

PERCEPTION OF EXAMINATION MALPRACTICE, AND PREFERRED INTERVENTION STRATEGIES, BY SOME STAKEHOLDERS IN THE NIGERIAN SCHOOL SYSTEM

BY

Professor Monday T. Joshua, Dr. Fidelis E. Obo, Dr. (Mrs.) Akon M. Joshua, Dr. (Mrs.) Aniefiok O. Edet & Dr. (Mrs.) Uduak I. Ekpoh
c/o Faculty of Education
University of Calabar
Calabar, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

Examination Malpractice is an academic disease that has posed a very serious threat to educational standards and credibility of certificates and diplomas awarded in schools in Nigeria and other countries. It is a phenomenon that has attained alarming proportion in many school systems, making the management of schools generally, and school examinations in particular rather difficult. This study, which is a survey, was designed to determine the perceptions that the various education stakeholders have of examination malpractice, and their preferred intervention strategies. It is believed that one's perception affects the treatment or therapy recommended or accepted by him/her. A sample of 1000 education stakeholders (comprising students, teachers, parents, school administrators) was drawn from secondary schools in Calabar Education Zone of Nigeria, using stratified random sampling technique. A structured questionnaire was used to collect data which were treated with descriptive and inferential statistics. Results of the study indicate that majority of education stakeholders perceive examination malpractice as a crime that needs to be fought, but a worrisome minority perceive it as a means of rendering help, meeting high expectations, boosting school image, and compensating for school inadequacies, and not as a factor in lowering standard. The stakeholders endorsed highly all the five intervention strategies presented by the researchers.

INTRODUCTION

Examination is a process of evaluating the extent to which education has taken place in the individual. Oluwatelure (2008) sees it as one important activity of the academic community which falls within the scope of the concept of curriculum. There comes a stage in the teaching-learning process that learners are required to face a set of tasks which are designed to test their knowledge, skills or abilities in written or oral forms, or in laboratory/workshop practicals. Every examination is expected to be guided by code of conduct or ethics of the institution, government or the examination bodies. Examination

therefore remains important aspect of the education process, although some have argued or queried its use as a true test of knowledge/ability.

As a result of its widespread use as a means of testing learners' knowledge/ability, examination has been exposed to all sorts of abuses. The different abuses in the management of examinations, which constitute examination malpractice (EM), stems from the use of examination results to license candidates for occupations or professions. And due to over-dependence on paper qualifications in Nigeria, the entire country has been be-deviled with a lot of problems and crises in the management of examinations, and these have been turned into money-making ventures through fraudulent means. This scenario or epidemic appears the same in other countries of the world. Thus, examination malpractice (EM) is an ugly but imposing phenomenon in the nation's educational systems.

Examination malpractice (EM) has variously been described as an act from which the examinee derives illicit advantage over and above other candidates in an examination. A synthesized definition of EM from numerous definitions in the literature, given by Joshua (2008a), is that it is any unauthorized or unapproved action, inaction, activity, behaviour or practice that is associated with the preparation, conduct and processing of examination and other forms of assessment, and carried out by any person involved in preparing for, giving, taking and processing that examination at any level. It is an illegal act committed by student, teacher, invigilator, supervisor, school administrator, parent, or any other public officer either in government ministry/parastatal or examination body before, during and/or after an examination in order to obtain or award undeserved marks/scores/grades. Thus, perpetrators of EM span across students, teachers, school administrators, parents, school proprietors, examination bodies/officials, law enforcement agents, government, society etc. EM is an academic disease that has affected and infected many members of the instructional team, or many stakeholders in the education industry, and has posed as very serious threat to education standards and credibility of school certificates/diplomas

awarded in Nigeria and other countries. It is an academic fraud (or fraud in the school system), and it is a form of corruption which derives from the corrupt nature of the social system operating in Nigeria currently (Joshua, 2008b). According to Oyechere (2003) in Jega (2006), EM has become a national disaster, and every disaster brings an emergency situation that requires all hands to be on deck.

Many strategies have been advanced in the literature and devised by governments to curb this menace, but, as a monster, it is still thriving and looming in the school systems. It is hypothesized that the solution to this ugly situation lies in determining the perception that the various education stakeholders have of EM and their preferred intervention strategies, and drawing the battle from those perspectives.

EM has been perceived differently by education stakeholders which include students, teachers, parents, school administrators and others. According to Oyechere (2008), students get involved in it not because they do not prepare well or are afraid of failure, but simply because they seem odd in a system where everyone is a potential cheater. Fellow students tease others who do not partake in this crime as being pretenders or 'Mr. Too Know' or cowards. Also, Adebayo (2002) in his study found out that students cheat because they believe everybody does it, and they also see it as a means of helping others. Similarly, Oluwatelure (2008) in studying how selected members of University community perceived academic integrity and examination issues found out that the youths in the community did not see anything wrong with 'giraffing', impersonation and going into examination hall with illegal materials. The study also revealed that some youths even make a living from writing examinations for others; and that 95% of the respondents were of the opinion that youths get involved in cheating just for the fun of it.

Still on perception, Oluwatelure (2004) discovered that teachers perceived EM (particularly selling examination materials) as a means of poverty alleviation, just as Denga (1983) found out the same in his study. This, to them, is as a result of inadequate compensation system in the nation.

Different strategies have devised and applied to curb this menace. For example, the Federal Government of Nigeria promulgated Decree 33 of 1999 and stipulated various stern penalties for various offences associated with conduct of examinations. The various school authorities, College Academic Boards, University Senates, etc have enacted similar laws to fight this monster called examination malpractice. Yet, the monster seems to be thriving and looming majestically in school systems. For instance, Obo (2008) in his study showed how States in Nigeria have been competing in taking top positions in the ranking of their examination malpractices indices, and how this index for the country has increased from 4.5 in 1999 to 16.9 in 2004 (an increase of 276%). There is therefore a serious need to fight this menace from different fronts, including the perspective of finding out the perception of EM by the stakeholders in the education industry.

This study, therefore, was designed to find out the perception of EM, and of appropriate intervention strategies, by the education stakeholders in Nigeria, which were limited to students, teachers, parents and school administrators. Thus, the following Research Questions were formulated to guide the study:

- (i) How do education stakeholders perceive examination malpractice (EM)?
- (ii) What do the education stakeholders perceive as the appropriate intervention strategies to curb EM?
- (iii) How does the education stakeholders' perception of EM vary with the category of stakeholders?
- (iv) How does education stakeholders' perception of appropriate intervention strategies vary with the category of stakeholders?

The hypotheses derived from these research questions and tested in this study were:

- (i) The perception that education stakeholders have of EM in relation to the selected objects/aspects is not significantly high.
- (ii) The perception that education stakeholders have of the selected intervention strategies in curbing EM is not significantly high.

(iii) Education stakeholders' perception of EM does not significantly vary with the category of the stakeholders.

(iv) Education stakeholders' perception of appropriate intervention strategies in curbing EM does not significantly vary with the category of the stakeholders.

METHODOLOGY

The study was essentially a survey. Four main education stakeholders were chosen for study, namely students, teachers, parents and school administrators. The study was carried out in Calabar Educational Zone, which is one of the three main Educational Zones in Cross River State, one of the 36 States in Nigeria. The populations of the education selected stakeholders are quite large, and some are infinite. There are seven (7) Local Government Areas (LGAs) that constitute the Calabar Educational Zone. Three LGAs were randomly selected from the Zone, and twenty (20) secondary schools were randomly selected from these three LGAs (7, 7, 6). In these 20 schools, fifteen teachers and seventeen/eighteen students (from the senior classes) were randomly selected into the sample for the study. Also, by a random process, 300 parents were also sampled (mainly through their wards in the schools), and the Principals and Vice-principals of the sampled schools were selected to form the sample for the study. Thus, the sample used for the study consisted of 1000 education stakeholders, made up of 350 students, 300 teachers, 300 parents and 50 school administrators. The selections were done in such stratified manner to maintain equal numbers of males and females among the respondents.

Data collection was effected through a research instrument (questionnaire) constructed by the researchers. The questionnaire comprised two sections. Section A had six items that sought for demographic data, while Section B had 30 items, with three items on each of the five objects of perception of EM, and five possible intervention strategies of curbing EM selected for study. The items were of the 4-point Likert scale with

responses of 'strongly agree', 'agree', 'disagree' and 'strongly disagree', scored 4, 3, 2, 1 respectively. The research instrument yielded a reliability index (Cronbach Alpha) of .89 and .87 on the two parts of Section B. data collection was carried out personally by the researchers, with the help of assistants in the persons of Vice-principals, class teachers, school/class prefects and students themselves (especially in reaching their parents). The data collected were analyzed with descriptive and inferential statistics from the Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS).

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

There were five (5) objects or aspects of perception of EM, and also five (5) possible intervention strategies to curb EM selected from the literature for consideration in this study. Three (3) questionnaire items were formulated on each of these objects and strategies. Responses to these three items were summed up to constitute the opinion or perception of the respondents on each of these objects and strategies. Percentages, population t-test and one-way analysis of variance were the analysis techniques deployed to test the study hypotheses, and thereby answer the research questions. The analysis and the interpretation are presented hypothesis-by-hypothesis.

Hypothesis 1

The perception that education stakeholders have of EM in relation to the selected objects/aspects is not significantly high.

This was derived from Research Question 1 "How do education stakeholders perceive examination malpractice (EM)? In testing this hypothesis, the sample mean (from the three items on each object) was compared with a referenced (or population) mean score using population t-test analysis. The reference mean score was obtained by multiplying the average of the scores attached to the four responses to questionnaire items by the number of items, i.e. Reference Mean = $\frac{1}{4}(4+3+2+1) \times 3 = 7.50$

The result of the analysis is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Population t-test analysis of education stakeholders' perception of examination malpractice

Perception of Examination Malpractice	Sample Mean	Sample SD	Reference Mean	t-value	Ave % Agree	Ave % Disagree
(i) As a means of Rendering Help	5.70	2.49	7.50	-22.92*	27	73
(ii) As a means of Meeting High Expectations	6.45	1.82	7.50	-18.18*	36	64
(iii) As a means of boosting school Image	6.46	2.34	7.50	-14.06*	36	64
(iv) As a means of compensating for inadequate facilities/teaching	5.63	2.38	7.50	-24.83*	24	76
(v) As a factor in lowering Standards	9.45	2.64	7.50	23.41*	76	24

* $p < .05$; Critical $t = 1.96$; $df = 999$

The results presented in Table 1 have shown that all the five calculated t-values (absolute values) are each greater than the critical t-value of 1.96 at .05 level of significance with 999 degrees of freedom. Based on this result, the null hypothesis is rejected in all the five instances. However, the negative t-values for objects (i) – (iv) imply that the stakeholders' perception of EM is significantly low; while the positive t-value for (v) implies that the respondents' perception of EM is significantly high. Using non-statistical terms, the results of the analysis indicate that most of the stakeholders do not perceive EM as (i) a means of rendering help to fellow humans (73% disagreed), (ii) a means of meeting high expectations (64% disagreed), (iii) a means of boosting image of the school (64% disagreed), and (iv) a means of compensation for inadequate facilities/teaching (76% disagreed). However, the stakeholders perceived EM as a factor in lowering the standard of education (76% agreed to this). It should also be noted from the table that 27% of the education stakeholders agreed that EM is a means rendering help to fellow humans, 36% of them agreed that EM is a means of meeting high expectations from parents, society, schools. etc, 36% of them agreed that EM is a means of boosting the image of the school and its functionaries, 24% of them agreed that EM is a means of compensating for the inadequate facilities/teaching in the school; and 24% of them disagreed that EM is a factor that is contributing to lowering standard of education.

Hypothesis 2

The perception that education stakeholders have of the selected intervention strategies in curbing EM is not significantly high.

This was derived from Research Question 2 “What do the education stakeholders perceive as the appropriate intervention strategies to curb EM? In testing this hypothesis, the sample mean (from the three items on each object) was compared with a referenced (or population) mean score of 7.50 (obtained as explained under Hypothesis 1). The result of the analysis is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2
Population t-test analysis of education stakeholders’ perception of intervention strategies to curb examination malpractice

Perception of Intervention Strategies	Sample Mean	Sample SD	Reference Mean	t-value	Ave % Agree	Ave % Disagree
(i) Public Campaigns/Advocacy	9.08	2.18	7.50	22.99*	75	25
(ii) Recognition of Non-supporters of EM	9.74	2.13	7.50	33.17*	82	18
(iii) Devotion to duties by School Personnel	9.55	2.12	7.50	30.67*	81	19
(iv) Quick Sanctions on Perpetrators of EM	9.14	2.55	7.50	20.32*	75	25
(v) Emphasis on Practical Skills in the society during Employment/Admission	9.34	2.21	7.50	26.43*	76	24

* $p < .05$; Critical $t = 1.96$; $df = 999$

The results presented in Table 2 have shown that all the five calculated t-values are each greater than the critical t-value of 1.96 at .05 level of significance with 999 degrees of freedom. Based on this result, the null hypothesis is rejected in all the five instances. The positive t-values imply that the perception that education stakeholders have of each of the five selected intervention strategies to curb EM is significantly high. The sizes of the sample mean values and percentages of agreement indicate that the stakeholders place more premium on ‘recognition of non-supporters of EM’ as the most effective intervention strategy, followed by ‘devotion to duties by school personnel’, followed by ‘emphasis on practical skills in the society during employment/admission’, followed by ‘quick sanctions on perpetrators of EM’, and followed by ‘public campaigns/advocacy’. But each of these

intervention strategies is perceived highly. However, there are some information to note in the 'percentages of disagreement' in the Table 2. As much as 25% of the stakeholders do not agree that 'public campaigns/advocacy', 'quick sanctions on perpetrators of EM' and 'emphasis on practical skills in the society during employment/admission' would curb EM. Also about 19% of them do not agree that 'recognition of non-supporters of EM' and 'devotion to duties by school personnel' would curb EM.

Hypothesis 3

Education stakeholders' perception of EM does not significantly vary with the category of the stakeholders.

This was derived from Research Question 3. The independent variable in this hypothesis is 'category of stakeholders' (i.e. whether students, teachers, parents or school administrators); while the dependent variable is 'stakeholders' perception of EM'. The statistical analysis technique deployed to test this hypothesis was one-way analysis of variance. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 3, but the information on sums of squares and mean squares are omitted in the table for ease of presentation and understanding.

The results presented in Table 3 have shown that all the five calculated F-values are each higher than the critical F-value of 2.61 at .05 level of significance, with 3 and 996 degrees of freedom. Based on these results, the null hypothesis is rejected in all the five instances. This implies that stakeholders' perception of EM significantly varies with the category of stakeholders. The ranks given to the mean values (shown in parentheses in the table) indicate that:

(i) 'Students' are the first in their perception of EM as 'a means of rendering help to fellow humans', followed by 'parents', and then by 'teachers', and lastly by 'school administrators';

(ii) 'School administrators' are the first in their perception of EM as 'a means of meeting high expectations of parents, society, etc, followed by 'students', then followed by 'parents', and lastly by 'teachers';

(iii) 'Students' are the first in their perception of EM as 'a means of boosting school image', followed by 'teachers', and then by 'students', and lastly by 'parents';

(iv) 'Students' are the first in their perception of EM as 'a means of compensating for inadequate facilities/teaching in the school', followed by 'parents', and then by 'school administrators', and lastly by 'teachers'; and

(v) 'School administrators' are the first in their perception of EM as 'a factor in lowering standard of education', followed by 'teachers', and then by 'parents', and lastly by 'students'.

TABLE 3
One-way analysis of variance of influence of category of stakeholders on perception of examination malpractice

Perception of Examination Malpractice	Category of Stakeholders	N	Mean	SD	F-value
(i) As a means of Rendering Help	Students	350	6.75 (1)**	2.79	35.95*
	Teachers	300	5.13 (3)	2.11	
	Parents	300	5.17 (2)	2.16	
	School Admin	50	4.84 (4)	1.71	
	Total	1000	5.70	2.49	
(ii) As a means of Meeting High Expectations	Students	350	6.77 (2)**	1.94	8.22*
	Teachers	300	6.21 (4)	1.63	
	Parents	300	6.24 (3)	1.83	
	School Admin	50	6.98 (1)	1.60	
	Total	1000	6.45	1.82	
(iii) As a means of boosting school Image	Students	350	6.14 (3)**	2.12	12.80*
	Teachers	300	6.18 (2)	2.34	
	Parents	300	5.82 (4)	1.38	
	School Admin	50	7.07 (1)	2.50	
	Total	1000	6.46	2.34	
(iv) As a means of compensating for inadequate facilities/teaching	Students	350	5.93 (1)**	2.50	3.30*
	Teachers	300	5.37 (4)	2.24	
	Parents	300	5.58 (2)	2.43	
	School Admin	50	5.40 (3)	1.71	
	Total	1000	5.63	2.38	
(v) As a factor in lowering Standards	Students	350	9.19 (4)**	2.68	3.77*
	Teachers	300	9.62 (2)	2.60	
	Parents	300	9.44 (3)	2.72	
	School Admin	50	10.40 (1)	1.77	
	Total	1000	9.45	2.64	

* $p < .05$; Critical $F_{3,996} = 2.61$; ** These are ranks given to the mean values

Hypothesis 4

Education stakeholders' perception of appropriate intervention strategies in curbing EM does not significantly vary with the category of the stakeholders

This was derived from Research Question 4. The independent variable in this hypothesis is 'category of stakeholders' (i.e. whether students, teachers, parents or school administrators); while the dependent variable is 'stakeholders' perception of appropriate intervention strategies in curbing EM'. The statistical analysis technique deployed to test this hypothesis was one-way analysis of variance. The results of the analysis are presented in Table 4, but the information on sums of squares and mean squares are omitted in the table for ease of presentation and understanding.

TABLE 4
One-way analysis of variance of influence of category of stakeholders on perception of appropriate intervention strategies in curbing EM

Perception of Intervention Strategies	Category of Stakeholders	N	Mean	SD	F-value
(i) Public Campaigns/Advocacy	Students	350	8.95 (4)**	2.27	1.53
	Teachers	300	9.15 (2)	2.22	
	Parents	300	9.09 (3)	2.14	
	School Admin	50	9.62 (1)	1.32	
	Total	1000	9.08	2.18	
(ii) Recognition of Non-supporters of EM	Students	350	9.67 (2)**	2.27	1.42
	Teachers	300	9.94 (1)	1.96	
	Parents	300	9.44 (4)	2.04	
	School Admin	50	9.66 (3)	2.15	
	Total	1000	9.74	2.13	
(iii) Devotion to duties by School Personnel	Students	350	9.41 (3)**	2.16	1.36
	Teachers	300	9.73 (1)	2.17	
	Parents	300	9.58 (2)	1.93	
	School Admin	50	9.40 (4)	2.59	
	Total	1000	9.55	2.12	
(iv) Quick Sanctions on Perpetrators of EM	Students	350	8.52 (4)**	2.85	11.25*
	Teachers	300	9.55 (1)	2.22	
	Parents	300	9.44 (2)	2.41	
	School Admin	50	9.22 (3)	2.16	
	Total	1000	9.14	2.55	
(v) Emphasis on Practical Skills in the society during Employment/Admission	Students	350	9.13 (4)**	2.34	3.77*
	Teachers	300	9.63 (2)	1.97	
	Parents	300	9.20 (3)	2.27	
	School Admin	50	9.86 (1)	2.15	
	Total	1000	9.34	2.21	

* $p < .05$; Critical $F_{3,996} = 2.61$; ** These are ranks given to the mean values

The results presented in Table 4 have shown non-significant F-values for Intervention Strategies (i) – (iii), and significant F-values for Intervention Strategies (iv) – (v). Based on

these results, the null hypothesis is rejected in instances (iv) and (v), and not rejected in instances (i), (ii), and (iii). This implies that education stakeholders' perception of 'public campaigns/advocacy', 'recognition on non-supporters of EM' and 'devotion to duties by school personnel' as appropriate intervention strategies in curbing EM does not significantly depend on the category of stakeholders. Thus all of them do agree at the same level on these as appropriate intervention strategies to curb EM. However, the significant F-values for Strategies (iv) and (v) imply that:

(i) 'Teachers' are the first in their perception of 'quick sanctions on perpetrators of EM' as an appropriate intervention strategy to curb EM, followed by 'parents', and then by 'school administrators', and lastly by 'students'; and

(ii) 'School administrators' are the first in their perception of 'emphasis on practical skills in the society during employment/admission' as an appropriate intervention strategy to curb EM, followed by 'teachers', and then by 'parents', and lastly by 'students'.

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

Perhaps the frightening aspects of the results of this study that is, or should be worrisome, and that should concern all stakeholders in the education industry, are the percentages of agreement/disagreement. While majority of the stakeholders in the sample disagreed that EM is a means of rendering help to fellow humans, meeting high expectations, boosting school image and compensating for inadequate facilities/teaching, and this is commendable; as much as 27% of the stakeholders perceive EM as a means of rendering help to fellow humans. This percentage, though reflecting minority position, is very worrisome. Thus, when people cheat in examinations, or facilitate EM, they believe they are rendering help, and perhaps believe/expect they should rather be commended or celebrated for doing so. This finding on EM as rendering help is in agreement with those of Adebayo (2002 and Obo (2008). But whoever holds this view (of EM as help) will hardly stop it as he/she may be propelled by self/intrinsic motivation to help their children (if parents, their

students (if teachers/school administrators) or their friends and neighbours (if students) through EM to jump the hurdle of examination and possess the needed credentials. It is not surprising that students took the first position in seeing EM as a means of rendering help, followed by parents (under Hypothesis 3). This is greatly worrisome.

Another finding showed that as much as 36% of the sample perceived EM as a means of meeting high expectations from parents, society, etc; and the same percentage perceived EM as a means of boosting the school image. This finding tends to explain the situation where public examination candidates, supported by their parents/guardians, withdraw from schools in townships/urban areas to register in and take examinations in some particular schools in rural areas noted for turning out 'wonderful results in forms of 10 credit passes, 9 alphas, etc'. It is then not a wonder that school administrators took the first position in perceiving EM as a means of boosting school image, and also as a means of meeting high expectations of parents and society (under Hypothesis 3).

The result also showed that 24% of the stakeholders in the sample perceived EM as a means of compensating for inadequate facilities/teaching in schools. Thus, instead of bringing pressure on relevant authorities to provide teaching-learning materials in classrooms, laboratories, workshops, etc to facilitate teaching/learning, school administrators and teachers resort to EM to cover up these inadequacies, and also to cover up their poor teaching, non-completion of syllabuses, non-/poor exposure of students to relevant practicals, etc. Also, 24% of the respondents did not see EM as a factor in lowering standard of education. These findings collaborate those of Obo (2008). It is not surprising then that students, who are at the receiving end in schools are the first in their perception of EM as a means of compensating for inadequate facilities/teaching in schools, followed by their parents. Thus, when students are face-to-face with examinations, and they have a feeling (real or apparent) of inadequate preparation (either by the school or by themselves), they resort to EM, sometimes supported by their parents.

These findings are very worrisome. This is so because Denga (1983) had warned that EM was further enhanced by the prevailing attitudes of most education stakeholders and their perception of the said issue. Perhaps, EM has thrived for so long in the school system, despite the various actions of governments to curb it, mainly because of the attitudes and perceptions held by various stakeholders concerning this monster called examination malpractice. That is why the various intervention strategies recommended by the stakeholders in this study (which are in agreement with the findings of Obo, 2008) are very important and strategic in curbing this menace. More campaigns/advocacy are needed to make stakeholders change their attitudes, perceptions and orientations; and the relevant authorities have to apply the prescribed sanctions on offenders while recognizing the non-offenders or brave ones who expose the offenders or frustrate the perpetration of it, at grave risks and consequences. The challenge for authorities at governmental and school levels to equip the schools, and provide close supervision and monitoring of teachers and principals in the discharge of their duties is a serious and urgent one. Really, fighting examination malpractice in all its ramifications is a serious, urgent and demanding challenge on all the stakeholders in the education industry of our nation, and of all nations of the world. But it is a challenge we must all face and conquer, if the monster in EM is not to swallow us and our future.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings of this study, it is concluded that most education stakeholders abhor the presence of EM and the damages caused by it in our school systems, and are ready to cooperate with relevant authorities to fight the menace to minimize its damaging influence. However, there is a worrisome proportion of the stakeholders who hold and manifest attitudes, perceptions and practices that really nurture the perpetration of this menace and invariably threaten the success of the fight against it. Based on the findings and this conclusion, the following recommendations are made:

- (i) More vigorous public campaigns/advocacy should be mounted through the mass media and in churches/mosques, schools, other social/religious/political gatherings on the danger and damage of EM;
- (ii) Serious instant sanctions should be visited on confirmed victims, perpetrators, supporters and sponsors of EM;
- (iii) Students, teachers, school administrators and other public officers who fight and/or expose EM and its perpetrators should be recognized publicly with appropriate rewards.
- (iv) School supervision (internal and external) should be intensified to ensure that teachers and school administrators do their work, and that students are properly and appropriately taught;
- (v) Employers should insist on practical skills to back up paper qualifications during recruitment exercises, as this will send appropriate signals to the learners in the schools.

REFERENCES

- Adebayo, S. O. (2002). Students' perception of the role of parents in academics and continued examination malpractice. *Academic Journals and Books* (downloaded online).
- Denga, D. I. (1983). Examination cheating behaviour among Nigerian secondary school youths: Implications for counseling. *Journal of Education and Development*, 3(2), 204–209.
- Jega, A. M. (2006). Examination malpractice: Concept, causes, consequences and remedies. *Education for Today*, 6(2), 59-72.
- Joshua, M. T. (2008a). *Examination malpractice: The monster in our midst*. Paper presented at Intervention Workshop for Teachers of English Language, Mathematics and science subjects in Akwa Ibom State held in September-November.
- Joshua, M. T. (2008b). *Intervention strategies in curbing examination malpractice in schools: The role of government and teachers*. Paper presented at Stakeholders Forum on Examination Malpractice, organized by Cross River State Ministry of Education, Calabar on December 16.
- Obo, F. E. (2008). *Education stakeholders' attitudes towards examination malpractice and their preferred intervention strategies in Cross River State secondary schools system, Nigeria*. Unpublished Ph.D thesis, Faculty of Education, University of Calabar.
- Olutayo, R. A. (2008). Checking the menace of examination malpractice: A call for more teaching and learning in schools. *Education and Leadership Journal*, 7(2), 34–45.
- Oluwatelure, F. A. (2004). Psychological strategies for combating examination malpractices. *Journal of Sustainable Development*, 2(2), 1–7.
- Oluwatelure, F. A. (2008). Perception of academic integrity violation and examination issues by selected members of the university community. *Pakistan Journal of Social Science*, 5(7), 686–690.
- Oyechere, I. (2008). Examination fraud. *The Nation Newspaper*, July 18.