



## ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS AFFECTING EXAMINATION MALPRACTICE

Patrick U. Osadebe<sup>1i</sup>,  
Mudiaga F. Bini<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Guidance and Counselling  
Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

<sup>2</sup>Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria

### Abstract:

This research was carried out to verify Secondary School teachers' assessment of the various factors affecting examination malpractice in Delta State. In carrying out this research, eight research questions and four hypotheses were generated, data were collected using the questionnaire instrument, the statistics of mean with a bench mark of 2.5 was used, other statistics used include Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, t-test, and MANOVA, to enable the researchers analyze and interpret data. The descriptive survey method was used, the population of the study was twelve thousand eight hundred and eighty – three (12,883) teachers in the four hundred and fifty-three (453) public secondary schools in Delta State, the sample size was one thousand (1,000) and the sample procedure was the cluster sampling technique, findings reveal that teachers' role, supervisors role, societal value and learning environment are major player in influencing examination malpractice, it also show that gender, qualification and rank of teachers shape their opinion about these factors of examination malpractice based on this, recommendations such as teacher ensuring the completion of examination syllabus, placing of monitoring cameras in examination halls, employing only trusted person for supervision among others would help to reduce or eradicate examination malpractice.

**Keywords:** teachers' assessment, factors affecting, examination malpractice

### 1. Introduction

One of the objectives of education in Nigeria is to prepare the young one to face future challenges and develop them to meet the nation's manpower requirements. In an attempt to accomplish this task, schools need to conduct examinations as yardstick for assessment to affirm if students are achieving what they are supposed to achieve and to

---

<sup>i</sup> Correspondence: email [drosadebeuzo@gmail.com](mailto:drosadebeuzo@gmail.com)

find out areas which need amendments, either in the area of the programme itself or in the process (Oluche, 1988). Situation where the result gotten from this assessment is falsified due to the menace of examination malpractice could therefore be said to be a problem to our school system and the society in general. This evil intruder, examination malpractice refers to any form of omission or commission before, during and after examination by either an individual or group of individuals to enhance a better score, (Shonekan, 1996). Examination malpractice is indeed any unlawful behavior engaged in by students to have personal advantage in an examination. This menace is prevalent in our educational system at all levels, ranging from the tertiary institution down to the primary school level. The malady seems incurable, because virtually all citizens in one way or the other are involved. It is even advertised with positive blatancy. Onyechere (2004), noted that it is almost a routine for students to cheat in examinations, this evil intruder, is known or baptized with so many esoteric aliases such as memory backup, help, mercenary, missiles, dubbing, among others. This negative trend is adversely affecting evaluation by way of adversely reducing the validity and reliability of test and putting the integrity of certificates issued in doubt.

In view of the havoc this menace of examination malpractice is doing to evaluation; efforts is being made by the government, education authorities, cooperate bodies, among others to stop or reduce this evil intruder. The government got to the extent of issuing Act 33 of 1999 referred to as the examination malpractice and miscellaneous offence act to check the malaise, a non-governmental Organization known as the examination malpractice project is also fighting against this negative trend, we also have patriotic Nigerians who are either in the public or private sector whom are contributing their quota to help stop or reduce examination malpractice in our schools and society, the present day involvement of students and all concern in examination malpractice is a clear indication that all these efforts had not yielded the needed results, hence the need for this research. This menace (examination malpractice) would not be in place without the contributions of factors such as, the Teacher role, Supervisors role, Societal values and Learning environment as propounded by Lefrancois (1972).

Trained teachers are supposed to be at the centre of teaching and learning process, coordinating, directing and organizing, but where there are insufficient trained teachers, teaching and learning is being endangered, trained teachers are supposed to transfer what they know to the students and in a situation where those regarded as those who knows are not well trained, then students learning is hampered and when the students do not learn, they resort to getting involve in examination malpractice especially in external examination. The Nigeria education focuses much on the cognitive domain, either in developing it or in examination, most times only the cognitive domain is being tested, there is no much regards for the psychomotor domain which lay emphasis on the practical or technical knowhow, in practical for instance examination malpractice will be at its very minimal, if not stopped entirely, because the individual will be concern with doing it, seeing it and manipulating or creating it, again the affective domain which is supposed to be developed, so that the moral lesson that

will make our people refuse and reject the menace of examination malpractice is also be neglected, hence our people now sees it as a social device. In West Africa Examination Council (WAEC) for examinal where the examination syllabus is provided by the body (WAEC) and test items are generated based on the syllabus, there could be a situation where the teacher at the school level could not complete the syllabus, the students may not be able to answer some items which are drawn from the areas not covered by their teacher, thereby getting involved in examination malpractice, either during the test or after the examination, this is to enable them pass the examinations.

Some supervisors' roles also affect examination malpractice and such role includes improper supervision, collecting bribe from students and schools among others. In most examinations such as West Africa Examination Council (WAEC), National Examination Council (NECO), among others, officials which are supposed to be trusted, have become so corrupt to the extent of collaborating with students and allowing them to cheat in examination after collecting money from the students, parents, school heads, among others. Some examination officials may lack what it takes to properly supervise an examination, either by way of not knowing what to do or by way of lack of the knowledge of the havoc they are causing to the students. Laziness and lackadaisical attitude on the part of some examination supervisor could also influence examination malpractice. These are some practice which the society hold in high esteem that affect examination malpractice such as much regard for paper qualifications, much regard for only those who pass not minding the means of passing among others. Students so desire to pass examination even without getting prepared through studying for the examination, since passing the examination is seen as a sign of success not minding the means, in-view of this, students are ready to do anything, examination malpractice inclusive to ensure they pass examination. Before now, students who are about to write examination are seen with a lot of seriousness in studying, burning candles where there is no electricity, but today, it is almost a reverse of the case, students eventually may resolve to examination malpractice to ensure their success. Our today's societal value goes a long way to encourage examination malpractice, our society respect those who pass examination not minding the means through which they pass such examinations. It is also true that only those who are successful are respected in the society and most of the successful one engaged in one form of illegality or the other to enhance their success (Bimufe, 2008). Based on this value for success no matter the means, individuals are bent on ensuring success using which ever mean, that they could be valued and respected in the society. Results and certificates have taken the place of what people can do. People are regarded, given employment or promotion based on their paper qualification not minding how they got such certificates and since individuals are aware of this, they want to do all they can to get a better paper qualification, this could be one of the drive why students engage in examination malpractice. The fact that it is accepted by almost all is another factor, parent give their children and wards money for this purpose, some supervisors sees it as a means of making money for themselves, friend feel it is a way of helping their friends, even the society value and regard those who pass no matter the means they use

in passing such examinations (Mama 1979), hence it could be said that this menace is near acceptance because almost all stakeholders see it as a way of life. Some even believe that those who indulge in the act of malpractice are sharp and social and have what it take to cope in our present day society. Another influence of examination malpractice is, a situation where teaching and learning process condition is not conducive, especially when equipment are not available learning could be hampered hence result is reduced learning, and when there is no learning and students are expected to write what they have learnt or else they fail, the students resolve to getting involve in examination malpractice.

### **1.1 Research Questions**

The following questions guided the study:

- 1) What is the mean level of the prevalent situation of examination malpractice in our society?
- 2) What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of supervisors as a factor of examination malpractice?
- 3) What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of teachers as a factor of examination malpractice?
- 4) What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of societal value as a factor of examination malpractice?
- 5) What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice?
- 6) What is the influence of teachers gender on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice
- 7) What is the influence of teachers qualification on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice
- 8) What is the influence of teacher rank on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice

### **1.2 Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses will be tested

1. There is no significant difference between male and female teachers on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice.
2. There is no significant difference between NCE teachers and those teachers above NCE on the mean assessment of factor of examination malpractice.
3. There is no significant difference between senior staff and junior staff on the mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice
4. There is no significant influence of gender, qualification and rank on the teacher's opinion of supervisors' role, teachers' role, societal values and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice.

## 2. Method

The research method used in this study was the descriptive survey method which is aimed at analyzing teacher's assessment of factors such as Teachers Role, Supervisors role, Societal value and learning environment, to enable the researcher describe and interpret findings as well as to give answer to formulated questions and hypotheses based on the problems stated. The population of the study comprises of the twelve thousand eight hundred and eighty-three (12,883) secondary school teachers in Delta state, which are teaching staff of the four hundred and fifty-three (453) secondary schools in Delta State.

The sample for the study was one thousand (1000) teaching staff in public secondary school in Delta state which stands at 7.8% of the population of 12,883 teachers of secondary schools in Della state. The cluster sampling method was used to group Delta State according to her senatorial districts and from the element of the central senatorial district, the simple random sampling was use to select the sample size from public secondary school in the rural and urban areas. The sampled local government and their disposition are as follow: Ughelli North 200 teachers, Ughelli South 100 teachers, Okpe 190 teachers, Ethiope East 220 teachers, Ethiope West 110 teachers, Uvwie 180 teachers.

The research instrument used for this study was the rating scale. The rating scale was constructed after a thorough review of the statement of problems, the hypotheses and related literature, the rating scale which is tagged "Evaluation of Factors Affecting Examination Malpractice" (EFAEM), is sub-divided into two (2) main sections. Section A and section B. Section A. contains the personal data of the respondents while section B consist of twenty-two questions or items of which the respondents are given options or alternatives to choose from which best suits their disposition of "strongly agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagreed (D) and Strongly Disagreed (SD)" which is regarded as a four 4) scale of measurement.

In order to ensure the validity of the instrument, it was constructed after careful review of professional literature on examination malpractice in Nigeria; also draft copies were given to three professional educators and three measurement evaluators to assess the suitability of the items on the questionnaire. Their professional suggestions were well integrated in the final copy. The research instrument was also subjected to thorough and proper scrutiny by the project supervisor who help to ensure its validity especially the face and content validity by ensuring that the rating scale actually look like a rating scale and that the items in the rating scale could help collect data needed for this research work, hence his approval. The test re-test method was used to determine the reliability of the instruction. The instrument was administered to 10 respondents in Delta State whom are not part of the sample for the study. The instrument was administered to respondents twice at different times within two weeks. The resulting test scores were correlated. The Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to correlate the response obtained from the two separate

administered instruments (questionnaire). This yielded a coefficient (r) of 0,62 thus the instrument employed in the research was considered enough for the study.

The questionnaire was administered to the respondents by the researcher after addressing them, intimating them that information they would give would be treated with strict confidentiality and that it would be used for nothing more than this research. The respondents responded by ticking the option that best suited their opinions. The questionnaire was finally retrieved from the respondents by the researcher on the same day after completion. This was done in each of the schools visited and appreciation was shown by the researcher to the teachers by way of thanking them for their contribution toward the success of the completion of his work. In order to analyze the data obtained with respect to the questions raised and hypotheses generated, the mean statistics, Pearson Product Moment Coefficient, t-test and MANOVA were conducted to make clear and enhance decision making.

### 3. Results

**Research Question 1:** What is the mean level of the prevalent situation of examination malpractice in our society?

To answer the research question one, a descriptive statistic of mean and standard deviation was conducted for each item of the prevalent situation of Examination malpractice rating scale. A benchmark of 2.50 was used to accept or reject an item as perceived by teachers. Table 1 gives the items of examination malpractice prevalent situation. All bolded mean values were accepted by the teacher as prevalent situation of examination malpractice in Delta State and mean values not bolded were rejected.

**Table 1:** Mean and Standard deviation of prevalent situations of Examination Malpractice

Items (in descending order)	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teachers' inability to cover their syllabus for various reasons could push students into examination malpractice	<b>3.47</b>	0.62258
Unserious students who so desire to pass examinations, have examination malpractice as last resort	<b>3.39</b>	0.57252
Most examination officials are furious and unnecessarily wicked in examination hall when not bribed	<b>3.38</b>	0.59722
When students are asked questions not taught by their teachers, they could resort to examination malpractice	<b>3.36</b>	0.66288
Students who desire to pass without due preparation resolve to examination malpractice	<b>3.31</b>	0.59646
Most external examination officials get involved in illegal deals during external examination	<b>3.30</b>	0.59963
Certificate being the means of promotion in our state, make people get involved in malpractice just to get it at all cost	<b>3.30</b>	0.60560
Ill-equipment of schools reduces learning which can lead to examination malpractice	<b>3.19</b>	0.62534
Societal preference for paper qualification and not what an individual can actually do us a push to examination malpractice	<b>3.14</b>	0.59957
Engaging the services of quack teachers in schools hinders learning and this could	<b>3.13</b>	0.73932

hinders learning hence encourage examination malpractice		
When learning condition is conducive, students will learn and avoid examination malpractice	3.12	0.68490
Societal respect for those who pass examination, not minding the means used, encourage students involvement in examination malpractice	3.12	0.60329
Lack of qualified subject teachers in schools hinders learning and this could cause examination malpractice	3.07	0.79103
Testing based on what you can do practically will reduce examination malpractice	2.96	0.76984
Lack of strict and thorough supervision during examination leads to examination malpractice	2.90	0.82455
Supervisors negligence to duty could encourage examination malpractice in our schools	2.85	0.84706
Low morality level of members of the society could directly or indirectly encourage examination malpractice	2.55	0.84776
An undeveloped mind would see nothing wrong with examination malpractice, hence indulge in it	2.53	0.90439
Mild or no punishment for those caught in the act of examination malpractice by the society, could encourage examination malpractice	2.22	0.76860
Societal respect for scam artist, pen robbers, Knaves, political thieves among other directly or indirectly encourage examination malpractice	2.14	0.77062
<b>Level of Malpractice</b>	<b>3.02</b>	<b>0.19242</b>

The table 4.1 shows that Teachers' inability to cover their syllabus for various reasons could push students into examination malpractice (3.47) was the highest reasons teachers perceived for the prevalent situation of examination malpractice in our society. Other prevalent situations as perceived by the teachers are Unserious students who so desire to pass examinations, have examination malpractice as last resort (3.39); Most examination officials are furious and unnecessarily wicked in examination hall when not bribed (3.38); When students are asked questions not taught by their teachers, they could resort in examination malpractice (3.36); Students who desire to pass without due preparation resolve to examination malpractice (3.31); Most external examination officials get involved in illegal deals during external examination (3.30); Certificate being the means of promotion in our state, make people get involved in malpractice just to get it at all cost ( 3.30); Ill-equipment of schools reduces learning which can lead to examination malpractice (3.12); Engaging the services of quack teachers in schools hinders learning and this could hinders learning hence encourage examination malpractice (3.14); When learning condition is conducive, students will learn and avoid examination malpractice (3.13) Societal preference for paper qualification and not what an individual can actually do us a push to examination malpractice (3.19) Societal respect for those who pass examination, not minding the means used, encourage students involvement in examination malpractice (3.12); Lack of qualified subject teachers in schools hinders learning and this could cause examination malpractice (3.07); Testing based on what you can do practically will reduce examination malpractice (2.96); Lack of strict and thorough supervision during examination leads to examination malpractice(2.90); Supervisors negligence to duty could encourage examination malpractice in our schools (2.85); Low morality level of members of the

society could directly or indirectly encourage examination malpractice (2.55) and an undeveloped mind would see nothing wrong with examination malpractice, hence indulge in it (2.53). The teacher did not perceive Societal respect for scam artist, pen robbers, Knaves, political thieves among other directly or indirectly encourage examination malpractice (2.22) and Mild or no punishment for those caught in the act of examination malpractice by the society, could encourage examination malpractice (2.14) as prevalent examination malpractice situations. The mean level of the prevalent situation of examination malpractice in Delta State society is 3.02. This mean score indicates that examination malpractice is prevalent in Delta State.

**Research Question 2:** What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of supervisor as a factor of examination malpractice?

In answering research question 2, descriptive statistics was conducted. The mean and standard deviation of the various items in supervisors role as factor of examination malpractice as opined by teachers is presented in Table 2.

**Table 2:** Descriptive Statistics of Teachers opinion on the role of Supervisor as factor of examination malpractice

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Most examination officials are furious and unnecessarily wicked in examination hall when not bribed	3.38	0.60
Most external examination officials get involved in illegal deals during external examination	3.30	0.60
Lack of strict and thorough supervision during examination leads to examination malpractice	2.90	0.83
Supervisors negligence to duty could encourage examination malpractice in our schools	2.85	0.85
<b>Mean Opinion of role of supervisor</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>0.45</b>

Arranged in Descending order, the teachers sampled are of the opinion that one of the role the supervisor play in promotion examination malpractice is that most examination official are furious and unnecessarily wicked in examination hall when they are not bribed (3.38). Most external examination officials get involved in illegal deals during external examination (3.30). Another role of supervisors in promotion of examination malpractice is the lack of strict and thorough supervision during examination (2.90) and finally negligence to duty by supervisors also promote examination malpractices in schools (2.85).

The average mean opinion of teachers on the role of supervisor as factor of examination malpractice is 3.11. This mean value indicates that most Examination supervisors (knowingly or unknowingly) play a major role in promoting examination malpractices in Delta State.



### Research Question 3

What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of Teachers as a factor of examination malpractice?

Using a benchmark of 2.50, the various ways in which teachers promote examination malpractice as opined by the teacher and arranged in descending order of their mean opinion is outlined in Table 3

**Table 3:** Descriptive Statistics of Teachers opinion on the role of Teachers as factor of examination malpractice

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Teachers' inability to cover their syllabus for various reasons could push students into examination malpractice	3.47	0.62
When students are asked questions not taught by their teachers, they could resort in examination malpractice	3.35	0.66
Engaging the services of quack teachers in schools hinders learning and this could encourage examination malpractice	3.13	0.74
Lack of qualified subject teachers in schools hinders learning and this could cause examination malpractice	3.07	0.79
Testing based on what you can do practically will reduce examination malpractice	2.96	0.77
<b>Mean opinion of Teachers role</b>	<b>3.20</b>	<b>0.40</b>

The Table 3 shows that it is the opinion of teachers that teachers play a role in examination malpractice by their inability to cover their syllabus for various reasons (3.47). Also asking students questions that they were not taught encourages them to resort to examination malpractice (3.35). They are also of the opinion that engaging the services of quack teachers (3.13) and the lack of qualifies teachers (3.07) in school hinders learning and could lead to the encouragement of examination malpractice. Teachers are of the opinion that testing students based on what they can do practically will reduce examination malpractice (2.96).

The average mean opinion of teachers on the role of Teachers as factor of examination malpractice is 3.20. This mean value indicates that most Teachers play a major role in promoting examination malpractices in Delta State.

**Research Question 4:** What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of societal value as a factor of examination malpractice?

**Table 4:** Descriptive Statistics of Teachers opinion on the role of societal value as factor of examination malpractice

Items on societal Value	Mean	Std. Deviation
Certificate being the means of promotion in our state, make people get involved in malpractice just to get it at all cost	3.30	0.61
Societal preference for paper qualification and not what an individual can actually do ss a push to examination malpractice	3.14	0.60
Societal respect for those who pass examination, not minding the means used,	3.12	0.60

encourage students involvement in examination malpractice		
Low morality level of members of the society could directly or indirectly encourage examination malpractice	2.55	0.85
Mild or no punishment for those caught in the act of examination malpractice by the society, could encourage examination malpractice	2.22	0.77
Societal respect for scam artist, pen robbers, Knaves, political thieves among other directly or indirectly encourage examination malpractice	2.14	0.77
<b>Mean opinion of Societal Value</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>.33</b>

The table 4 shows that the societal value of esteeming certificate (3.30) as the means of promotion encourages examination malpractice in schools. Also, societal preference for paper qualification (3.14) and not what an individual can actually do can also push people to get involved in examination malpractice. Respect for those who pass examination not minding the means they use (3.12) and low morality level of members of the society (2.55) encourage examination malpractice. The teachers did not accept the fact that mild or no punishment for those caught in the act of examination malpractice by the society could encourage examination malpractice (2.22) and that societal respect for scam artist, pen robbers, Knaves, political thieves can directly or indirectly encourage examination malpractice.

The average mean opinion of teachers on the role of societal value as factor of examination malpractice is 2.75. This mean value indicates that societal value has a way of promoting examination malpractices in Delta State.

**Research Question 5:** What is the mean opinion of teachers on the role of learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice?

**Table 5:** Descriptive Statistics of Teachers opinion  
on the role of Learning Environment as factor of examination malpractice

	Mean	Std. Deviation
Unserious students who so desire to pass examinations, have examination malpractice as last resort	3.39	0.57
Students who desire to pass without due preparation resolve to examination malpractice	3.31	0.60
Ill-equipment of schools reduces learning which can lead to examination malpractice	3.19	0.63
When learning condition is conducive, students will learn and avoid examination malpractice	3.12	0.69
An undeveloped mind would see nothing wrong with examination malpractice, hence indulge in it	2.53	0.90
<b>Mean opinion on learning environment</b>	<b>3.11</b>	<b>0.34</b>

Teachers are of the opinion that unserious students who so desire to pass examination have examination malpractice as last resort (3.39). The teachers are also of the opinion that students who don't prepare well (3.31), ill equipment of schools (3.19) and a learning conditions that is not conducive (3.12) make students to resort to examination malpractice. It was also agreed that an undeveloped mind (2.53) would see nothing

wrong with examination malpractice, hence indulge in it. The Mean opinion of teachers on the role of learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice is 3.11 indicating that the environment a student finds his/herself will encourage examination malpractice.

**Research Question 6:** What is the influence of teacher gender on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice?

To answer this research question, a Pearson correlation analysis was conducted. The summary of the output is presented in Table 6

**Table 6:** Correlation between Gender and Examination malpractice

	N	R	R <sup>2</sup>	q
Gender* Examination Malpractice	1000	0.10**	0.01	0.02

The table 6 shows that there was a significant positive correlation between gender of the teachers and their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice (R = 0.10; q = 0.02). The R<sup>2</sup> value of 0.01 shows that gender of the teachers have 1.0 percent in mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice by teachers.

**Research Question 7:** What is the influence of teachers qualification on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice?

**Table 7:** Correlation between teachers qualification and Examination malpractice

	N	R	R <sup>2</sup>	q
Teacher qualification* Examination Malpractice	1000	- 0.08**	0.0064	0.01

The table 7 shows that there was a significant negative correlation between Teachers' qualification and their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice (R = -0.08; q = 0.01). The R<sup>2</sup> values of 0.0064 shows that teachers qualification have 0.64 percent influence on the mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice by teachers.

**Research Question 8:** What is the influence of teacher rank on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice?

**Table 8:** Correlation between teachers rank and Examination malpractice

	N	R	R <sup>2</sup>	P
Teacher qualification* Examination Malpractice	1000	- 0.10**	0.01	0.00

The table shows that there was a significant negative correlation between Teachers' qualification and their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice (R = -0.10; q = 0.01). The R<sup>2</sup> values of 0.01 shows that teachers rank have 1.0 percent influence on the mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice by teachers.

**Hypothesis One:** There is no significant difference between male and female teachers on their mean assessments of factors of examination malpractice.

To test the hypothesis one, an independent sample t-test was conducted. The summary of the output is presented in Table 9.

**Table 9:** Independent sample t-test of mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice based on Gender

	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	q
<b>Examination Malpractice Factors</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>532</b>	<b>60.08</b>	<b>4.06</b>	<b>-3.12</b>	<b>998</b>	<b>0.00*</b>
	<b>Female</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>60.83</b>	<b>3.56</b>			
Supervisor's Role	Male	532	12.41	1.80	-0.43	998	0.67
	Female	468	12.46	1.82			
Teachers' Role	Male	532	15.92	1.96	-1.09	998	0.28
	Female	468	16.06	2.03			
Societal Value	Male	532	16.27	2.05	-3.38	998	0.00*
	Female	468	16.69	1.90			
Learning Environment	Male	532	15.48	1.69	-1.31	998	0.19
	Female	468	15.62	1.72			

The Table shows that there is a significant difference between male (M= 60.08; SD = 4.06) and female (M= 60.83; SD = 3.56) teachers on their mean assessment of examination malpractice prevalence in Delta State ( $t(998) = -3.12$ ;  $q = 0.00$ ). On the opinion of the teachers on the supervisors' role as factor to examination malpractice, there was no significant difference between the opinion of male (M= 12.41; SD = 1.80) and female (M = 12.46, SD = 1.82) teachers [ $t(998) = -0.43$ ;  $q = 0.67$ ]. Comparing the opinion of male (M =15.92; SD= 1.96) and female (M= 16.06; SD= 2.03) teachers on the role of teachers as a factor of examination malpractice, there was no significant difference in their opinion [ $t(998) = -1.09$ ;  $q = 0.28$ ]. On societal value as a factor of examination malpractice, there was no significant difference between the opinion of male (M= 16.27; SD = 2.05) and female (M = 16.69, SD = 1.90) teachers [ $t(998) = -3.38$ ;  $q = 0.00$ ], but no significant difference exist in the opinion of male (M= 15.48; SD = 1.69) and female (M = 15.62, SD = 1.72) teachers on the role of learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice [ $t(998) = -1.31$ ;  $q = 0.19$ ].

Based on the significant difference that exists between the male and female teachers on their mean assessment of factor of examination malpractice, the null hypothesis is therefore rejected. This implies that the mean assessment of factor of examination malpractice is higher for the female teachers than the males. It therefore means that female teachers are more of the opinion that examination malpractice is prevalent in Nigeria than their male counterparts.

**Hypothesis Two:** There is no significant difference between NCE teachers and those teachers above NCE on the mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice.

In testing the hypothesis two, an independent sample t-test was conducted. The summary of the output is presented in Table 10.

**Table 10:** Independent sample t-test of mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice based on qualification

	Acad Qual.	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	q
<b>Examination Malpractice</b>	NCE	384	60.84	3.37	2.79	998	0.01
	B. Ed	616	60.18	4.10			
Supervisor Role	NCE	384	12.57	1.80	1.90	998	0.06
	B. Ed	616	12.34	1.81			
Teachers Role	NCE	384	15.75	1.80	-3.09	998	0.00
	B. Ed	616	16.14	2.09			
Societal Value	NCE	384	16.72	2.07	3.14	998	0.00
	B. Ed	616	16.31	1.92			
Learning Environment	NCE	384	15.81	1.53	3.98	998	0.00
	B. Ed	616	15.38	1.79			

The Table 10 shows that there is a significant difference between teachers that has NCE (60.84± 3.37) and those with B. Ed (60.18±4.10) on their mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice in Nigeria (t (998) = 2.79; q = 0.01). On the opinion of the teachers on the supervisors' role as factor to examination malpractice, there was no significant difference between the opinion of NCE (12.57±1.80) and B. Ed (12.34±1.81) teachers [t (998) = 1.90; q = 0.06]. On teachers on the role of teachers as a factor of examination malpractice, there was a significant difference in their opinion of teacher with NCE (15.75±1.80) and B. Ed (16.72 ± 2.07) [t(998) = -3.09; q = 0.00]. On societal value as a factor of examination malpractice, there was also a significant difference between the opinion of NCE (16.31±2.07) and B. Ed (16.31±1.92) teachers [t (998) = 3.14; q = 0.00], A significant difference also existed in the opinion of NCE Holders (15.81±1.83) and B. Ed holders (15.38±1.79) on the role of learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice [t (998) = 3.98; q = 0.00].

Based on the significant difference that exists between teachers with NCE and B. Ed on their mean assessment of factor of examination malpractice, the null hypothesis is therefore rejected. This implies that the mean assessment of factor of examination malpractice is higher for the NCE teachers than the teachers with B. Ed. It therefore means that teachers with NCE are more of the opinion that examination malpractice is prevalent in Nigeria than their B. Ed counterparts.

**Hypothesis Three:** There is no significant difference between senior staff and junior staff on the mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice.

To test this hypothesis, an independent sample t-test was conducted. The summary of the output is presented in table 11

**Table 11:** Independent sample t-test of mean assessment of factors of examination malpractice based on rank

	Rank of Staff	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	df	q
Examination Malpractice	senior	691	60.69	3.98	3.30	998	0.00
	Junior	309	59.86	3.47			
Supervisor Role	senior	691	12.49	1.80	1.51	998	0.13
	Junior	309	12.30	1.83			
Teachers Role	senior	691	16.01	2.03	0.60	998	0.55
	Junior	309	15.93	1.91			
Societal Value	senior	691	16.57	2.05	2.49	998	0.01
	Junior	309	16.24	1.84			
Learning Environment	senior	691	15.62	1.75	1.97	998	0.05
	Junior	309	15.39	1.60			

The table 11 shows that there was a significant difference in the mean assessment of senior staff ( $60.68 \pm 3.98$ ) and junior staff ( $59.86 \pm 3.47$ ); [ $t(998) = 3.30$ ;  $q = 0.00$ ]. On the supervisors role as a factor of examination malpractice, the opinion of the senior staff ( $12.49 \pm 1.80$ ) is not significant difference from the opinion of the junior ( $12.30 \pm 1.83$ ), [ $t(998) = 1.51$ ;  $q = 0.13$ ]. The opinion of senior staff ( $16.01 \pm 2.03$ ) on the role of teachers as a factor of examination malpractice was also not significantly different from the opinion of the junior staff ( $15.93 \pm 1.91$ ) [ $t(998) = 0.60$ ;  $q = 0.55$ ]. The opinion of senior staff ( $16.57 \pm 16.24$ ) on the role of societal value as a factor of examination malpractice was significantly different from the opinion of the junior staff ( $16.24 \pm 1.84$ ) [ $t(998) = 0.60$ ;  $q = 0.01$ ]. On the learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice, the opinion of the senior staff ( $15.62 \pm 1.75$ ) is not significantly different from the opinion of the junior staff ( $15.39 \pm 1.60$ ), [ $t(998) = 1.97$ ;  $q = 0.05$ ].

Based on the result of the mean assessment of Examination malpractice, where a significant difference was observed, the null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative holds true. The result implies that the senior staffs are more of the opinion that examination malpractice is prevalent in Delta State.

**Hypothesis Four:** There is no significant influence of Gender, qualification and Rank on the opinion of teachers on supervisors' role, teachers' role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice.

To test this hypothesis, a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted. The summary of the output is presented in tables 12a and 12b.

**Table 12a:** Descriptive statistic of effect of Gender, Qualification and Rank on the factors of Examination Malpractice

	Gender	Academic Qualification	Rank	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Supervisor Role	Male	NCE	senior	12.91	2.01	115
			Junior	12.04	1.50	109
		B. Ed	senior	12.57	1.68	278
	Junior		10.33	1.40	30	
	Female	NCE	senior	12.46	1.89	55
			Junior	12.81	1.66	105

Teachers Role	Male	B. Ed	senior	12.21	1.76	243
			Junior	12.85	2.09	65
		NCE	senior	15.48	2.11	115
			Junior	16.04	1.50	109
	Female	B. Ed	senior	16.11	2.09	278
			Junior	15.50	1.28	30
		NCE	senior	15.64	1.57	55
			Junior	15.81	1.80	105
Societal Value	Male	B. Ed	senior	16.24	1.96	243
			Junior	16.15	2.76	65
		NCE	senior	16.61	2.27	115
			Junior	16.51	1.84	109
	Female	B. Ed	senior	16.19	2.00	278
			Junior	14.83	1.70	30
		NCE	senior	17.55	2.33	55
			Junior	16.62	1.85	105
Learning Environment	Male	B. Ed	senior	16.76	1.83	243
			Junior	15.85	1.47	65
		NCE	senior	16.00	1.68	115
			Junior	15.77	1.49	109
	Female	B. Ed	senior	15.16	1.74	278
			Junior	15.33	1.40	30
		NCE	senior	16.64	1.45	55
			Junior	15.19	1.19	105
		B. Ed	senior	15.72	1.72	243
			Junior	15.08	2.22	65

The table 12a shows that on the opinion of teachers on the supervisor role as a factor of examination malpractice, for male teachers that are NCE holders, the senior staff are more of the opinion that supervisors play a role in examination malpractice than the junior staffs that are NCE holders. Also for the B. Ed holders, the senior staff are more of the opinion that supervisors play a role in examination malpractice than the Junior staffs that are B. Ed holders. Also for the Female Teachers with NCE, the mean score for junior staff is higher than that of the senior staff. For the B. Ed teachers, the mean score for junior staff is also higher than that of the senior staff.

On teachers' role as a factor of examination malpractice, the mean opinion of the male NCE teacher that is senior staff is lower than the mean opinion of male NCE teachers that are junior staff. But for male teachers with B. Ed, the mean opinion for the senior staff is higher than that of the junior staff. For the female teachers with NCE, the mean opinion of junior staff is higher than that of the senior staff while for the female teachers with B. Ed the mean opinion of the senior staff is higher.

On the opinion of teacher on societal value as a factor of examination malpractice, the male NCE holders that are senior staff had a higher mean opinion than the junior staff. Also for the Male B. Ed holders, the senior staffs had a higher mean opinion than the junior staff. Also for the female teachers with NCE, the table 12a shows that the senior staffs had a higher mean opinion than the junior staff; while for the

Female B. Ed holders, the senior staffs also had a higher mean opinion than the junior Staff.

On learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice, the mean opinion of the male NCE teacher that are senior staffs is higher than the mean opinion of male NCE teachers that are Junior staff. But for male teachers with B. Ed, the mean opinion for the senior staff is lower than that of the junior staff. For the female teachers with NCE, the mean opinion of junior staff is lower than that of the senior staffs while for the female teachers with B. Ed the mean opinion of the senior staff is higher than that of the junior staff.

The interaction effect of Gender, Qualification and Rank on the dependent variables using MANOVA is presented in Table 12b.

**Table 12b:** MANOVA of the influence of gender, Qualification and Rank on opinion of of supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice

Effect	Multivariate Tests <sup>a</sup>					
	Wilks' Lambda Value ( $\Lambda$ )	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Significance	Eta Squared ( $\eta^2$ )
Intercept	0.006	41082.62	4.00	989.00	0.00	0.994
Gender	0.964	9.25	4.00	989.00	0.00	0.036
Academic Qua.	0.942	15.23	4.00	989.00	0.00	0.058
Rank	0.951	12.73	4.00	989.00	0.00	0.049
Gender * Academic Qua	0.987	3.36	4.00	989.00	0.01	0.013
Gender * Rank	0.936	16.96	4.00	989.00	0.00	0.064
Academic Qua * Rank	0.981	4.85	4.00	989.00	0.00	0.019
Gender * Academic Qua * Rank	0.985	3.75	4.00	989.00	0.01	0.015

The table 12b shows that for the MANOVA test of the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variables, there was a significant main effect of gender on the relationship among dependent variables {  $F(4, 989) = 9.25$ ;  $\Lambda = 0.964$ ;  $q = 0.00$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.036$ }. The effect size of gender on the dependent variable is 3.6%. There was also a significant main effect of academic qualification on the relationship among the dependent variables [ $F(4, 989) = 15.23$ ;  $\Lambda = 0.942$ ;  $q = 0.00$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.058$ ]. The effect size of Academic qualification on the relationships among supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice is 5.8%. There was also a significant main effect of rank on the relationship among supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice. [ $F(4, 989) = 12.73$ ;  $\Lambda = 0.951$ ;  $q = 0.00$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.049$ ]. Academic qualification had an effect size of 4.9% on the relationship among the dependent variable.

The Table 12b also shows that there was a significant interaction effect of Gender and Qualification of the relationship among the dependent variables of supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice [ $F(4, 989) = 3.36$ ;  $\Lambda = 0.987$ ;  $q = 0.01$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.013$ ]. The eta squared value of



0.013 indicates that the interaction of Gender and academic qualification had an effect of 1.3% on the relationship among the dependent variables. There was also a significant interaction effect of Gender and Rank on the relationship among the dependent variables [ $F(4, 989) = 16.96$ ;  $\lambda = 0.936$ ;  $q = 0.00$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.064$ ]. The effect size of gender and rank is 6.4%. The interaction effect of academic qualification and rank on the relationship among the dependent variables was also found to be significant [ $F(4, 989) = 4.85$ ;  $\lambda = 0.981$ ;  $q = 0.01$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.019$ ]. The eta squared value of 0.019 indicates that the interaction of academic qualification and rank had an effect of 1.9% on the relationship among the dependent variables of supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice.

The Interaction effect of Gender, Academic qualification and rank on the relationship among supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice was found to be significant [ $F(4, 989) = 3.75$ ;  $\lambda = 0.985$ ;  $q = 0.01$ ;  $\eta^2 = 0.015$ ]. The effect size of 0.015 indicates that Gender, academic qualification and rank collectively had an effect of 1.5% on the relationship among supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice. The null hypothesis is therefore rejected and the alternative holds true. This implies that there is a significant effect of Gender, qualification and Rank on the relationships between the supervisors' role, teachers' role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice.

#### 4. Discussion

The Interaction effect of Gender, Academic qualification and rank on the relationship among supervisors' role, teacher's role, societal value and learning environment as factors of examination malpractice was significant.

The finding on the pronounce of examination malpractice in Delta State as assessed by secondary school teachers show that the mean of 3.02 is higher than 2.5, hence the affirmation of it pronounce. This finding is in agreement with the work of Onyechere (2003) which opine that it is almost a routine for student to cheat in examination.

The findings on the teachers' opinion on the role of supervisor as a factor of examination malpractice had a mean of 3.11 which is higher than the criterion mean of 2.5. This indicates that most examination supervisors (knowingly and unknowingly) play a major role in promoting examination malpractice. This finding is in line with the findings of Orliungur (2003), Peretomode (1995) and Ejiogu (1997) whose studies reveals that examination malpractice is significantly influenced by supervisors activities, person and characters. But Bimufe (2006) disagree with this assertion.

The findings on teachers' opinion on the role of teachers as a factor of examination malpractice had a mean of 3.20 which is higher than the criterion mean of 2.5. This therefore show that teachers role influence examination malpractice, this findings is in line with the work of Cemeka (2013), Adebola (2012), and Umar (2003) whose findings reveals that the teacher play a major role in encouraging or

discouraging examination malpractice, but this findings disagree with the works of Lefrancois (1972) and Olatunbosan (2010) who suggest that the teacher factor has nothing to do with examination malpractice to the extent of influencing it.

The findings on the mean opinion of teachers on the role of societal value as a factor of examination malpractice has a mean of 2.75 which is higher than the criterion mean of 2.50 meaning the calculated mean is higher than the criterion mean it also shows that societal value can influence examination malpractice, this finding is in agreement with the work of Nuraini (2006) and Ali (1986) whose studies revealed that examination malpractice is significantly influenced by societal value and believes while the study disagree with the work of Olatunbosun (2010) who is of the view that the society believe play no role in influencing examination malpractice.

The finding on the mean opinion of teachers on the role of learning environment as a factor of examination malpractice has a mean of 3.11 which is higher than the criterion mean of 2.5, this shows that learning environment can significantly influence examination malpractice. This findings is in accordance with the work of Bolarin (2002) and Bimufe (2008) whose studies reveal that learning environment contribute immensely to the uprising of examination malpractice but the work of Olatunbosun (2010) is contrary to this findings because she believes that no matter the learning environment, it has nothing to do with promoting or reducing examination malpractice.

Findings also reveal that teachers' gender, qualification and rank have significant influence on their opinion or assessment of factor of examination malpractice.

## 5. Conclusion and Recommendations

Examination malpractice is a social problem that has wrecked unimaginable havoc to the entire fabric of Nigeria. It is a hydra headed problem that requires a multidimensional approach to its resolution. Any effort aimed at resolving this problem must be collaborative, that is, involving all stakeholders in the education sector, if not, such effort will end up being an exercise in futility.

The following recommendations were made from the findings:

1. Seminars/workshop/conferences should be organized for students, teachers, examination officials and the society at large on the effect of examination malpractice.
2. Students should be helped to understand the implication of examination malpractice, through counseling.
3. Parents should encourage their children to study by providing learning materials to curb examination fraud among secondary school students.
4. Teachers of secondary schools should be encouraged to put much effort on the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domain in the area of teaching and assessment of students in order to curb examination malpractice.
5. Implementation of examination malpractice penalty should be made more effective.

6. Employment and promotion should be made based on which one can do and not the paper qualifications
7. Teachers should ensure completion of examination syllabus using various teaching method
8. Philanthropists should make gift donor of teaching and learning materials to schools where students can make use of them.
9. Ministries of education should make sure that examination malpractices are eliminated by monitoring the day to day affairs of secondary schools.
10. Secondary school students are encouraged to organize themselves into a reading mates group in order to curb examination malpractice.
11. Monitoring camera should be placed in examination halls.
12. Only trusted and reliable examination supervisors should be given the opportunities to supervise examination.

## References

1. Abdulrazaq, O. O., Aminullalu, B. U. & Alawaye, S. (2008). Female students perceived causes of and solution to examination malpractice, implication for counseling, *Sokoto: Sokoto Educational Review*, 10(2)7 - 10.
2. Ada, N.A (2004). Examination malpractice and cultism in Nigeria institution of learning, in Ada, NA (Ed), *issues in sociology of education*, Makurdi: peach Global publications.
3. Addison, W. (1990). Examination malpractice among secondary school students in Nigeria, Minna, College Press.
4. Adebola A. (2012). Involvement in examination malpractice, Lagos: Lagos book club.
5. Adekale, A. (1993). Incident and causes of examination malpractice among students in Nigeria, *journal of education foundations*. 4, (1), 18—41.
6. Adeyegbe A. (1994). Examination administration: A macro-theoretical framework option. *Nigeria Journal of Development Issues: Socio, Political Economic Development*, 4(2) 25 – 32.
7. Afolabi, A. (1998). Validity of public examination, the environment and sustainable national development, Ife society of educators, published by cardinal crest Ltd.
8. Agbese, C. C. (2010). Conquering malpractice, a challenge for the society. *Vanguard Newspaper* 15th November, 31.
9. Agbo, F. O. (2008). An investigation into the forces behind examination malpractice. A challenge for secondary school education in the 21st century, *Curriculum Organ Nigeria*, 10(2) 344 – 347.
10. Agogo, P.O (2006). Deviation from Nig cultural practice and value, publisher.
11. Aina, O. (1996). Primary, the ethics an integrity of business and technical examination, in Onyechere I. (eds) promoting examination ethics the challenge of

- a collective responsibility, Examination ethics project publication; Lagos 121 – 135.
12. Ajayi, K. (1985). Teaching and teaching profession in Nigeria, In Oyeneye, O. and Shoreni, M. O. (eds) *Sociology of Education*, Ibadan: Gunsanya.
  13. Ajoke, D. J. & Harbor-Peter, P. T. (1990). *The end of malpractice in Nigeria*, Bolore: Agoyo press.
  14. Akpa, G. D. (1985). *The guidance counselor and implementation of continuous assessment under the 6-3-3-4 system*; *The Counselor*, 8, 104-116.
  15. Ali, R. (1986). The menace called examination malpractice, *New Watch Magazine*, July 1, Pp. 16 – 18.
  16. Aliyu, K. (1997). The implication of examination malpractice in our society, *Bichi Journal of Education* 1(4)6-7.
  17. Anyiin, K. (1998). Examination malpractice in Benue State schools: the way forward, seminar-paper by the cultism committee. Makurdi 1998.
  18. Audu, O. E. (1985). *Examination malpractice and the way forward*, Lagos: Joja publishers.
  19. Bednar, C. V. & Leviee, I. A. (1993). *Conducting examination*, London, Fastan books.
  20. Bimufe, M.F. (2008). *Examination malpractice a hindrance to educational development*, Kaduna; Presidential press:
  21. Bloom, B. S. (Ed.) (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives, Handbook 1: The Cognitive domain* New York: Mckay Co.
  22. Bolarin, E.O (2002). *Eradicating examination malpractice in Nigeria, A Lecture delivered at the 2002 convocation of Adeniran Ogunsaya College of Education Oto, Ijaniki*, Lagos.
  23. Cemeka, V. (2011). *Discouraging examination malpractice, a task for all*. Seminar paper by the collision committee, Makurdi 2011.
  24. Cemeka, V. (2013). *The school, examination and societal believes, their relationships and link*, A seminar paper presentation, Makurdi, 2013.
  25. Dike, B. (1996). *Fighting examination malpractice a multi-dimensional approach*, Calabar: Rapd Educational Publishers.
  26. Douglas, A. (2000). *This generation and the way forward*. Sunday Trust November, 2.
  27. Ejiogu, A. R. (1997). *Problems and prospects of education in Nigeria education, A historical overview*. In *emergent issues in Nigerian education* 2, 12-18
  28. Ejiogu, A. R. (2001). *Moral and national development: A case for national Rebirth*, Abuja. National Orientation Agency.
  29. Ekpu, R. (1991). *The menace calls examination malpractice*, New watch Magazine, July 1
  30. Eleanor, P. & Oughton, J. (2007). *Developing the child's mind- The classification of educational goals handbook II: Affective Domain*, New York, Mckay Co.
  31. Eromosele, S.A. (2011). *Taming the menace of examination malpractice in Nigeria* press, Benin City; Upper press.

32. Fayombo, G.A. (2004). Assuring quality in school practices and strategies, 1 national conference proceeding P. 160-167
33. Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). Examination malpractice act, Lagos, Government press.
34. Federal Republic of Nigeria (1999). National policy on Education (Revised) Lagos: Federal Ministry.
35. Gronlund, N. E. (1985). Measurement and evaluation in teaching (5<sup>th</sup> ed.), New York: Macmillan printing company
36. Ibia, E. I. (2006). Sociological foundation of Nigeria Educational Uyo: Abaam publishing co.
37. Lefrancois, G. R. (1972). Psychological Theories and Human living Konyo's Report, Monterey Book/Role publishing Co.
38. Maheshwari, U. K. (2011). The examination malpractice A fight for all, London: fastened 'Books.
39. Mama, V. E. (1997). The school a mini society (Nsukka, University trust publication).
40. Merton, R. K. (1968). Social theory and social structure, New York: The Free Press.
41. Mohammed, A. A. & Gyallesu, S. U. (1995). Teacher's input to examination malpractice, prevention and detection strategies in Oyechare, I. Promoting Examination Ethics: The Challenges of a collective responsibility, Lagos: Potomac Books.
42. Nenty, V. O. (1985). The way of the society, Auch: Jes Publications.
43. Newty, H. J. (1985). Tendency to cheat during Mathematics Examination and some Achievement related variables, A paper presented at the WAEC monthly seminar, University of Lagos.
44. Nsosong, A. U. (2011). Remote caused and counseling implications of examination malpractice in Nigeria, *Students Pulse* 3(10), 1 – 3.
45. Nuraini, A. (2008). Examination malpractice: causes, effect and solution, Minna; College press.
46. Nworgu, B.G (2003). Educational measurement and evaluation, theory and practice. Revised Edition. Nsukka, University Trust Publishers.
47. Obayendo, A. B. (2008). The scourge of examination malpractice concept, causes, consequences and remedies education for Today, 6(2) 59 – 72.
48. Odili, J. N. & Ajuar, H.N. (1995). Basic educational measurement and evaluation, Warn: Johnny & co.
49. Okebukola, E. (2004). Students study habit, *Journal of Human Ecology*; 4(7) 13 – 16, Uyo: Abaam publishing co.
50. Okereke, A. (2012). Societal values and its total neglect, A seminar paper presented at a two-day summit on respect for our culture in Nigeria organized by House of Assembly Committee on welfare Held at the Army Barrack, Sokoto Town August 15 – 16.

51. Olatunbosun, O. A. (2010). Way-out of examination malpractice, *The Light*, 4(3) 32 – 40.
52. Oluche, A. (1988). Education and Development, *A Journal of the Nigeria Education Research Council (NERC)*, Jan. 19<sup>th</sup> 1(4) 3 – 4.
53. Omotosho, H.M (1990). *The face of examination malpractice in Nigeria*, WAEC News, 4(3), 3-5
54. Onyechere .I. (1996). Examination Ethics handbook, Yaba: NERDC press.
55. Onyechere, I. (2003). *Cheating a worldwide problem*, a paper presented at All Africa Nation conference. r, . . .
56. Orliungur, M. (2003). Examination malpractice; implication for schools and the Nigeria societies; *A Conference Paper at the 27<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference of the Counseling Association of Nigeria (CASSON)*, University of Ibadan, 18th to 22nd August.
57. Peretomode, V. F. (1991). Education administration; Applied concepts and theoretical perspective for students and practitioners, Lagos: Joja Educational Researcher and publishers Ltd.
58. Peretomode, V.F (1995). *Sociology of Education*, Lagos: Obaroh and Ogbinaka publisher Ltd.
59. Rhoda, O. O. (2004). Student’s perception of factors and solutions to examination malpractice in Nigeria Universities, Lagos: Life Press.
60. Salami, N. (2002). *A handbook on history of education in Nigeria*, Lagos: Ola Ama press.
61. Samuel, I. (2003). Way out of examination malpractice, *ThisDay* newspaper; September 30.
62. Shamans, M. O. (1990). *Code of Judicial conduct. An Overview*, 74, New York: Judicature 21.
63. Shonekan, M. (1996). Promoting the ethics and integrity of WAEC examination in Onyechere I (eds) *Promoting examination ethics, the challenge of a collective responsibility*, Lagos: Examination Ethic Project Publication.
64. Shonekan, M. (1996). The scourge of examination fraud, *National concord*, Lagos: concord publication, Pp 10-15. 29th January.
65. Sofola, O. (2004). Dangers of examination malpractice, *Life Magazine: Special Issues*, Gbangada: Lagos, Life Press.
66. Sooze, S. (2004, May 29). Way out of examination malpractice, *Daily Times*; Pp 7-8.
67. Umar, U.T (2003). The proliferation cyf examination malpractice, Lagos: Life press.
68. ThisDay (2004). Examination malpractice: Zamfara Toplist Survey, Thursday September, 14.
69. Udoh, V. (2008). Examinations and it illegality, *curriculum organ*, Nigeria 7(4) 201 – 221.
70. Umar, A. (2003). The state of educational facilities and the users, *The Nigeria Journal of Development Issues: Socio-Political Economic Development*, 2(6) 5 - 7.
70. Usman, J. O. (1999). *How to answer biology questions*, examination malpractice Makurdi: Living faith press.

71. Vanguard Newspaper (2013). Examination malpractice, (Zamfara Top-list Survey). Thursday September 12th, 2013. Pp. 4.

Creative Commons licensing terms

Author(s) will retain the copyright of their published articles agreeing that a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0) terms will be applied to their work. Under the terms of this license, no permission is required from the author(s) or publisher for members of the community to copy, distribute, transmit or adapt the article content, providing a proper, prominent and unambiguous attribution to the authors in a manner that makes clear that the materials are being reused under permission of a Creative Commons License. Views, opinions and conclusions expressed in this research article are views, opinions and conclusions of the author(s). Open Access Publishing Group and European Journal of Education Studies shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability caused in relation to/arising out of conflicts of interest, copyright violations and inappropriate or inaccurate use of any kind content related or integrated into the research work. All the published works are meeting the Open Access Publishing requirements and can be freely accessed, shared, modified, distributed and used in educational, commercial and non-commercial purposes under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License \(CC BY 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).