.

According to the group discussion results, the instructional process was run with rigid academic schedules that led to superficial coverage rather than in-depth understanding. This has also, in turn, impacted students' motivation and overall well-being to prepare themselves for the exit exam. This result is consistent with a study conducted by(Dorn, 2015), revealing that rigid scheduling often leads to rushed content coverage and limits opportunities for in-depth understanding. It also notes that students feel more prepared and less stressed when schedules allow for longer, focused learning periods.

The group discussion revealed that students have felt the exam questions did not align with the blueprints and instructional materials covered in the class. This finding agrees with a study by (Yimer & Bishaw, 2023), which founded that discrepancies often exist between the curriculum content and what is assessed in exit exams, leaving students unprepared for certain topics.

The focus group discussion also indicated that students believed the instructional process faced several challenges, including teachers' competency, experience, and teaching methods. This finding is consistent with a study by(NJENGA), which revealed that many teachers lack the essential skills and knowledge needed to effectively teach and assess students, especially in specialized or technical subjects. Additionally, research by (A. T. Kebede & Phasha, 2024), has highlighted that inexperienced teachers may face difficulties in classroom management and implementing effective teaching strategies, which can negatively impact students' learning experiences.

The findings from the discussion highlighted that students face multiple challenges related to their academic background such as University and department placement, and cumulative grade point average (CGPA) when preparing for exit exams which may have negative impact on the results. This findings consistent with the study by (Hailu et al., 2024), which founded that the pressure to maintain a high CGPA can lead to significant stress and anxiety, negatively impacting students' overall well-being and academic performance.

Additionally, research by (A. Kebede, 2024) indicated that many students are placed in academic programs that do not align with their interests or career aspirations. University and department placements are often determined by quota systems rather than individual preferences or strengths, which can result in decreased motivation, engagement, and overall academic satisfaction.

Moreover, a study by (Kassaw, Demareva, & Herut, 2024) suggested that students enter University with varying levels of preparedness, which affects their ability to adapt to the demands of higher education. Those from disadvantaged backgrounds may face even greater difficulties due to limited access to quality primary and secondary education, further exacerbating their academic challenges.

During the group discussion, students have also highlighted challenges concerning campus facilities, specifically internet connectivity and library resources. This finding aligns with the study by(Ayenew & Gebre, 2022), which indicated that limited resources such as inadequate educator training and insufficient infrastructure can impede the effective administration of exit exams.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

The analysis indicated that gender, field of study, and enrollment type significantly influenced the exam outcomes. Female students, students admitted to Business and Economics, Natural and

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

Computational Sciences, Social Sciences and Humanities fields and students enrolled to weekend programs were more likely to fail, highlighting critical challenges that need intervention. Furthermore, cumulative grade point average (CGPA) emerged as a strong predictor of success, with lower CGPAs associated with higher failure rates. This pattern underscores the importance of offering continuous academic support throughout students' educational journeys to enhance overall performance.

The logistic regression model applied in this study demonstrated a good fit to the data, confirming the reliability of the identified factors as strong predictors of exit exam outcomes. Additionally, qualitative insights from interviews revealed further challenges such as limited access to internet and tutorial sessions, ineffective teaching methods, and poor psychological readiness have significantly affected students' performance in exit exam.

Based on the findings of this work, researchers put the following recommendations for the betterment of students' achievement in exit exam. Jinka University should take targeted steps to address gender disparities in exit exam performance, as female students face a higher failure rate than their male counterparts. Providing additional tutoring, mentorship, and psychological support can help bridge this gap. Similarly, weekend program admitted students experienced a significantly higher failure rate, indicating the need for better academic support structures. Enhancing tutorial access, offering more academic advising, and restructuring the weekend program to align with student needs can improve their success. Additionally, disparities in performance among different fields of study suggest that some programs may require additional support according to their nature of the subject to improve student outcomes.

Strengthening tutorial programs is essential, as attendance strongly correlates with exam success. The University should ensure that tutorials perfectly align with the exit exam blueprint and continues performance based, improve accessibility, and actively encourage participation. Students with lower CGPAs also require early academic interventions such as supplemental instruction and personalized advising to boost their performances. Faculty training is necessary to align teaching methods with the exam content ensuring students receive instructions that directly prepares them for the test. Furthermore, addressing performance gaps between fields of study may require a review of teaching strategies based on the nature of the field, resource allocation, and faculty development to ensure all students receive quality education.

Infrastructure and resource limitations, including poor internet access and outdated learning materials hinder students' academic preparation. Improving library resources, expanding technology access, and enhancing campus facilities will create a more supportive learning environment. Additionally, psychological and emotional support services should be expanded to help students manage test anxiety and stress. Implementing a continuous monitoring system with regular assessments and interventions will further ensure that struggling students receive timely support. By addressing gender, program structure, and fields of study disparities, Jinka University can significantly enhance student success in the exit exam.

Limitation of the study

This study on exit exam performance at Jinka University has certain limitations. It relies on existing institutional data, which may not capture all factors influencing student performance, such as socio-economic background or individual learning challenges. Additionally, the study focuses on correlations rather than causation, limiting the ability to determine definitive reasons for disparities. Variability in data quality and potential self-reporting biases in student feedback may also affect accuracy. Lastly, the findings are specific to Jinka University and may not be fully generalizable to other institutions with different academic structures and student demographics.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

Author Contributions: Abraham S. Kume and Mulat M.Yeshaneh contributed to the conceptualization, data collection, analysis, and drafting of the manuscript. Addisu M. Hunegnaw and Kussie G. Goroya were responsible for manuscript preparation. The manuscript's last version was read and endorsed by all writers.

Funding: Not applicable

Informed Consent Statement: Ethical approval was obtained from the Jinka University Research Ethics Review Committee. As anonymized institutional data were used, informed consent was waived. Data confidentiality was strictly maintained, and the study was conducted solely for educational improvement purposes.

Data Availability Declaration: Upon reasonable request, the corresponding author will provide the datasets used and analyzed in this study.

Acknowledgments: Our sincere thanks go to the Jinka University Registrar Directorate for their assistance in providing secondary data and essential information. We also extend special gratitude to the Jinka University Research Ethics Review Committee for their guidance and support.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors claim no conflicts of interest in relation to this study.

References

1. Al-Alawi, L., Al Shaqsi, J., Tarhini, A., & Al-Busaidi, A. S. (2023). Using machine learning to predict factors affecting academic performance: the case of college students on academic probation. *Educ Inf Technol (Dordr), 28*(10), 1-26. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11700-0
2. Alyahyan, E., & Düştegör, D. (2020). Predicting academic success in higher education: literature review and best practices. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 17*(1), 3. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s41239-020-0177-7
3. Archer, K. J., Lemeshow, S., & Hosmer, D. W. (2007). Goodness-of-fit tests for logistic regression models when data are collected using a complex sampling design. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis, 51*(9), 4450-4464. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csda.2006.07.006
4. Ayenew, E., & Gebre, A. (2022). Assessing Higher Education Exit Exam in Ethiopia: Practices, Challenges and Prospects. *Science Journal of Education, 10*, 79. doi:https://10.11648/j.sjedu.20221002.15
5. Ayenew, E., & Yohannes, A. G. (2022). Assessing higher education exit exam in ethiopia: practices, challenges and prospects. *Science Journal of Education, 9*(2), 79-86. doi:https://10.11648/j.sjedu.20221002.15
6. Bishop, J. H., Mañe, F., & Bishop, M. (2001). How External Exit Exams Spur Achievement. *Educational Leadership, 59*(1), 58-63. doi:https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ634863
7. Dorn, C. (2015). *Research of scheduling impact on student academic performance.* Retrieved from https://minds.wisconsin.edu/bitstream/handle/1793/73988/ChanynDorn.pdf
8. Grech, J. E. (2025). Psychological Responses after Failing an Important Exam: An IPA Study. *Psychology, 16*(2), 149-169. doi:https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2025.162009
9. Hailu, M., Abie, A., Mehari, M. G., Dagnaw, T. E., Worku, N. K., Esubalew, D., . . . Fenta, E. T. (2024). Magnitude of academic performance and its associated factors among health science students at Eastern Ethiopia University's 2022. *BMC Medical Education, 24*(1), 1288. doi:https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-024-06296-z
10. Hanushek, E. A., & Woessmann, L. (2011). How much do educational outcomes matter in OECD countries? *Economic policy, 26*(67), 427-491. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0327.2011.00265.x
11. Kassaw, C., Demareva, V., & Herut, A. H. (2024). *Trends of academic achievement of higher education students in Ethiopia: literature review.* Paper presented at the Frontiers in Education. https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/education/articles/10.3389/feduc.2024.1431661/pdf
12. Kebede, A. (2024). Exploration of Ethiopian University Student's Lived Experience with Pre-Determined Quota Department Placement: A Case Study of School Psychology Student in Bahir Dar University. *Journal of Clinical Psychology and Neurology, 2*(2), 1-6. doi:https://app.oaskpublishers.com/assets/article-pdf/exploration-of-ethiopian-university-students-lived-experience-with-pre-determined-quota-department-placement-a-case-study-of-school-psychology-student-in-bahir-dar-university.pdf

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 6 August 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202508.0435.v1

13. Kebede, A. T., & Phasha, T. N. (2024). Developing teachers' competency for inclusive education in Ethiopia. *African Journal of Disability, 13*, 1383. doi:https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1286675.pdf
14. Koçak, Ö., Göksu, İ., & Göktas, Y. (2021). The Factors Affecting Academic Achievement: A Systematic Review of Meta Analyses. *International Online Journal of Education and Teaching, 8*(1), 454-484. doi:https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1286675.pdf
15. Legese, H. (2018). Factors Affecting the Academic Performance of Undergraduate Students': The Case of Raya University, Maichew, Ethiopia. *Journal of Education and Practice, 9*(31). doi:https://www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JEP/article/view/45757
16. Marsidi, S. R. (2021). Identification of stress, anxiety, and depression levels of students in preparation for the exit exam competency test. *Journal of Vocational Health Studies, 5*(2), 87-93. doi:https://doi.org/10.20473/jvhs.V5.I2.2021.87-93
17. NJENGA, M. TVET Teacher CPD. Practices and Policy Recommendations. doi:https://www.researchgate.net/publication/375911330_TVET_Teacher_CPD_Practices_and_Policy_Recommendations
18. Salehi, S., Cotner, S., Azarin, S. M., Carlson, E. E., Driessen, M., Ferry, V. E., . . . Yonas, A. (2019). *Gender performance gaps across different assessment methods and the underlying mechanisms: The case of incoming preparation and test anxiety.* Paper presented at the Frontiers in Education. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2019.00107
19. Teshome, S. W. (2025). A systematic literature review of the policy and practice critiques of higher education exit exams: A global perspective. *Bulletin of Educational Management and Innovation, 3*(1), 19-37. doi:https://doi.org/10.56587/bemi.v3i1.110
20. Yakubu, M. N., & Abubakar, A. M. (2022). Applying machine learning approach to predict students' performance in higher educational institutions. *Kybernetes, 51*(2), 916-934. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/K-12-2020-0865
21. Yimer, A., & Bishaw, K. (2023). A Review on Implementation Challenges and Measures of Exit Exam to Enhance and Assure the Quality of Engineering Education at Ethiopia HEIs. *Higher Education Research*. doi:https://doi.org/10.11648/j.her.20230806.13
22. Yirdaw, A. (2016). Quality of education in private higher institutions in Ethiopia: The role of governance. *SAGE open, 6*(1), 2158244015624950. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244015624950
23. Yizengaw, T. (2003). *Transformations in higher education: Experiences with reform and expansion in Ethiopian higher education system.* Paper presented at the Keynote paper prepared for a regional training conference on improving tertiary education in sub-saharan Africa: Things that work. https://www.academia.edu/120036254/_Teshome_Yizengaw_2007_The_Ethiopian_Higher_Education_Creating_Space_for_Reform_Addis_Ababa_St_Mary_s_UC_Printing_Press_ISBN_978_99944_999_4_5_263_pages_22_tables_and_8_figures_Birr_60_

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© 2025 by the author(s). Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY license.