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ABSTRACT

Academic dishonesty is a discipline issue which poses a question to the effectiveness of school administration. Educators are in agreement that cheating in examinations is an ethical issue which is of great concern. This issue of dishonesty among students is witnessed in every institution of learning including primary, secondary and institutes of higher learning. Kenya National Examination Council has put strict measures in the KNEC Act published in 2012 that provides strict penalties to culprit of cheating in KNEC examinations. However despite these strict measures, examination irregularities do occur in various parts of the country. Some irregularities go unnoticed. Research on the role of school administrators in curbing the examination irregularities in KCSE is needed because by instilling good examination ethics, honesty in school life and hard work to earn good grades will positively influence the achievement of education goals in the country. The purpose of this study was to find out the role of school administrators in curbing the examination irregularities in KCSE. The research objectives were: first objective was to establish the various forms and causes of examination irregularities. The second was to establish the role played by the school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in KCSE. The third objective was to investigate the effect of examination irregularities on teaching and learning process in schools and the last objective was to establish the appropriate strategies the school administrators can take to curb examination irregularities in KCSE examinations. The methodological approach used in this study was descriptive survey design. The target population comprised of 31 secondary schools in Nairobi County. Purposive sampling was used to obtain sample size. The survey used a sample size of 435 respondents drawn from both private and public secondary schools together with county director of education. The sample size consisted of principles, teachers and students. Questionnaires for principals, teachers, and students were administered. Interviews with school principals and county director of education were conducted in the study seeking to know the role of school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in KCSE. The study revealed that: collusion was the main form of examination irregularity while the main cause of examination irregularity was lack of adequate individual preparation for examinations. The study found that the major role played by school administrators in curbing examination irregularities was to play an active supervisory role during examinations. The main effect of examination irregularities was found to be: lowering of school reputation and also brought shame to the students. The study found that proper preparation of students for examinations was the main strategy in curbing examination irregularities in KCSE examinations. The findings concluded that the school administrators can effectively eliminate examination irregularities if they play their role effectively hence lead to achievement of education goals of the country. The study recommended that: The Kenya National Examination Council to provide comprehensive assistance and training for examination officials on examination issues and misconduct and on how to handle examination misconduct. Second recommendation was that the school administrators to ensure thorough preparation of candidates for examinations. The study further recommended that KNEC to pay the school administrators for the noble role they play during examination period. The study also recommended the penalties to be put in place as stipulated by KNEC Bill 2012 for the persons and centers guilt of cheating in KCSE examination to deter others from practicing the vice. Lastly the study recommended that the Ministry of Education to create an action plan for total elimination of examination irregularities within a specified timeframe. The researcher suggests a further research to be conducted on alternative form of assessment to replace the high stake KCSE examination.
CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

Cheating is a form of deception which involves flouting accepted rules in other ways rather than the truth such as act of fraud, copying during examinations or forging certificates (Kinai, 2007). Educationist use different terms to refer to cheating in examination (Molnar et. al, 2005). These terms includes: examination irregularities, unfair practices, cheating, dishonesty, misconduct and examination malpractices. In this study these terms are used interchangeably to refer to examination malpractices. Examinations malpractice is claiming more than one has the right to achieve in an examination. It can also be defined as going against examination rules and regulations with an aim of gaining an advantage in an examination over the other candidates (Molnar, 2005).

Studies show that students who cheat in examinations have strong tendency to practice unethical and dishonesty behaviors at the work place (Levy and Rakovski, 2007).

Public examinations are used by the country to assess the performance of an education system hence should reflect true effort of the student’s abilities. It is equally important that the selection and placement decisions made are based on true picture of the student’s abilities hence any practice that threatens fairness and objectivity in examinations must be detected and stamped out.
Cheating in examinations is widespread in the world and in all levels of education. Studies show that many students cheat in examinations and that the brighter the student the less likely it is that this student to have cheated in examinations (Bunn et al, 1992). Woods (2001) stated that giving work that was too difficult might contribute to cheating and likelihood to succeed in cheating determines cheating.

Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) assert that public examination is viewed as a system that denies teachers participation in the final evaluation of students. This leads to high incidences of teachers colluding with the candidates. Bundu (2008) argues that there are high incidences of examination irregularities in Nigeria. Anassi (2004) acknowledges that cheating knows no boundary and runs across countries hence globalization of the issue is inevitable. Anassi further acknowledges that students are the same throughout the world, thus cheating is a global issue. Anassi (2004) reports that the seed of corruption is wide spread among western and African countries and that the vice of corruption is as old as man. In ancient china civil service examinations were given in small rooms to prevent the examinee from looking at the test papers of others and that the examinees were searched for notes before entering the room. Death penalty was in effect for those who were found guilty of cheating. Despite of this cheating occurred. Cheating was rampant throughout the Atlanta district in 2009. A major exam cheating scandal occurred where school administrators and teachers were caught erasing wrong answers in the candidate’s scripts. Munavu (2001) observed that developed countries such as New Zealand, Australia and United Kingdom were focused on issues of cheating in examinations. In china cheating is rampant and the country has enacted a law for examination security. In Britain cheating incidences in GSCE examination and A-levels are
increasing. In United Kingdom cheating in exams is being made difficult by introduction of secure boxes containing examinations and that these boxes can only be opened through use of codes transmitted from mobile phones to prevent leakage (Kagete, 2008). In Nigeria high incidences of cheating are reported. Single final examination that determine the future of the candidates tempts students to cheat to get good grades in Nigeria (Wasanga & Ingolo, 2001).

The government in various countries has sought security measures to ensure that cheating in examinations is curbed. In India, Copying in Examination Prevention Act 2008 was enacted. This Act provides up to 5 years jail term for those guilt of cheating and assisting students to cheat in examinations.

In Kenya, public examinations are viewed as being high stakes. Examinations are used as tools for selection into the succeeding levels of education, training and employment (Kasomo, 2007). Due to high stakes the learning process is influenced by examinations hence leading to rote learning. Examinations in Kenya are fiercely competitive. This high competitive nature of public examinations has led the candidates to engage in unfair practices to enhance quality grades. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) acknowledge that the education system in the country is faulted. Grading candidates based on a single final examination ignoring what else the candidate has done over the duration of course of study has led to increased incidence of cheating. They further reported that the candidates get inflated practical marks which show low correlation with theory papers. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) acknowledges that lack of teacher participation in final evaluation of candidates
make teachers teach exams only and are easily tempted to collude with candidates for higher grades.

Kenya National Examination Council has put stringent measures to ensure incidents of examination malpractices are curbed. Some of these measures include cancelling of examination results for the culprits of examination cheating, delaying retake of examinations for a period of 3 years for the culprits, prosecution of those guilt of examination leakage and shortening the storage time in police stations (KNEC Act 2012).

If for any reason Kenya National Examination Council feels that the practical scores given for a centre is are questionable then KNEC moderates candidates external mark to get the mark in the theory paper (Wasanga & Ingolo, 2001).

Examination malpractice is a collective responsibility involving students and other individuals within and without the school. This is illustrated by the reported cases of candidates collecting money in advance with the intention to buy examination papers and bribe the supervisors, invigilators and others involved in administration of examinations. Kasomo (2007) warns against cheating in examinations and points that no candidate should be tempted by any force from within or without to cheat in examinations. He points out that cheating in examinations is a very serious offence and is only punishable by disqualifying the results of the affected student. National examinations and in particular KCSE play a critical role in making decisions about placement in Universities, colleges, Jobs among others (Kasomo, 2007). Annual reports of examination irregularities are a hindrance to fairness in decision making.
about the candidate. Examination irregularities are widespread in the country. Every year, examination irregularities are reported across the country. In year 2012, 1,254 candidates who sat for their KCSE examinations were involved in cheating (Mutula, 2013). Among the 39 Counties, Garissa County recorded the highest cases of examination irregularities followed by Mandera, Kisii, Migori, Kisumu, Wajir and Nairobi.

Effective solution to these practices need to be identified to avoid the vice from destroying the education system in the country. In year 2011, 7967 candidates were involved in cheating in KCPE while in year 2012 the cases reduced to 718. In KCSE, 1254 candidates were involved in cheating in examination in year 2012 and 118 centers did not get their examination results (KCSE results release report, 2013). In year 2011, 2927 candidates were involved in examination irregularities in KCSE. The Kenya National Examination Council Act 2012 provides stiff penalties for examination offences.

Table 1.1 shows the trend of examination irregularities in Kenya from 2009 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>No. of candidates in KCSE</th>
<th>No. of candidates caught cheating</th>
<th>% of cheaters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>483,630</td>
<td>2975</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>466,696</td>
<td>3812</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>436,349</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>411,783</td>
<td>2927</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>357,488</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>337,404</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KNEC Statistics 2015
Year 2013 had the highest cases of cheating with 0.75 % of cheaters. However year 2014 and 2011 had high cheating cases also.

Table 1.2: Schools and candidates involved in cheating in Nairobi County between 2009-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of schools with irregularities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of candidates caught</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Ministry of education year 2014

From the table 1.2 year 2013 recorded the highest with 17 secondary schools (public & private) and 112 candidates involved in cheating in KCSE examination.

Kaimenyi (2015) reported that the main form of cheating was collusion. He indicated that 81.0% of irregularities were by collusion while 6.0% was by phones. KNEC (2009) showed that 22% of cheating cases were by smuggled notes in exam room, 4.6% through leakage, 1.8% were by impersonation and 1.5% through registration irregularities. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) acknowledge that collusion was the main form examination irregularities.

It is argued that dishonesty in examinations is acquired through a gradual process in which dishonest actions are rewarded with good grades rather than punishment. The school administrators can take corrective measures and instill good ethics and honesty in tests and examinations in the candidate’s life at school (Kasomo, 2007). Research on the role of school administrators in curbing examination malpractices in
KCSE is needed as this will greatly reduce examination malpractices in secondary schools thus leading to achievement of education goals.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

Despite measures that have been put in place to address examination malpractices, irregularities do occur. Many cases of irregularities go unnoticed and are not reported. School administrators are charged with the responsibility of ensuring smooth running of examinations, maintaining discipline and to ensure exam misconduct do not occur. However every year some candidates have their results cancelled due to irregularities. Little has been done to analyze the role played by school administrators in curbing the examinations malpractices. If the role of school administrators in curbing examinations malpractices is not treated with the seriousness it deserves, the opportunities that would otherwise been available for the students to acquire good ethics and honesty will become foreclosed. This will in long run make it difficult for the country to realize national development goals in education. Among the 39 Counties Garisa recorded the highest cases of cheating followed by Mandera, Kisii, Wajir and Nairobi (Mutula 2013). Nairobi featured among the counties affected by cheating in examinations.

1.3 Purpose of the Study

The aim of this study was to establish the role played by school administrators in curbing examination malpractices in KCSE.
1.4 Objectives of the Study

i. To establish the various forms and causes of examination malpractices.

ii. To establish the role played by the school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in KCSE.

iii. To investigate the effect of examination malpractices on teaching and learning process in school.

iv. To suggest appropriate strategies that the school administrators can take to eliminate examination malpractices.

1.5 Research Questions

The research questions addressed in this study were:

i. What form of examination malpractices exist in schools in Nairobi?

ii. What are the causes of examination malpractices in Nairobi?

iii. What role do school administrators play in curbing examination irregularities in Nairobi?

iv. In what way do examination malpractices affect teaching and learning process in schools in Nairobi?

v. What measures can school administrators take to eliminate the examination malpractices in Nairobi?

1.6 Assumptions of the Study

i. The respondents would give truthful information

ii. The school administrators would co-operate in unearthing the needed knowledge in eradicating examination malpractices.
iii. It was assumed, for the purpose of this study that the respondents from Nairobi represent national role of school administrators in curbing irregularities in KCSE examinations.

1.7 Significance of the Study

This study was to provide information to the school administrators on how to curb examination malpractices in their schools hence achievement of the intended outcome of the national examinations. Further the study would provide information to future researchers in this field of study. The study was also hoped to provide variable opportunities for students to acquire skills, knowledge and honesty in their school life. Lastly the study was hoped to provide valuable information to the Ministry of Education which is charged with the responsibility of improvement, maintenance and achievement of education goals.

1.8 Limitations and Delimitations of the Study

1.8.1 Limitations

This study was limited to secondary schools with examination irregularity cases in Nairobi County between 2009 and 2013. Due to limited resources secondary schools with no cheating cases were not included in this study.

1.8.1 Delimitations

The study was delimited to the KCSE examinations in both public and private secondary Schools in Nairobi County as opposed to other examinations such as mocks.
1.9 Theoretical Framework

This study used aspects of socio-learning theory by Albert Bandura (1977). This theory emphasizes the importance of observing and modeling the behaviors, attitudes, emotional reactions of others. Bandura states that learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people were to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others, one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as guide for action. Social learning theory explains human behavior in terms of continuous reciprocal interactions between cognitive, behavioral and environmental influences. Components underlying observational learning are:

Attention, including modeled events (such as distinctiveness, affective valence, complexity, prevalence, functional value) and observer characteristics (such as sensory capacities, arousal level, perceptual set, past reinforcement).

Retention including symbolic coding, cognitive organization, symbolic rehearsal, motor rehearsal. Motor Reproduction, including physical capabilities, self-observation of reproduction occurrence of feedback. Motivation, including external, vicarious and self-reinforcement.

Albert Bandura’s theory added a social element, arguing that people can learn new information and behaviors by watching other people (known as observational learning or modeling). This type of learning can be used to explain a wide variety of
behaviors. Social learning theory has three core concepts. First is the idea that people can learn through observation. Next is the idea that internal mental states are essential part of this process and finally this theory recognizes that just because something has been learnt, it does not mean that it will result in a change in behavior. These core concepts are explained below;

Observational learning — In this concept, Bandura demonstrates that children learn and imitate behaviors they have observed in other people. He identified three basic models of observational learning. A live model- which involves an actual individual demonstrating or acting out behavior. A verbal instructional model- that involves description and explanation of behavior. A symbolic model – which involves real or fictional characters displaying behaviours in books, Television programs, and online medial among others?

Mental states are important to learning – Bandura noted that external environmental reinforcement was not the only factor to influence learning and behavior. He described intrinsic reinforcement as a form of internal rewards, such as pride, satisfaction and sense of accomplishment. Learning does not necessarily lead to a change in behavior.- People can learn new information without demonstrating new behavior.

Attitudes are acquired; through rewards and punishment we receive when we engage in certain behaviors, when we observe the behavior of others and when we see others reinforced or punished for engaging in certain actions (Mary and Amina, 2002). Socio-learning theory posits that knowledge acquisition is a cognitive process that takes place in social context.
Principles of Socio-learning Theory

Albert Bandura identified four factors that are necessary for observational learning to occur (Mary and Amina, 2002); **Attention** – This is attending to the appropriate model whose behavior is valued. The model may be responsible teachers, peers, parents among others. **Retention** – Is ability to remember what the model did and store the information in the memory to be able to reproduce the actions at a later date. **Motor reproduction** - This is translating what is stored in the memory into actions. **Motivation** - In order for observational learning to be successful, you have to be motivated to imitate the behaviors that have been modeled. Reinforcement and punishment play an important role in motivation. In his theory, Bandura points that; The highest level of observational learning is achieved by first organizing and rehearsing the model behavior symbolically and then enacting it overtly. Coding modeled behavior into words, labels or images results in better retention than simply observing.

Individuals are more likely to adopt a modeled behavior if the model is similar to the observer and has admired status and the behavior has functional value.

The school administrators can learn a great deal from this theory on strategies to curb examinations irregularities in their schools by inculcating good behaviors, attitudes and habits towards examination ethics (Wasanga and Arasa, 2007). Students learn behaviors through observational learning namely vicarious conditioning and modeling (Kariuki, 2007). Vicarious conditioning is learning that occurs when the student observe another student behavior and its consequences. Behaviors observed may include forms of cheating in examinations. If a student
observe another student cheat and is rewarded with good grades without being discovered the student may get motivated to cheat. Likewise when a student observes positive behaviors such as hard work, honesty and excellence in performance, the student may get motivated to imitate the behavior (Kariuki, 2007). The school administrators can recognize the efforts the learners are making and reinforce them if positive or discourage them if negative through punishments and negative reinforcement.

This theory is in harmony with the forms of cheating, causes of cheating, role of administrators in curbing cheating in exams, effects of cheating and strategies to control cheating. If people observe positive, desired outcomes in the observed behavior then they are more likely to model, imitate and adopt the behavior. Psychologists note that students tend to follow the norms of their peer group which would include norms about academic honesty/dishonesty. Study done by Bunn, Caudil and Gropper (1992) showed that there is 41% increase in probability of a student cheating if he/she has seen someone cheat in exam. Students learn forms of cheating from their peers or models. Likewise students learn honesty if peers approves honesty. Kariuki (2007) acknowledges that the moral culture, social tone of the school and the code of discipline affects the student most. The school administrators can use every possible opportunity to inculcate hard work, high standards of discipline and good reading culture in the school. Students can be influenced by others to cheat by communicating answers, copying from each others answer sheet or from their books. Schools can influence other schools to cheat in examinations. Anassi (2004) reports that tribes, subgroups and institutions may
corrupt to concede with others they view as corrupt. Students may cheat when they know other schools or counties cheat in examinations.

The school administration can use Social Learning Theory to control cheating by use of quality circles and peers as models of good behavior, honesty and hard work. A model of desired behavior can also be invited to speak to the students. Student can de-learn academic dishonesty through watching the effects of cheating if negative. Cancellation of students' examination results of students guilty of cheating can deter other students from cheating.
1.10 Conceptual Framework

Figure 1.1: Role of school administrators in curbing examination malpractices in KCSE examinations

In the figure 1.1, the independent variable is the role the school administrator plays in ensuring no irregularities occur. The study was intended to analyze the role of school administrators in controlling cheating in examinations. However other factors in schools may be intervening in determining exam cheating. The role of school administrators together with the intervening factors lead to the desired outcome of academic honesty while taking exams that is, the dependent variable.
1.11 Definition of Terms

**Role:** This refers to the function and responsibilities or part played by the school administrators to prevent cheating in examinations.

**School administrator:** This refers to persons who are in charge of day to day running and managing the school. These include the school Principal, deputy Principal and the teachers.

**Cheating:** This is the application of unacceptable and psychological ways of gaining an advantage in examinations over the other candidates.

**Impact:** This is the effect brought about by cheating in the process of teaching and learning.

**Malpractices:** This refers to the dishonesty practices in examination aimed at gaining an advantage over the other candidates. Some of the examination malpractices include; collusion, smuggling notes into the examination room, use of electronic devices, and impersonation among others.

**Conformity:** This refers to the pressure to think and act likes those in the school environment.

**Attitudes:** These are beliefs, opinions or evaluations that candidates have about examinations that in turn affect their behaviors.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section covers history of examination malpractices, mechanisms of deterring malpractices, meaning and purpose of education.

Cheating in public examinations is a serious problem in many countries. Students who cheat in examinations gets results from testing which they do not deserve hence reducing the quality of an education system of a country. Quality education is paramount to economic growths and social stability of a country. However, quality education cannot be attained if the examination irregularities continue to thrive in the society. The examination results must be valid and reliable for quality education to be attained. Examination irregularities varies with the communities concerned (Kagete, 2008). In USA cheating is a very serious offense while in Nepal, cheating in examinations is normal. However, in many countries, cheating in examinations is a very serious problem. Those who engage in examinations irregularities attain results that they do not deserve hence weakening education system of a country. Cheating stifles competition and erodes the motivation to study in students and leads to inaccurate evaluation of student’s knowledge, skills and abilities (Ongeri, 2012).

More light need to be shed about examination malpractices and design mechanisms to deter the malpractices. This study was aimed at investigating the role school administrators can play in curbing examinations malpractices and hence help to achieve education goal of the country.
2.2 Examination Malpractices

2.2.1 Introduction

Cheating is a form of deception which involves flouting accepted rules in other ways rather than the truth (Kinai, 2007).

2.2.2 Historical Background of Cheating in Examinations

In the beginning, the idea of intellectual property did not exist. Books were published by hand copying them (Sifuna, 2006). Scholars made commentaries with little of original material. There was no standard system of citation because printing and pagination did not exist.

The scholars knew and trusted each other. Education was in Latin and Greek. Some scholars were monks and spent much of their time copying manuscript.

Cheating in examinations can be traced in history through thousands of years. In ancient China during the civil service examinations, tests were given in individual small rooms to prevent examinees from looking at the test papers of others. The examinees were searched for notes before they entered those rooms. Death penalty was in effect to the examinees and the examiners found guilty of cheating. However, cheating still occurred. Copying of other peoples writing was common as there were no rules for citations.

In 1800s, and early 1900's cheating was wide spread. It was estimated that 2/3 of students in colleges at some point were involved in cheating. During the 20th century essays and term papers could be re-submitted over and over again by different
students with only change in name on the paper (Kagete, 2008). In USA as higher education gained more demand and became the way for white color jobs, a greater emphasizes on anti-cheating policies were put in place.

2.2.3 Related Studies on Cheating in Examinations

Studies have been carried out on frequencies and causes of cheating in examinations. Bunn et al (1992) in their study on economic undergraduates concluded that the brighter the students, the less likely it is that the student has cheated and the higher the probability of cheating in students if the student believes other students cheat in examinations. Mixon (1996) in his study on habitual cheating concluded that there is an analogy between cheating and crime. He also noted that determinants of habitual cheating are the same as those that relate to having cheated once. Nowel and Laufer (1997) found that non-tenure track faculty, large classes, poor performance and being employed all lead to more cheating in examinations. Kerkvliet and Sigmud (1999) in their study on determinants of source specific cheating behavior in examinations concluded that the further along a student was in his academic career, the more likely he/she was to cheat in examinations.

2.2.3.1 Related studies on forms of examination irregularities

Examination irregularities involve various methods used by candidates to cheat during examinations. Studies show that there are host of methods candidates use to cheat in examinations. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) identified collusion as the main form of cheating. Each year, collusion is identified as the main form of cheating in KCSE. In this case the candidates are assisted by external agent to answer questions during examinations without lawful authority. It also includes copying from script of
another candidate, exposing work with intention for others to copy, communicating
with another candidate with intent to assist that candidate answer questions and to
seek assistance in answering examination questions. In ancient China civil service
examinations were done in small rooms to prevent examinees from looking at others
work. The examinee was searched for notes before entering the small room. In year
2009, 65% of cheating cases in KCSE were by collusion while in year 2014, 81.0%
cases of cheating were by collusion (Kaimenyi, 20015). In Atlanta the main
examination cheating scandal was by school administrators together with teachers
erasing wrong answers in candidates' script (Baxter, 2009). Other forms of cheating
were copying from notes, text books and other reference materials. In India copying
exam prevention bill of 2008 was enacted. Leakage of exams is a major concern of
every nation. In Britain secure boxes containing exams are used to prevent leakage.
In year 2009, 22% of cheating in KCSE was by copying from notes, 4.9% by
phones, 4.6% by leakage, 1.8% impersonation and 1.5% through registration
irregularities (KNEC, 2009).

2.2.3.2 Related studies on causes of examination irregularities

Studies shows there are many factors that lead candidates cheat in examination.
Studies indicate that many students cheat in examinations and that the brighter the
student the less likely it is that the student has cheated. Nowel and Laufer (1997)
acknowledge that large classes and poor performance in tests increase probability of
cheating. Kariuki (2007) acknowledge that performance and methods of instructions
determine cheating. Carrol (2002) argued that low grades and low test scores have
high correlation with high levels of cheating. Students who associate with those who
cheat are more likely to cheat than those who associated with non-cheaters. Lunalo (2005) acknowledge that giving hard work and too difficult exams may contribute to students cheating. Poor time management by both students and teachers increases the probability of cheating (Carrol, 2002). Mcabe and Trevino (2002) argued that peer pressure influence cheating. Bunn, Caudil and Gropper (1992) found that there is 41% increase in probability of a student cheating if he/she has seen someone else cheat in examination. Barnaby and Bernadi (2004) asserts that students who value the outcome of the exam violate the norms of their peers arguing that cheating is good as long as they get what they intend to get. Baxter (2009) reported that pressure to meet test target for promotion and cash bonuses made school administrators and their teachers to collude by erasing wrong answers in candidates’ script. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) argues that education system is faulted as it grades candidates based on a single final examination ignoring what else the candidate has done over the duration of the course of study. Bundu (2008) argues that lack of teacher participation in final assessment of candidate increases incidences of teachers colluding with learners. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) describe public examinations as being fiercely competitive. Kinai (2007) states that student may cheat in exams if they had not prepared well for exam. Jactone (2006) expresses that in absence of enough examination rooms and good spacing between candidates during examinations the students would be influenced by others to cheat by communicating answers to each other, and copying from each other script. Kasomo (2007) acknowledges that lack of guidance and counseling on good study habits and exam taking skills may influence candidates to cheat.
2.2.3.3 Related studies on role of school administrators in curbing exam cheating

Wango (2009) reported that the effectiveness of a school administration is measured by outcome of examination results. Kariuki (2007) acknowledges that exams syndrome instills fear among students. Fear of failure lead them to cheat, depression or even suicide thus guidance and cancelling on test taking skills would build confidence to the candidates. Examination has even caused failure in life due to self-fulfilled prophesy. Carrol (2002) noted that poor time management influenced cheating. School administrator work to ensure that time is well managed to achieve schools objectives. Inculcating good behaviors right will reduce cheating. Anassi (2004) acknowledged that the culture of corruption is simply an acquired habit or practice over time thus the school administrators can stamp out dishonesty at early stage. Inculcating honesty right would reduce cheating. Anassi (2004) stated that without an elaborate institution framework, the fight against corruption is doomed to fail. This has been the position in the schools. School administrators need to create a framework for deterring cheating in their schools. Kaimenyi (2015) posits that school administrators are role model to the learners, however instead of being role models they show students how to cheat. He further acknowledges that the cheating has been made worse by the fact that the principals and the head teachers were in the forefront of perpetuating exam cheating. Baxter (2009) reported that school administrators erased wrong answers in candidate script. Kerkviet and Sigmud (1999) reported that threatening students before exam with expulsion if they cheat promotes cheating behavior while Kasomo (2007) acknowledged that guiding and
counseling students on good study habits and exam taking skills would reduce cheating.

2.2.3.4 Related studies on Effects of cheating on teaching and learning in schools

Cheating in exams has effects on students, teachers, schools, and education system of a nation. Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (1998) noted that cheating in examination undermines education system and interferes with the achievement of education goals in schools. Mallon (2004) states that cheating retards pursuit of knowledge. Levy (2007) acknowledged that students who cheat in exams have strong tendency to practice unethical and dishonesty behaviors at their workplace. Davy, Smith and Easterling (2004) reports that students who justify cheating are more likely to engage in corruption in future. Nonis and Swift (2001) stated that students who are dishonest in exams are more likely to engage in corruption on the job when they get employed. Kagete (2008) posits that students are negatively affected by academic dishonesty after graduation. Cheating causes emotional stress to the school administrators and teachers. Baxter (2009) reported that thousands of students were affected by the test-cheating scandal. Kaimenyi (2015) acknowledges that students who cheat in examinations will live with this dishonesty; they will never trust seniors and their self esteem are affected even if they score good grades. Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (1998) states that an institution plagued with cheating become less attractive to students, employers and potential donors. Kagete (2008) states that the more students cheat and get without needed skills and knowledge the lower the quality of their output and the less the employer is willing to pay graduate
employees. Teachers who collude with candidates face job sack, imprisonment or demotion. Baxter (2009) reported that school administrators and teachers caught erasing wrong answers from candidate script were to face imprisonment.

2.2.4 Examinations Cheating in Modern Society

In modern society, cheating is a frequent occurrence and wide spread in every part of the world and in all levels of education. In the USA, Studies show that 20% of students started cheating in the 1st grade. Similarly, other studies reveal that currently in USA, 56% of middle school students and 70% of high school students have cheated (Kagete, 2008).

Students are not the only ones who cheat in an academic setting. A study among North Carolina School teachers found that some 35% of respondents said that they had witnessed their colleagues cheat in one form or another. The rise of high - stakes testing and the consequences of the results on the teacher is cited as a reason as to why a teacher might want to inflate the results of their students (Ogeri 2012). Teachers also have incentives to cheat. The Federal government of the USA has mandated high- stakes testing as part of the No Child Left behind Act signed into law in 2002 (Kagete, 2008). Schools and teachers are held accountable for the results. As a result, teachers are known to “teach to the test” while not teaching the actual answers, they teach the questions and similar ones, and they neglect any topic that will not be tested on.
2.2.5 Mechanisms to Deter Cheating in Examinations

In every nation of the world, cheating in national public examinations is a major concern. Every government has employed various measures to curb cheating in public examinations. In USA, bottled water at candidate’s desk is banned to prevent candidates checking at someone’s work pretending to look at the water. Tying of shoe laces and looking on the roof is forbidden. In Britain, there is use of high technology gadgets to curb cheating incidences in examinations. The examination is tagged with radio transmitters and microscopic identification in order to ensure that examination paper reaches its designated school. Secure boxes containing examination papers have been identified which can only be opened using codes transmitted by the examiners in charge. In India, a bill was passed by the state that provided for up to 5 years in jail for those found guilty aiding students to cheat in examinations. Copying Examination Prevention Act of 2008 was enacted. China likewise has enacted a law for examination security to curb the growing cheating incidences in examinations.

In Kenya the ministry of education’s goal is to ensure Kenya has a world class education of the highest standard for its students that equip them with the skills employers seek for in the job and profession (Ongeri, 2010). Education holds the key to the future of a society. However, cheating in public national examinations prevent the nation from realizing her education goals of having a world class education. Public National Examinations are described as “fiercely competitive”. Cheating in examinations prevents fairness and objectivity. Molnar (2005) points that examination irregularities occur among candidates in order to gain an advantage in examinations over the other candidates. Studies done by Levy and Rakovski
(2007) reveals those students who cheat in examinations have strong tendency to practice unethical and dishonesty behaviors at the work place.

The competitive nature of National examinations leads candidates, teachers and other stakeholders to engage in unethical behaviors to enhance good grades. The results of National public examinations are used to select students into succeeding levels of education and training and employment (Kasomo, 2007). Hence the results should reflect the true pictures of student's abilities. To curb cheating in examinations, The Kenya National Examinations Council has put measures aimed at reducing cheating in national examinations. These measures includes cancelling of examinations results for those found guilty of cheating, delaying retake of examinations for a period not less than 3 years, prosecution of persons found involved in leakages of examination (KNEC Act, 2012). In 2010 KCSE, KNEC made two major adjustments aimed at curbing cheating. The 1st was to schedule all examinations in morning sections only with short break in between. This was meant to shorten the time the examination papers are to be within the school compound. The other adjustment was to reduce storage time of examination papers in police stations (KNEC Act, 2012). These adjustments have yielded positive results as the number of candidates involved in cheating dropped from 1,171 in 2009 to 534 in 2010 (KNEC results 2010). Other measures taken to curb cheating include frisking of candidates before entering the examination room (KNEC Act, 2012) among others.

National public examinations are indicators of the effectiveness of the education system of a country. Hence the examination results should be reflecting the true
effort of the students, teachers and school at large. The result should reflect the true picture of student's abilities.

In Kenya examinations results are used to select students into succeeding levels of education, training and employment (Kasomo, 20007). Stiff completion for places and jobs is much visible hence it is imperative that objectivity and fairness be the overriding concern in the selection and placement (KNEC, 2013). The competitive nature of public national examinations leads the students, teachers and other stakeholders to engage in cheating to enhance good grades.

In year 2011, the candidates caught in cheating in KCSE were 2927 (Ongeri, 2012) while in year 2012 there were 1254 candidates involved in cheating in KCSE (Mutula, 2013).

Cheating is also seen in classroom tests, assessments and in assignments. It is argued that if measures are put in place to prevent this unethical behavior in examinations, then cheating would be stamped out in schools. Kasomo (2007) points that guidance and counseling on tests and examination taking behavior help to develop confidence in students to sit and write examinations.

2.3 Summary

Examination malpractices involve various methods employed by candidates to cheat during examinations. Kinai (2007) acknowledge that cheating is a more serious form of lying which involves flouting accepted rules as seen in copying during an examination. Educators are in agreement that cheating in examinations is an ethical
issue which is of great concern. The quality of an education system is very important and crucial to the economic development and social stability of any country. It leads to the acquisition of the necessary skills, knowledge needed for national development. Assessments, tests and examinations are used as determinants of quality education. They measure the effectiveness of an education system. For the purpose of education to be realized in the country, the quality of education must be valid and reliable. To attain validity and reliability, examinations must also be valid reliable, reflecting the true abilities of a candidate. Cheating in examinations greatly affects the country’s quality of education which in turn affects social stability and economic growth of the country. Any practice that hinders objectivity and fairness in examinations must be identified and stamped out.

The reviewed literature shows that studies have been carried out on causes and effect of examination cheating. However cheating is an issue that is greatly affecting Kenya’s education system today. Much has been studied on the school administration’s role in management of schools but fail to address their role in controlling exam irregularities that have watered down the education system of the nation. The gap identified in the reviewed literature is that no study of this kind has been conducted in Kenya according to the knowledge of the researcher at the time. Therefore the study focused on the role of schools administrators on curbing examination irregularities hence helping achievement of education goals in the country.
CHAPTEER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter presents methods and techniques the researcher employed in the study. The following are illustrated; research design, locale of the study, target population, sample size, research instrument.

3.1 Research Design

A descriptive survey is a method of collecting information by interview, or administering questionnaires to a sample of individuals (Orodho, 2008). It can be used to collect information about people’s attitude, opinions, habits or any of the variety of education or social issues. This study adopted a descriptive survey design to investigate the role that school administrators play in curbing examination malpractices in KCSE.

3.2 Locale of the Study

The study was carried out in Nairobi County. Nairobi County has eight regions namely; Dagoreti, Westlands, Starehe, Kamukunji, Makadara, Embakasi, Kasarani and Langata. Nairobi County bounders Kiambu, Kajiado and Machakos Counties.

The locale was chosen because it is easily accessible, affordable in terms of time available and due to incidences of cheating reported in some schools in this county.
3.3 Target Population

Target population comprises all items or people under consideration in any field of inquiry (Orodho, 2008). The target population comprised 31 secondary schools, principals in these secondary schools, teachers and students. The county director of education was equally targeted.

3.4 Sample Size

The respondents comprised of all the schools with incidents of cheating in KCSE between the years 2009 to 2013. These schools were 31 in total.

Table 3.1: Sampling Frame

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Target population</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Sample size percentage %</th>
<th>Sampling technique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School principals</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>Automatic inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>2867</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Purposive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total sample size</strong></td>
<td><strong>435</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: researcher 2014

3.5 Sampling Techniques

The researcher purposively selected the schools for the study based on cases of irregularities. Mugenda (2003) observed that purposive sampling allow cases with required information in respect to the objectives of the study to be studied. Three teachers in each of the selected schools who may have had duties with KNEC as
supervisors, invigilators or examiners were selected for the study as they had wealth of knowledge on cheating cases among students. The school principals in each of the schools were included in the study. In addition, 10 students drawn from form four in each of the sampled schools were included in the study as the researcher believed they had the needed information being in school for a period of three years. The best ten students in academics were purposively selected as it was assumed they would understand the questionnaire and respond appropriately. The county director of education was also included in the study. The sample size comprised of 435 respondents.

3.6 Data Collection

Data collection refers to gathering specific information aimed at proving or clarifying or refuting some facts (Kombo and Delno, 2006).

The data collected in this study comprised of both qualitative and quantitative data. The quantitative data was collected using questionnaires which were administered to the respondents. The questionnaires were distributed to the respondents by the researcher. The respondents were given three days to fill in the questionnaires. All the questionnaires were gathered after the response time was over. The qualitative data in this study was collected using interviews. Unstructured interviewing was used where topic list was used as a reminder based on the objectives of the study. The researcher controlled the order in which the topics were covered and over respondents answers. This is aimed at helping to build rapport with the informants hence study sensitive topics (Orodho, 2008) such as cheating in national examinations.
3.7 Research Instrument

The researcher used questionnaires designed for students, teachers and school administrators. Berliner (2002) observed that questionnaires are widely used in research because it is possible to give similar or standardized questions to the subjects. This makes it possible to compare responses from different subjects in the same questions. According to Orodho (2008), questionnaires measures likelihood of straight, even blunt answers. This can be superior to an interview because social communication operates strongly in a face of situation that may prevent the person from expressing what she/he feels to be socially or professionally unacceptable views. The researcher used structured and unstructured questions. Contingency questions were included to allow the researcher probe more information.

3.7.1 Questionnaires for the School Principal

This was designed to gather data on the role of the school administrators in KCSE examinations. In addition, to collect information on causes of examination irregularities in KCSE, strategies the school administrators can take to eliminate cheating in examinations and finally to identify the effect of cheating in examinations on teaching and learning.

3.7.2 Questionnaire for the Teachers

This was aimed at collecting data from teachers on forms and causes of cheating in examinations among the candidates, the strategies the school administrators can take to eliminate cheating in the examinations and collecting information on the effect of cheating in KCSE to teaching and learning in schools.
3.7.3 Questionnaire for the Students

This was aimed at generating information from the students on the various factors that lead candidates to cheat in KCSE examination. It is also aimed at generating information on forms of cheating in examinations among the candidates and the effect of cheating in KCSE examinations on teaching and learning in schools. In addition, generate information on suitable measures school administrators can take to curb cheating in KCSE examinations.

3.8 Interview for Principals and County Director of Education

The qualitative data was collected by use of interviews. The interview helped the researcher to gather data from the principal respondents and the county director of education on role of school administrators in curbing examination irregularities, forms and causes of exam irregularities, effects of cheating in KCSE examination on teaching and learning and on strategies to curb examination irregularities in KCSE.

3.9 Piloting

To ensure the effectiveness of the questionnaire a pre-test was carried out. Three schools were selected for pilot study and were not included in the study. Pre-test procedures used to test the questionnaire were identical to those that were used during the actual study. Orodho (2008) points out that the number in the pretest should be small about 1% of the entire sample size. Pretest allows the researcher to exclude the vague questions as revealed in the sense that the respondents will interpret them differently (Orodho, 2008). This enhances validity of the instrument. The pilot study reveals whether the anticipated analytical techniques are appropriate
(Orodho, 2008). Piloting helps to identify deficiencies such as unclear directions, clustered questions, wrong phrasing of questions among others.

3.9.1 Reliability of Research Instrument

Orodho (2008) state that reliability of measurement concerns the degree to which a particular measuring procedure gives similar results over a number of repeated trials. A test-retest method was used to estimate the degree to which the same results could be obtained with a repeated measure of accuracy of the same concept in order to determine the reliability of the instrument. Test-retest involved administering the same instrument twice to the same group of subjects but with a time relapse of two weeks in between. The developed questionnaires were given to the respondents. Completed questionnaires were analyzed. The same questionnaire were given to the same respondents the second time and scored. A comparison of the response of the first and the second time results were computed using Pearson’s product moment formula for the test-retest to compute the correlation coefficient in order to establish extent to which contents of the questionnaires were consistent in eliciting the same responses every time the instrument is administered. A correlation coefficient of 0.8 was considered high enough to judge the reliability of the instrument (Orodho, 2008).

3.9.2 Content Validity

Fraenkel and Wallen (2000) define validity as the appropriateness, meaningfulness and usefulness of the specific inferences researchers make, based on the data they collect. The content validity of the research instrument was ensured through expert judgment from the researcher’s supervisors.
3.10 Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis means categorizing, ordering, manipulating and summarizing data to obtain answers to research questions (Orodho, 2008). In this study, the qualitative data collected was thematically analyzed. The information relevant to the research questions and objectives was identified and a coding system developed based on the collected information. The major issues or topics were classified. The key concepts, insights and interpretations were highlighted. The coded materials were placed under major themes. A summary report identifying major themes and association between them were developed. According to Kombo and Delno (2006) quantitative data analysis consist of measuring numerical values from which descriptions such as mean and standard deviation are made. In this study, the quantitative data was put into discrete data and continuous data and subjected to statistical analysis using excel to analyze it on the basis of frequencies and percentages and presented in terms of graphs and tables.

3.11 Ethical Consideration

Consent from respondents was obtained in writing. The respondents from the sampled schools were required to sign a written consent. Sensitivity was observed when reaching to the respondents.
CHAPTER FOUR
DATA ANALYSIS, PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.0 Introduction

This section consists of data analysis, presentation and interpretation of the research findings. It consists of analysis of data collected through questionnaires and interviews. Data was collected from 28 principals of secondary schools, 84 teachers, 280 students in secondary schools in Nairobi County and the County Director of Education in Nairobi County. The 3 piloted schools out of the targeted 31 schools were not included in the study. The study attempted to research on the following research objectives;

i. To establish the various forms and causes of examination malpractices.

ii. To establish the role played by the school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in KCSE.

iii. To investigate the effect of examination malpractices on teaching and learning process in school.

iv. To suggest appropriate strategies that school administrators can take to eliminate examination malpractices.

4.1 Demographic data of respondents

The respondents were asked to indicate their school type in the questionnaire. The findings are represented in the table 4.1
Table 4.1: School Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: survey findings**

From the Table 4.1 both public and private schools were sampled in the study. Private schools had the highest cases of irregularities of 50%. Private schools may cheat to get cash bonuses, attract high enrolment due to performance and to get or keep donors. Both private and public were equally represented. School administrators may collude to retain their position or get promoted. The findings shows that students are tempted to cheat in exams in both private and public secondary schools and that both bright, average and below average students are equally tempted to cheat in public national examinations. However district and county categories had the most cheaters among the public schools. Kaimenyi (2015) stated that 5 national schools were involved with examination irregularities in 2014 KCSE exams. He further stated that it was a shame for schools that admit the top cream students in KCPE to be in the list of those who cheat. Studies done by McCabe and Trevino (2002) showed that students who perform poorly tend to cheat more than students who perform well. Most students who fail to get admission in public secondary schools join private schools.
4.1.1 Gender of respondents

To gather data on the gender of the respondents, the respondents were asked to indicate on the questionnaire their gender. The findings are shown in the tables 4.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.2: Respondent Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principlals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings

From the table 4.2, 17 (60.7%) male principals participated in this study while 11 (39.3%) female principals participated in this study. For male teacher respondents were 36 (42.9%) while 48 (57.1%) were female. Hence the views in this study are from both female and male principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4.3: Student’s Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings
From the table 4.3, 172 (61.5%) of the respondents students were male while 108 (38.5%) were female. Both male and female respondent students participated in the study.

4.1.2 Experience of Respondents

The experience of respondent principals and teachers is shown in the table 4.4

Table 4.4: Experience in years of Principal and Teacher Respondents in Nairobi County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience in years</th>
<th>No. of Principals</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 and above</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>84</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings

From the table 4.4, most of the Principal 18 (64%) and teacher respondents 34 (40%) in the study area have experience of 5 years and above. Thus they have wealth of knowledge on discipline maintenance in examinations and are able to detect and deal with any incidences of examinations misconduct.

Further the research sought to gather data from teacher respondents who had worked with KNEC. The teacher respondents were also asked to indicate in the questionnaire if they have ever worked with KNEC in various capacities: supervision, invigilation and examiner. Their response indicated that 59 (70%)
teachers have worked with KNEC in duties of: supervision, invigilation and examiner while 25(30%) have not.

This response shows that most of the teachers who participated in this study had knowledge of forms of examination irregularities occurring in KCSE and on how to detect and prevent them from occurring in this study hence the findings are reliable.

4.2 Forms and Causes of Examination Irregularities

4.2.1 Introduction

The first objective of this study sought to investigate the forms and causes of examination irregularities from the principal, teacher and student respondents and the County Director of Education. The study sought also to establish from the teacher respondents whether all the examination irregularities are reported to KNEC.

Their response showed that 71(85%) of the teacher respondents indicated that most of cheating cases are not reported to KNEC while 13(15%) indicated that all examination cheating cases are reported to KNEC.

The response shows that majority of teachers 85% indicated that cheating cases not reported. This shows that cheating occurs in KCSE and that in marking exercise the same is not detected or ignored by the examiners. Thus most of the cheating is not noticed during examination period and during the marking exercise. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) reported that most cheating go unnoticed. Ongeri (2012) reported that most of examination cases are not reported. When students cheat and are not discovered, other students and schools are encouraged to cheat.
The teacher respondents were further asked to give reasons for not reporting irregularity cases to KNEC. The reasons are presented in the table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Reasons for failure to report irregularities to the Examination Council from teachers’ respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination officials not to be seen as having failed in their duties</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid consequences of cheating in examinations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To protect school reputation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some cheating cases are not clear and lack evidence</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To avoid cases with examination council</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The process of dealing with exam irregularity cases is rigorous therefore many opt to ignore the case.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all irregularity cases are detected</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam officials together with school administration collude with candidates</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For security of examination officials</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: survey findings*

From the table 4.5, the findings show that irregularities are not reported due to the following reasons: Examination officials do not want to be regarded as having failed in their duty as reported by 50 (60%) of teacher respondents. Supervisors may want to win confidence with the students and the school administrators and establish good rapport with them so that they can keep their jobs. Some supervisors and invigilators
always wish to supervise or invigilate the same school year in year out and school administrators may opt for them. This could be due to fact that they are lenient to candidates or they cooperate with them hence do not report the cases.

Some irregularities are not clear and lack evidence this was reported by 42(50%) of teacher respondents. Many of cheating cases may not be proved that they and can lead to the officials being summoned.

The process of dealing with irregularities is rigorous and time consuming, thus many officials opt to ignore the cases 38(45.2%). Teachers may avoid reporting the cases to ensure they do not commit themselves in following up the case.

To avoid cases with the Examination Council 34(40.5%). Some cases may be very involving thus in terms of time and finances. Some cases may end in jailing the culprit hence and other penalties.

Not all the irregularity cases are detected 34(45.5%). irregularities may occur and not detected. Earlier studies show that many academic irregularities are not detected. From the table 4.5, teachers fail to report irregularities to avoid consequences of cheating as reported by 28(33.3%) of teachers respondents. The examination officials may fail to report in order to protect the school from the consequences of cheating. Schools that cheat are not ranked and can face deregistration if cheating is severe. This was seen in 2013 KCSE where some schools failed to be ranked due to cheating. Principals may face demotion or interdiction due to cheating in their school.

42
From the table 4.5, 13(15.5%) of the respondent teachers reported that the school administrators and the examination officials may collude with the candidates. Teachers collude with candidates for better grades. Teachers collude for promotion, cash bonuses and to keep jobs. The school administrators, subject teachers, supervisors, invigilators and security officials in the examination centre work together to allow cheating to take place. This confirms cabinet ministers report (2015) which showed that cheating is made worse by the fact that principals and teachers are in the forefront of perpetuating cheating. Baxter (2009) reported that school administrators and teachers erase wrong answers in candidates’ scripts.

From the table another reason identified was due security reasons as reported by 9(10.7%) of respondent teachers. The examination officials may fail to report cheating cases to avoid learners attacking them. Some students if discovered that they are cheating and are reported for further action by Examination Council, may feel their future have been tampered with and hence opt to revenge. In some counties and schools the students revenge by issuing threats to the supervisors, invigilators or examination officials. KCSE exam determine the future of the candidates. It must be recognized that irregularities occurs.

Further the study sought to investigate from the students if they have seen students cheat in examination. The findings are represented in the table 4.8
### Table 4.6: Evidence of cheating according to respondent students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student’s response on cheating</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have seen students cheat in exams many times</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have seen students cheat in exams few times</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have seen once</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have not seen</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: survey findings**

From the table 4.6, 137(48.8%) of student respondents admitted that they had seen students cheat in exams many times while 78(32%) had seen this few times and 29(12%) had seen only once. However 36(12.9%) indicated that they had never seen students cheat in examinations.

From the data it can be deduced that examination irregularities do occur in KCSE examinations. Bunn et al (1992) argues that many students cheat in examinations however bright student are less likely to cheat. National schools that admit the cream of the KCPE performers also cheat as shown by KCSE statistics. Lunalo (2006) argues that students who have not prepared well for exams are more likely to cheat. A child who is getting good grades in schoolwork enjoys inner satisfaction which boosts his/her ego, and most likely steers away from any disciplinary problems such as academic dishonesty. Every year results of some candidates are canceled due to cheating. This shows that examination irregularities do occur.
4.2.2 Forms of Examination Irregularities

The principal and teacher respondents were asked to indicate if examination irregularities had occurred in their schools in the past 5 years. The findings showed that all responded that examination irregularities had occurred in their schools.

To gather data on the forms of examination irregularities, the principal, teacher, and student respondents were asked to indicate the forms of examination irregularities occurring in KCSE in their schools. The findings are presented in the table 4.7

Table 4.7: Forms of examination irregularities in the study area from the principal, teacher and student respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examination Irregularities</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collusion</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smuggled materials note/</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>textboks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phones/electronic devices</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaked examination papers</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing on body parts</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impersonation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings

From the table 4.7, 262 (66.8%) of the total respondents indicated collusion as the main form of examination irregularity. This was also identified in the interview. Majority 19(67.9%) of the principal respondents in the interview reported that
subject teachers drill candidates on practical anticipated from the KNEC science confidential and based on examination questions. Further, 11(39.2%) reported that subject teachers give exaggerated practical marks for technical subjects. From these findings, Collusion is the most prevalent form of irregularity in the study area. In this case the candidate is assisted by an external agent to answer questions during examination. It includes copying from the script of another candidate, exposing work with intention for others to copy, teachers exposing results especially for science practical for candidates to copy. It also includes exchange of candidate’s script with intention to assist the candidate answer questions, communicating answers occurs during examinations. Technical teachers give inflated scores for technical subjects or for projects that were not complete or had not kicked off.

Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) stated that subject teachers give inflated scores that have low correlation with the theory paper. Levy and Rakovski (2007) acknowledged that students and/ teachers expose materials with intention to help candidates answer questions. KNEC statistics shows that collusion is the main form of irregularity. In 2014, 81.0% of irregularities were by collusion while in 2009, 65.0% of cheating cases were by collusion. Principals and the head teacher show candidates how to cheat instead of being role model of honesty. Baxter (2009) reported that school administrators and teachers erased wrong answers from students’ scripts. He further reported that this was the largest test-cheating scandal in Atlanta. Some teachers collude with students especially the B.O.G teachers and those in teaching practice also in private secondary schools. This was because they are not government employees and hence may not be easily traced by the Examination Council. Subject teachers sneak into the laboratory room where examination are taking place and
assist candidates to perform the practical, the science teachers also expose materials for the candidates to copy.

From the table 4.7, 199 (50.8%) of the total respondents admitted that materials are smuggled into the examination room. In the interview all respondents admitted that notes, text books, done examinations papers were smuggled into the examination room by the candidates. Candidates smuggle notes and text books in the examination room so that in case of laxity in invigilation they can get an opportunity to cheat. Students also hide materials in the toilet where they periodically visit for reference during examinations. Small notes commonly referred to as “Mwakenya” are common in examination room. This finding concurs with study by Jactone (2006) who reported that students carry reference materials into the exam room. In 2008, 46.0% of cheating cases in KCSE were by smuggled notes and books in exam room while in 2007, 42.9% of cheating cases were by smuggled notes and books.

The data on table 4.7 shows that 28(100%) of principals, 17(20%) of the teachers and 91(37%) of students respondent reported that phones are used for communication during examination through face book, internet and e-mail. In the interview all the respondents reported that phones are used by the candidates to communicate examination questions and answers. In this study phone were used for communication during examination. Students Possess communication dices such as phone, I pads and sim cards without lawful authority. Students send the questions and suggested answers to other candidates. Most leakage is communicated by use of electronic media. Statistics shows phones were confiscated in the exam room in that
6.2% of irregularities in KCSE 2014 were by phones. In year 2009, 22.12% of irregularities were by phones.

Based on the data on table 4.7, all 28(100%) of the respondent principals, 12(14%) teachers and 87(31%) of student respondents identified leakage as a form of exam irregularity that had occurred in their schools. This was also revealed in the interviews. Of the principals respondents 25(89.3%) reported that leaked examination papers were emailed to candidates. Hacking was also reported by 3(10.7%) of principal respondents. Based on these findings, the researcher felt that availability of leaked examination papers largely contribute to cheating in exams as it is very tempting to even bright students and teachers. Those entrusted with exam security leak the examination hence making papers available especially through electronic media. Lawson (2004) identified leakage as form of irregularities. In year 2009, leakage comprised 4.6% of cheating cases in KCSE. Leaked papers are obtained from the colleges, businessmen or from electronic media.

Based on the data on table 4.7, 6(21.4%) of the principals, 13(15.5%) of teacher and 112(40%) of student respondents indicated that candidates write answers on body parts which includes the palms thighs, hands, legs and on clothes such as shirts, socks shoes and slippers. KCSE examination is a major exam that determines the candidates’ future. The candidates use any possible means to ensure they pass examination. The candidates are tempted to write answers on body parts and clothes. Candidates write answers on clothes and body parts for reference during examinations. The candidates therefore need to be thoroughly checked before entering examination rooms.
In an interview with the respondent principals, 7(25%) reported that impersonation have occurred in their schools. The County Director of Education admitted that impersonation and other registration irregularities occurs in the study area. In this study area impersonation was identified as a form of irregularities. This is confirmed by the data from KNEC (2009) which showed that 3.3% of cheating cases were by impersonation and registration irregularities. Impersonation occurs when a person, for the purpose of an examination is not registered to take a particular examination but, with intention to impersonate, presents or attempts to present him or herself to take the paper of a candidates or registers for an examination using a false name or identity. It also includes the situation whereby a candidate who is registered to take a particular examination but knowingly allows another person to take the examination on his or her behalf.

4.2.3 Causes of Examination Irregularities

The study further sought to investigate the causes of examination irregularities from the respondent principals, teachers and students. The findings from respondent students are presented in the table 4.9
Table 4.8: Nervousness and cheating in examination according to student respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Nervous/not nervous</th>
<th>cheated %</th>
<th>Not cheat %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous when taking exams</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not nervous when taking exams</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings

From the table 4.8, 130(46%) of students responded that they were nervous when taking examinations while 150(54%) of the students admitted that they were not nervous when taking examinations. This shows that some students are nervous when taking examinations. Anxiety and nervous habits are common to candidates. Exam syndrome instills fear to candidates which may affect their thinking and memory during an examination that affect them negatively. The students were further asked to indicate in the questionnaire if they have ever cheated in examinations. The findings are presented in the table 4.8. From the table 4.8, out of 107 students who admitted that they had cheated in examinations, 83(77.6%) reported that they were nervous when taking examinations while 24 (22.4%) not nervous when taking examinations. This showed that nervous students are more likely to cheat in examinations than those who are not nervous. From the table 4.10, 107(38%) of students admitted having cheated in examination while 173(62%) of students indicated that they had never cheated in examinations. This shows that in KCSE examination, nervous candidates are likely to cheat than those not nervous.
Nervousness and anxiety increase probability of student forgetting responses in an exam hence result to cheating to avoid failure.

The study further sought to investigate from the respondent students the cause of the nervousness among candidates during examinations. The findings are presented in table 4.9.

Table 4.9: Causes of nervousness among candidates as reported by respondent students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Causes of nervousness among students</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of: defeat, failure, questions arising from areas not revised</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of preparation</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The candidate is expected by everyone to pass</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High value of KCSE examinations which is a major determinant of candidate’s future</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>130</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings

Table 4.9, shows that the main cause of nervousness were: lack of preparation for examination 65(50.0%), fear of defeat/failure/or questions arising from areas not well revised 33(25.4%), everybody expects the students to pass with good grades and lastly the high value of KCSE examination which is a major determinant of students future by 10(7.7%). The students who admitted having cheated in examinations gave the following reasons for cheating in examination presented in the table 4.10.
Table 4.10: Survey of causes of examination irregularities from respondent students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause of examination irregularity</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Difficult examinations</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of proper supervision/invigilation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of preparation for examinations</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other candidates and schools cheat in examinations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from parents, school, society and peers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>107</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: survey findings*

From the table 4.10, poor preparation for exams was the main cause of cheating in examinations as indicated by 39 (36.4%) of the respondent students out of 107 students who indicated having cheated in examinations. Other causes were: difficult examinations 22 (20.6%), lack of good supervision 16 (15.0%), pressure from different sources 11 (10.3%), other schools and candidates cheat in examinations 12 (11.2%) and finally nervousness by 7 (6.5%). The causes of cheating are discussed below.

Based on the data on table 4.10, lack of preparation increases the incidences of cheating as reported by 36.4%. The same was reported in the interview. Thus lack of individual preparation for both teachers and students lead to cheating. Teachers
who fail to prepare their candidates well for examinations can cause candidates to lack confidence during examination hence contributing to high incidences of cheating. Likewise, candidates who do not prepare well for examination are likely to cheat to avoid failing the exam. The method of instruction used by the teacher determines cheating. The traditional method of instructions which are teacher centered may contribute to students failing dismally. Studies shows that learner centered methods of instruction promotes learning. Teachers who have not prepared their candidates properly may be tempted to collude for better grades. Students may cheat in exams if they had not prepared. Kinai (2007) reported that students may be tempted to cheat if they had not prepared well for the examinations or if the examination is too difficult for their abilities.

Table 4.10 shows that difficult examinations increase incidences of cheating as shown by 22% students. The same was reported in the Interview. Giving too difficult exam and test can lead to a student feeling hopeless hence may lead to a student cheating to avoid failing. Tests are used to grade learners. Poorly performing students may be compelled to cheat to avoid low grades. Therefore excessively difficult examinations increase probability of cheating among students. These findings concur with Kinai (2007) who reported that too difficult exams can lead a student to cheat in exam. Lunalo (2006) argued that difficult exams above the abilities of a student cause the student to cheat. This finding also concurs with the study by Carrol (2002) who argued that low grades and low test scores have high correlation with high levels of cheating and that Students who perform poorly tend to cheat more than those who perform well.
From the table 4.10, 16(15%) of students responded that lack of good supervision contributes to cheating. They reported that lazy invigilators, sleeping, reading magazines, texting during invigilation and leaving the examination room all contribute to cheating among students during KCSE examination. The same was reported in the interview. This shows that laxity in supervision and laxity of examination officials contributes to cheating in KCSE. Students cheat most when they know they can never be discovered. When invigilation and supervision is not taken seriously candidates influence each other to cheat by communicating to each other answers, copying from each other’s scripts or from notes and text books. At the same time the teachers can be influenced to collude with candidates. These findings concur with the findings by Jacktone (2006) who reported that in the absence of strict invigilation and supervision, students may be tempted to cheat in examinations. Thus laxity in invigilation is a factor that influences cheating. Bunn, Caudal and Gropper (1992) argued that students engage in cheating if they know their cheating would never be discovered. Therefore laxity in supervision and invigilation make cheaters escape unnoticed. This increases cheating greatly as the candidates know they will not be discovered.

From the table 4.7 on forms of exam irregularities, 209(74.6%) of student respondents cited that students copy from one another script and communicate answers to each other during KCSE examinations due to lack of enough facilities in exam room. In the Interview it was also revealed that lack of adequate facilities and enough space between candidates increase the probability of candidates cheating. Inadequate facilities such as classrooms, small lab/ no laboratory, halls desks equipments, small space in an examination room in a centre may lead to cheating.
Lack of space in the examination room can make the candidates to be close to each other thus making them to see the work of another and copy. Lack of enough equipment in the lab makes candidates to share items which form basis for them to communicating to each other pretending to borrow an item. This agrees with findings by Jactone (2006) who stated that in absence of enough examination rooms and good spacing between candidates during examinations some students are influenced to cheat in examination by communicating answers to each other, copying from each other’s scripts or from their books. Lack of adequate equipment especially during science practical will also influence candidates to copy from one another and communicate answers to each other during sharing of items and apparatus.

Based on the data from table 4.10, pressure to pass exams was a factor that led candidates to cheat in exams as shown by 10.3% of students. Pressure arises from different sources. In the interview with principal respondents it was reported that society expects students to pass. Pressure to pass arises from the school administration, parents, community and government among others. Pressure to pass with good grades to obtain admission in university, college and job placement and pressure from school administrators, parents, teachers, society influence cheating. The government wants value for money. The pressure may generate from the student own desire to pass with good grades and pursue a career of his/her choice in the university. The implication is that examinations are the only yardstick for assessment for entry to higher education, job placements among others. There is glorification of grades such that a student who has not passed with good grades is seen as a failure in the society. Lunalo (2006) states that the culture of the nation is
one that overrates exams where a student gets respect if he get an A, Division 1, 1st class or a PhD scholar. A student who does badly rarely gets a chance to say why he/she obtained low grades. Pressure to pass exams is a factor that influences cheating. McCabe and Traveno (2002) argued that peer pressure influence cheating. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) described public national examination as being fiercely competitive. The teachers and the students want to defeat their rivals in competition. Hence cheating occurs in the spirit of competition and to compete for the few available placements in universities, colleges or even attaining jobs. This competitive nature causes candidates to cheat in examinations.

In the interview all the respondents admitted that availability of leaked papers is a major cause of cheating. Leakage availability is very tempting even to the bright students and teachers. Leakage is available from business men, colleges and electronic media through face book, whatsup, or sent to candidates through e-mail. Those charged with the responsibility of exam security relax in their duty. They compromise integrity and ethics. This is quite unfair for those students who have not seen the papers before. Candidates send to other candidates through e-mail, whatsup. KNEC (2009) showed that 4.6% of irregularities were by leakage.

In the interviews with the principal respondents, 18(64.3%) identified ranking of school based on KCSE performance as a cause that influence examination irregularity. County Director of Education admitted that ranking of schools motivate collusion to occur. Ranking is a factor that influences cheating. Ranking of schools has no benefit to the education system in the nation as it creases the incentive to cheat among candidates and schools. Government measures teachers’ performance
through KCSE results. The teachers whose subjects' trail are regarded as incompetent. This lowers the teaching morale which can lead the teacher colluding. This acts as an incentive for school administrators and subject teachers to collude. Subsequent bashing of media ridiculing those schools that trail motivates teachers to collude. Ranking of schools can cause learners, teachers and school administrators from schools that trail to feel ashamed of their schools hence engage in cheating. The ministry has abolished ranking as teachers and candidates engage in unethical practices in the rush for top positions. Schools are not the same in terms of facilities and entry behavior of students thus should not be ranked. The demerits of ranking outweigh the merits. The taskforce of Odhiambo (2012) on education reforms identified the current system of education as being exam oriented where student fail to acquire intended skills and competences due to cheating and rote learning. The teachers teach exams only and omit contents that are not tested they teach memorization of facts leading to rote learning. The government recommended for the abolition of ranking as it act as an incentive to cheat. Cheating is a collective responsibility involving students and other individuals in the school as the school does not want to lag behind.

In the interview Promotion based on performance was cited as a motivator for teachers to collude with candidates for better grades. Majority 22(78.6%) of principal respondents in the interview reported that teachers collude to keep jobs or to be promoted. The effectiveness of a school administration is measured by the outcome of national public examination results (Wango, 2009). Teachers and students drive their credit from the examination results. The teachers are influenced by these circumstances to collude in order to maintain job, get promotion or get cash
bonuses. In the area of study, majority of the teachers who are promoted comes from national schools that admit cream of KCPE performers and are likely to perform well in KCSE. Teachers in schools of below average students such as day schools rarely get promoted as students perform dismally. The implication is that promotion of teachers and principals is based on students’ performance in KCSE and that examination is the only yard stick used to assess performance in students. School heads may collude with candidates in examinations so that they can retain their position or get fame or attract and keep donors. Pressure to meet test target for promotion and cash bonuses make school administrators and teachers to collude by erasing wrong answers in the candidates’ scripts.

The research sought also to investigate from respondent students whether cheating is good and if it occurs in every test. The finding are represented in the table 4.11.

**Table 4.11: Response on cheating from respondent students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception on cheating in exam</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cheating in exams is good</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating in exam is not good</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>90.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating occurs in every test</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating does not occur in every test</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>280</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: survey findings*

From the data on table 4.11, the students 252(90%) admitted that it is not right to cheat in examinations. This shows that majority of students knows cheating is wrong. Most of the students view cheating as wrong even though the outcome may
seem good. Students may disapprove cheating due to the consequences faced while others feel guilty. Of the student respondents, 213(76%) admitted that cheating does not occur in every test while 67(24%) admitted that cheating occurs in every test. This shows that some student have morally internalized cheating as acceptable. These shows there are factors that hinder cheating from occurring. Kinai (2007) acknowledged that too difficult exam can cause students to cheat. The level of difficultness of an exams influence cheating. Students are less likely to cheat if there are higher incidences of being caught. It can be said that the level of difficultness of a test and the high stake of an examination will influence students to cheat. Interviews with principal respondents and county director of education all admitted that the high stakes placed to KCSE examination is a contributor to cheating among candidates. The high stake of KCSE influences students to use any psychological means to ensure they pass the examinations. Teachers are also tempted to compromise to see their students pass with good grades and proceed to next level of learning. Many people are chasing for the few opportunities available in the universities, jobs and colleges; hence cheating in examinations to attain grades needed for the opportunity. The implication is that KCSE is a major and important public national examination in Kenya as it determines the future of candidates. In the interview, majority 15(53.6%) of principal respondents agreed that fear of failing contribute to cheating. The same was reported by the County Director of Education. The implication is that the teachers, principals and candidates fear to be called failure in the community and society hence influences cheating to ensure the candidates pass. A student who has a donor or looking for a donor will greatly fear failing hence may cheat to keep donors or attract more donors. Fear of failing may
also cause schools to engage in unethical practices to attract donors or keep donors. For example, students and schools are chasing ‘wings to fly’ opportunities of scholarships.

The research also sought to find out from the student respondents whether the school principal can help students cheat in exams. The findings show that 213 (76%) students indicated that school principals cannot help students cheat in KCSE examination. These findings indicate that most of school administrators are good role models of academic honesty and cannot allow students to engage in unethical practices. The response of 67 (24%) students indicated that their school principals can allow cheating to occur. Those who indicated that school principals can help candidates cheat in examinations were asked in the questionnaire to suggest ways the school principal can help candidates cheat. Their response is given below:

The principal gives candidates leaked examinations from KNEC and also buy leaked papers for students to revise with their subject teachers. School principals Google answers and give students to copy secretly. Principal colludes with invigilators and supervisors to allow teachers and candidates to cheat in examination.

From these responses of 67% students, it was the feeling of the researcher that there was an agent need to address this issue of collusion. The principals’ desire to raise the school grade and get fame and to keep their job motivates them to collude with candidates. This shows that corruption occurs in schools hence learners lack role model as their teachers and principals may be practicing the same.
From the table 4.11, 28(10%) of students admitted that cheating is good. From these findings, it can be deduced that some students have morally internalized cheating in examination as acceptable so long as they get what they want. The outcome of cheating when positive can cause a student to cheat. Some students cheat because they do not understand why it is wrong to cheat. Students may opt to cheat and pass than to face failure. This concur with findings by Banarby and Bernadi (2004) who reported that students who value the outcome of an exam violate the norms of their peers arguing that cheating is good as long as they get what they intend to get.

4.3 Role of School Administrators in Curbing Examination Irregularities in KCSE

The second objective sought to gather data on role of school administrators in curbing examination irregularities from the principal and student respondents together with the county director of education.

The study also sought to investigate from the principals and CDE whether the expected role of the school principal by KNEC was comprehensive enough to ensure no examination irregularities occurred during KCSE examinations in their schools. The findings showed that 24(86%) of the principal respondents agreed that the role of the school principal as expected by the KNEC during KCSE examinations is comprehensive enough to ensure no examination irregularities occur in the school while 4(14%) indicated that it’s not enough to ensure no examination irregularities occurs in KCSE. County Director of Education also reported the same in the interview.
The data obtained from the principals and students on the role of school administrators in curbing irregularities in KCSE is presented in the table 4.12.

Table 4.12: Role of school administrators in curbing cheating from principal and student respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th></th>
<th>Student</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist supervisors and invigilators in frisking candidates</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising examination officials</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of adequate facilities in the examination center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give rules and regulation to the candidates</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure no phones in the examination center</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of candidates</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keep science practical confidantials confident</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide security to examination</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain discipline during examination period</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>65.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witness opening of exams and sealing of candidates script</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enlighten candidates on immediate consequences of cheating in examinations</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report cheating cases to KNEC officials on the ground</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings
From the table 4.12, all the principal respondents and 154(56%) of student respondents identified frisking as a role of school administrators. The same was reported in the interview. Therefore frisking is one of the roles played by school principals to prevent copying from materials during exam. Frisking reduces the chances of candidates entering exam rooms with reference materials. This ensures that no notes, textbooks, communication materials are smuggled into the examination room. Hands, palms and other areas where materials may be hidden are checked. The toilets are also checked to ensure no reference materials hidden there. Every year some candidates’ results are canceled due smuggled notes into the exam room. KNEC (2009) showed that the second main form of exam cheating after collusion was smuggled notes into the exam room. Therefore frisking candidates would greatly reduce cheating.

Based on the data on table 4.12 playing an active supervisory role as shown by 100% principals and 15.4% students ensures cheating does not occur in examinations. The same was identified by all respondents in the interview. Students may be tempted to cheat if the school principal is not available to supervise and to ensure that the supervisors and the invigilators are doing their duties effectively. Principal dismiss supervisors and invigilators who collude with the students and report the information to the KNEC official on the ground. Also the principals report any form of cheating/ impersonation in the examination to the KNEC officials on the ground. This will deter candidates from cheating in the examination. Therefore playing an active role would reduce cheating. Roberts and Melissa (2006) acknowledged that cues of being watched enhance cooperation. When students learn they are being watched as they do examinations they are likely to cooperate and
avoid cheating. Students are more likely to cheat when they know they will never be discovered. Supervising examinations by the school administrators will make the candidate aware that they are being watched.

The data on table 4.12 shows that providing adequate facilities in examinations centers would reduce examination irregularities. This was reported by 28(100%) principals and 174(62%) students. All respondents reported the same in the interviews. Sharing of items and apparatus during examinations encourage students to communicate answers to each other. Physical facilities affect schools performance. For academic progress basic facilities should be provided and maintained. The schools administrators are expected to provide adequate facilities in examination room as this will to a great extent reduce examination irregularities. This prevents students from copying from one another or communicating answers to one another in the examination room while sharing items or apparatus. It also ensures enough space between candidates to avoid student checking from another candidate’s script. Asiabaka (2008) argued that a close relationship exist between physical environment and academic performance of students. In his study on causes of examination irregularities, Jactone (2006) reported that in absence of enough examination rooms and good spacing between candidates during examinations the candidates are tempted to cheat in examinations by communicating answers to each other and copying from each other’s script or from their text books.

From the data on table 4.12, giving students rules and regulations as stipulated by KNEC is a role of school administrator that will help reduce examination irregularities. This is shown by 20(71.4%) principals. In the interview all
respondents admitted the same. Schools administrators are expected to issue rules and regulations to candidates before examination starts to enlighten them on consequences of cheating and what is expected during examination. Some students cheat due to ignorance of the immediate consequences of cheating. Waweru and Malau (2004) acknowledges that rules spells out specific action or non-action allowing no discretion. Rules enlighten candidates on what must or must not be taken this will reduce cheating. Molnar (2005) argues that high incidences of cheating occur where students are ignorant of the immediate consequences of cheating.

Another role of school administrators identified from the table 4.12 was to ensure no mobile phone in the examination center among the students. This is shown by 28(100%) of the principal and 91(32.5%) student respondents. This was also reported by all respondents in the interview. Creating a mobile phone free zone will to a great extent reduce cheating in examination. Students use mobile phones and other communication devices in examinations to get leaked questions and answers / communicate leaked questions and suggested answers to other candidates. In year 2008, 11.2% cases of cheating in KCSE were by possession of phone in exam room while in year 2014, 179 phones were confiscated in exam room.

Based on the table 4.12, school administrators are required to identify the registered candidates for a particular examination to prevent impersonation as shown by 28(100%) of respondent principals. This was also reported in the interview. Impersonation and registration irregularities are common exam irregularities in the study and hence it is the duty of school administrators to identify his/her candidates
in an examination. KNEC (2012) circular to school heads states that it is the responsibility of the school administrators to identify candidates registered for particular examinations. The supervisors and invigilators do not know the candidates hence the school administrators assists the supervisors and the invigilators to identify the candidates registered for examination to avoid impersonation. Every candidate who is registered for examinations have their passport photos sent alongside their registration information. The use of photographs to identify candidates helps reduce impersonation. KNEC (2005) showed that 6.4% of cheating cases were by impersonation.

From the table 4.12, another role of school administrators identified was that of ensuring the confidential for science practical examinations are kept confident to avoid leaking out the information to the candidates or other interested parties. This was reported by all the school principals 28(100%). In the interview, 6(21%) of the respondent principals reported that teachers collude by use of science confidential. This shows that confidential form basis for cheating in science practical. Principals upon reception of confidential are expected to keep them well to avoid teachers and other interested parties from leaking out the information.

From the table 4.12 another role identified in this study was that of providing security to the examinations. This was reported by all the principal respondents. The principals provide security to the examination papers by giving supervisors a lockable room to keep the examination materials. This would ensure the safety of exams and prevent leakage from the center. Exam security is a concern of every nation to avoid leakage that affects students greatly.
From the table 4.12, all the principal respondents 28(100%) and 184(65.7%) of respondent students reported that the principal maintain discipline during the examination period to ensure smooth running of examinations and ensure that candidates do examinations in secure environment. This will prevent persons who are at or near an examination venue to act or incite in a disorderly manner. The school principals need to be physically present in the school throughout the examination period to ensure no disorderly conduct or disturbances in or near the examination room which is a serious form of irregularity. They are also expected to discipline any misconduct.

Another role of school administrators identified from the table 4.12 was witnessing opening of examination papers and sealing of candidate’s scripts. This was reported by all the school principals 28(100%). Witnessing the opening of examination papers ensures papers are intact and have not been leaked out and witnessing the sealing of examination script of the candidates ensures that candidate’s responses are not altered by any one. Witnessing sealing of examination answer scripts for the candidate ensures safety as none can alter the responses of the students given in his or her script. Baxter (2009) reported that school administrators and teachers erased wrong answers from candidates’ script. This was the largest test-cheating scandal in Atlanta.

From the table 4.12 another role identified were that of recording all activities related to examination. All the principal respondents 28(100%) reported that they record in the log book all activities related to examinations. These activities were identified as; mode of transportation of examination materials, time the examination
gets in and leaves the Centre. Any examination misconduct is also recorded in the log book. School administrators shed light on cause of cancelation of results for if a candidate is guilty of cheating. Hence recording incidences in the log book will help the county director's office know reason why results for candidates were canceled by the examination council. Other roles identified in the interviews were that of releasing teachers of integrity to perform duties of supervision and invigilation who cannot compromise ethics. Some teachers can easily compromise integrity and ethics hence allow cheating to occur in a centre for selfish gain. The candidates' desks, tables should be clean and exam rooms not to have stimulus materials such as charts, drawings. This would reduce cheating as some candidate hind and write notes in desks for reference. According to Hawthorne effect, honesty in examination may be increased when the candidates knows they are being observed with interest and their conduct in examinations is being taken into consideration. Likewise search for notes and frisking thoroughly discourage students from entering exam rooms with note and books.

4.4 Effects of Examination Irregularities on Teaching

This objective sought to gather data on effects of cheating in KCSE examination on teaching. The data was obtained from the respondent principals, teachers, students and the county director of education. The respondents were asked to indicate in the questionnaire if cheating affects teaching in their schools. The findings are presented in the table 4.13.
Table 4.13: Effects of Cheating in KCSE Examination on Teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating affect teaching</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheating does not affect teaching</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings.

From the table 4.14, all 28(100%) of the principal respondents, 85% (71) of the teacher respondents and 171 (61.1%) of respondent students admitted that cheating in KCSE affects teaching. Interview with principal respondents and county director of education showed that all agreed that cheating affects teaching in schools. This shows that cheating affects teaching in schools. The respondents were further asked to suggest the effect of cheating on teaching. The identified effects of cheating are presented in table 4.14

Table 4.14: Effects of cheating on teaching from respondent principals, teachers and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of cheating on teaching</th>
<th>principal</th>
<th>teacher</th>
<th>student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxity in teaching</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowers teaching morale</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage truancy among teachers</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead to unhealthy competition</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strike</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings
From the table 4.14, 24(85%) of principals and 23(27.4%) of teacher respondents identified laxity of teaching among teachers as an effect of cheating, 21(75%) of principals reported that cheating may also encourage truancy among teachers shortcut for better, while 21(75%) of principals and 218(77.9%) students responded that cheating lowers the teaching morale.

Based on data on table 4.14 the main effect of cheating on teaching is laxity and lowering of the teaching morale. In the interview 8(28%) principals reported that teachers who collude with candidates relax in their duty. Teachers who compromise integrity may not work hard as they know they will collude with candidates for good grades. This affects syllabus coverage. The spirit of teaching may be killed as learners may not take seriously teachers and their teachings. Cheating when severe destroys reading culture of the school, lowers concentration and attentiveness in teaching. This finding concurs with that of Banarby and Bernadi (2004) who argued that cheating in academia lowers motivation for teaching. The morale of teaching is lowered if teachers know students will cheat. When students know other students in other schools cheat in exams they are likely to engage in cheating to be like them.

Teachers who are honest may feel demoralized and sometimes are rejected if they fail to collude with candidates. Frustrations and disappointments settles in leading to lowered academic input. Honest teachers felt demoralized, disappointed and frustrated in that after teaching and instructing the students on good study habits and examination taking skills they end up cheating. Students disregard teachers as they know they will cheat in KCSE. When cheating is severe in an institution it may destroy reading culture of the school and lower concentration and attentiveness in teaching. This agrees with study by Grimes (2004) who noted that cheating affects
achievement of curriculum goals. These findings also concur with that of Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (1998) who reported that academic dishonesty undermines academic world and interferes with the basic mission of education. In the interview with principal respondents it was reported that teachers give exaggerated marks for practical technical subjects. Teachers also give exaggerated marks to projects and award marks to projects that have not kicked off, that never existed or that have not been completed. This they do to ensure their students are not defeated by other schools. This destroys education system as learners get away without the needed skills in practical subjects. These findings also agree with research by Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) who asserts that cheating waters down the education system. Bundu (2008) asserts that cheating in examinations may lead to goals of education not being realized as teachers teach exams and skills of answering questions trading off contents for grades. Much time is lost in searching for possible questions to come in examinations instead of teaching. Cheating also encourage rote learning and memorization of facts. In the interview with respondent principals, 20(70%) reported that cheating in KCSE can lead to deregistration of an examination center and closure of the school. Where the school is plagued with examination irregularities the Examination Council can order the closure of the school. Whitely and Keith- Spiegel (1998) acknowledged that an institution marred with cheating become less attractive to the students, parents, donors and future employers. When cheating cases are severe parents shy off from the school and future employers are discouraged from hiring graduates from such schools. Mallon (2004) argues that cheating undermines academia when students steal ideas. Stealing ideas stifles pursuit of knowledge.
From the data on table 4.14, 2(7%) of principals admitted that cheating can lead to strikes. In the interview with the principal respondents 3(10.7%) reported that cheating may lead to strike. Strike arises when a significant number of candidates get their results canceled due to cheating and hence incite students to strike. This may also occur when a teacher collude with one stream, the other streams may protest leading to strike. Strikes have been reported in some counties whose candidates' results get canceled.

Among the teacher respondents 37(44%) reported that cheating in KCSE examination may lead to unhealthy competition between candidates and schools. Students may engage in cheating to concede with other counties or schools that cheat in rush for top positions. Wasanga and Ingolo (2001) assert that KCSE exams are fiercely competitive.

4.5 Effects of Cheating in KCSE Examination on Learning

The study further sought to gather data on the effect of cheating on learning from the respondent principals, teachers, students and the County Director of Education. In the questionnaire the respondents were asked to indicate if cheating in KCSE affects learning. The findings are represented in the table 4.15
From the table 4.15, 28(100%) of principals, 71(84.5%) of teachers and 225(80%) student indicated that cheating affects learning in schools. From this data, it is clear that cheating affects learning greatly. Learners acquire dishonest behaviors which they are likely to exhibit even in work place. These findings concur with the findings by Davy, Smith and Easterling (2004) which pointed that cheating in examinations affects students, teachers and the institution of learning. This may arise due to lowered institution reputation that cause people to shy off from the institution. Further to gather data on the effects of cheating on learning, the respondents who indicated that cheating in KCSE affects learning were asked to suggest the effects. Their responses are presented in the table 4.16
### Table 4.16: Effect of cheating on learning from respondent principals, teachers and students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of cheating on learning</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>freq</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>freq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destroys school reputation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowers education standards</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower students’ dignity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: survey findings**

From the table 4.16, 28(100%) of respondent principal, 71(84.5%) of teacher respondents and 225(80%) respondent students reported that cheating in KCSE affects the reputation of the school, 28(100%) of the respondent principals, 50(59.5%) of teachers and 176(62.5%) of students that reported that cheating lowers education standards. While 176(62.9%) of students reported that cheating lowers the dignity of the students.

Based on the data on table 4.16 it can be said that cheating affects schools' reputation, lowers education standards and bring shame to learners. This concurs with study by Whitley and Keith–Spiegel (1998) who noted that a learning institution plagued by cheating in examinations may become less attractive to students and prospective employers of the students. Interview with respondent principals revealed that cheating lowers spirit of hard work in students and causes other candidates to be tempted to cheat. The study habits of students are affected hence students fail to achieve the education goals. Laxity in learning and lowered concentration both lead to education of learners being affected. Among the teacher respondents reported that laxity in learning, trading off learning, lowered
concentration and lack of preparation in learners all lead to education of learner’s being affected. These findings are in accordance to the studies done on effects of cheating in examinations by Davey et al (2004). Their study shows that cheating has a host of effects to the students, teachers, and individual schools and on an education system itself.

From the data on table 4.16, dignity of students is destroyed as shown by 62.9% students. The students are not proud of their results as are not reflection of the true abilities of the candidates. Students felt ashamed to interact with students from other schools which do not cheat in examinations. They feel demoralized and uncomfortable studying in the school due to shame. Other schools ridicule the students affecting their self-esteem and lowers cooperation with those schools. Davey et al (2004) acknowledges that cheating in examinations often cause emotional distress, shame to students and teachers. Mallon (2004) argues that cheating undermines academia when students steal ideas. Cheating demoralizes honesty students as they see cheaters rewarded with good grades. Cheating interferes with visions of education and transfer of knowledge as students leave schools having not acquired the required knowledge. Cheating interferes with the basic purpose of education, transfer of knowledge by allowing students to get by without having the needed knowledge, skills and abilities.

Interview with the respondent principals revealed that cheating in KCSE examination encourages cutting of classes and a culture of corruption is developed if cheating is not immediately controlled. Students who develop the dishonesty behavior may also exhibit this behavior even in the work place. In the interviews,
6(21.4%) principals and County Director of Education revealed that cheating in KCSE exams affects the future of learners. These findings concur with that by Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (1998) who reported that an institution marred with cheating in academics becomes less attractive to potential donors, students and prospective employers. When cheating cases are very severe parents shy off from the school and the future employers are discouraged from hiring students from such schools. Learners acquire dishonest behaviors which they are likely to exhibit even in the workplaces. Interviews with respondent principals 6(21.4%) and County Director of Education revealed that cheating in KCSE examination affects learning greatly as it kills the spirit of hard work in both learners and teachers. Cheating stifles initiative and critical thinking in learners. This happens when the students from the lower forms acquire the behavior as they learn from the candidates sitting for KCSE examination. Cheating stifles initiative and critical thinking as the cognitive abilities in learners are not subjected to learning. The basic mission of education is not achieved as learners get without the knowledge needed in future. These finding also are in accordance with study by Nonis and Swift (2001) who pointed that cheating in academics negatively affects students after graduation. The students are likely to engage in dishonesty act such as fraud. It can be concluded that cheating in public examinations has many effects to students, teachers, schools and the education system. School administrators who collude with students for top grades cause students never to trust seniors when they leave school.
4.6 Strategies to Eliminate KCSE Examination Irregularities in Schools

The fourth objective sought to gather data from the principals, teachers, students and the County Director of Education on the strategies school administrators can take to curb cheating in KCSE examination. The findings are represented in the table 4.18

Table 4.17: Strategies to Eliminate Cheating from Respondent Principals, Teachers and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Principal freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Teacher freq</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>student freq</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategies to eliminate cheating in exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitize students and teachers on dangers of cheating</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good preparation of students for exams</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expose candidates to many exams to build confidence</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and counseling</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting right in providing strict supervision</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate teachers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punishing culprits of cheating in exam to deter others from practicing the vice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instilling CCTV</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings
From the table 4.17 the following strategies were identified:

Guidance and counseling as reported by 28(100%) principals, 36(42.9%) teachers and 49(17.5%) of students. Students need to be guided so as to develop good study habits, acquire good morals of honesty and hard work, prepare well for exams, gain enough confidence to sit and write exams. Students need to be aware of various tips that should be put in place for them to be successful and excel in examinations. This agrees with research done by Kasomo (2007) which showed that guidance and counseling on tests and examination taking behavior help to develop confidence in students to sit and write examination. Instilling good values deter cheating from occurring.

Based on table 4.17, Good preparation of students for examinations was identified as a strategy to eliminate cheating as reported by 28(100%) of principals, 84(100%) of teachers and 39(36%) of students. Students need to be well prepared for exams. Good syllabus coverage and in good time give students confidence and allow time for revision before the onset of examinations. In the interview all the respondents admitted that proper preparation of examinations greatly reduces cheating. Well preparation of teachers for classroom instructions and use of learner centered methods of instruction boosts learning among students. Harsh and unfair teachers who use teacher centered methods of instructions may cause students to cheat if they fail to understand the content taught. Lack of individual student preparations promotes cheating. Woods (2001) argues that students cheat much less when they understand the contents well and when free to ask questions. Kinai (2007) argues that students may cheat if the work is too difficult for their abilities or they have not
prepared well for examinations. Kariuki (2007) acknowledged that the cheating child may be the one who feels both inadequate and inferior.

The data on table 4.17 shows that Sensitizing students and teachers on the dangers of cheating in examinations reduces cheating. This was reported by 28(100%) principals, 84(100%) teacher and 280(100%) of the students. Sensitizing teachers and students on immediate consequences of cheating reduces cheating. Some students cheat due to ignorance of the immediate consequences of cheating. When students are enlightened and sensitized on examinations rules and regulations, they are less likely to cheat. This confirms studies by Woods (2001) that argued that a large amount of cheating occurs where students are ignorant of the immediate consequences of cheating.

From table 4.17, starting right in providing strict supervision in exams right from lower forms reduces cheating. This was reported by 21(75%) of principals and 252(90%) students. It is necessary to take time and to clearly explain to students the standards school administrators expect and why. Discipline in examinations should be observed at all times during internal and external examinations. The school administrators are required to be consistent and steady as students respond best to steady consistent handling. Strictness in supervision of examinations should start early. This was also echoed by all respondents in the interview. Starting early to instill and build good values to the student right in form one will help to internalize the examination morals and hence reduce examination irregularities. Anassi (2004) argues that corruption is an acquired habit over time and that someone who should have taken the responsibility to stamp it out failed to do so.
Data on table 4.17 shows that exposing students to many exams would reduce cheating. This was reported by 28(100%) principal and 173(61.7%) students. The same was reported by all respondents in the interviews. Exposing students to many and in the format of KCSE examination build confidence in learners. Students who do weekly tests earn higher scores in final examinations than who do exams at the end of the term only. Many exams exposes clearly the topics that require attention and the content not well understood for further action. Further many exams make the candidate acquire knowledge on how to handle examinations and have experience on answering question. Many examinations boost the memory of the students therefore reducing cheating. This concurs with Lunalo (2006) who acknowledged that diagnosis tests help to identify the student’s weakness and strength for appropriate action before the final national public examination.

Based on the data on the table 4.17, taking action to the culprits of cheating would reduce cheating. This is reported by 3(11%) of principals. In the interview 2 (7.1%) principals reported that taking action on the culprits of cheating would reduce cheating by deterring other from engaging in the vice. It is necessary to take action before a situation gets out of control. Be consistent and deal with exam misbehavior as soon as possible. The bigger the problem gets the more difficult it shall be to deal with it. The centers and the candidates guilty of cheating should face the law to deter others from practicing the vice. During science practical students should to be confined as they wait for their turn to ensure no communication between candidates taking exams and those waiting for their turn. The school administrators are required to report any examination misconduct to the KNEC officials on the ground and to order cancellation of a candidate’s exam if guilt of cheating. Penalties should be
made effective and be followed to the later to deter cheating from continually occurring. Bunn et al (1992) argued that there is increased probability of cheating in a candidate if the student knows he/she will not be discovered. The severity of punishment for cheating is immaterial for a candidate who cheat thinking he will not be discovered. Kasomo (2007) warned that no student should respond to any external agent to cheat in examination. Hence students are to resist such assistances from any one.

From table 4.18, having adequate teaching staff would reduce cheating. This was reported by 18(63%) principals. Adequate teachers reduce workload thus the teacher will have time to prepare well for classroom instructions. When students are taught well and understand the contents they are likely to do well hence reduce cheating. Capacity building among the principals enlightens them on what is expected of them during national public examination. Creating a good learning culture in school would ensure students and teachers use their time effectively as this would ensure students are well prepared for examinations.

Data on table 4.17 shows that instilling CCTV in examination rooms would reduce cheating. This was reported by 40% of the students. This is quite effective in reducing cheating as cheaters cannot escape undiscovered. However it is costly for every exam room in all the examination centers to have CCTV.

The study further sought to investigate from the respondent students who had indicated that they have never cheated in examination the reason for not cheating. The findings are represented in the table 4.19.
Table 4.18: Reasons for not cheating in exam from student respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason for not cheating in exams</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of guilty</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always have confidence in exams</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers advice students not to cheat</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being caught cheating</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>173</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: survey findings

From the table 4.18, 98(56.6%) of students indicated that they don’t cheat as they always have confidence in exams. Confident candidates are less likely to cheat in examination as shown by 56.6% of students. Confidence may be due to early completion of syllabus, having been exposed to many examinations, having had enough revision. Kasomo (2007) states that guidance and counseling on exam taking skills and good study habits helps to build confidence in students.

The data in table 4.18 shows that 33(19.1%) admitted that they do not cheat because they feel guilty. Students who have acquired academic honesty in school life are less likely to cheat even when an opportunity to cheat presents itself. Students who comply with their internal standards for honesty avoid cheating to maintain positive self-view in terms of being honesty. McCabe and Trevino (2002) argues that students who morality views cheating as wrong are less likely to engage in cheating.

Based on data on table 4.19, 19(11%) students indicated that teachers advised them not to cheat. Advising students not to cheat reduces probability of cheating. When
students are guided, they become less likely to cheat in examinations. Some students cheat in the examination because of ignorance of immediate consequence of cheating in examination. Hence guiding and counseling the learner will greatly reduce examination irregularities. Kasomo (2007) showed that guidance and counseling on test and examinations taking behavior builds confidence on a candidate. This in turn reduces cheating.

Data on table 4.18 shows that fear of being caught reduces cheating. This was reported by 23(13.3%) students. The fear being caught steer candidates away from cheating. A candidate will cheat more if he/she thinks he/she will not be discovered. Buun at el (1992) stated that probability of cheating increased when a candidate thought he/she would not be discovered.
CHAPTER FIVE
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter contains the summary of the findings, conclusions, recommendations and further research recommendation.

5.1 Summary of the Survey Findings

This survey was aimed at determining the role of school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in Kenya Certificate of Secondary Education Examinations. The research was carried out in Nairobi County. The research's objectives were:

i) To establish the various forms and causes of examination irregularities.

ii) To establish the role played by the school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in KCSE.

iii) To investigate the effect of examination irregularities on teaching and learning process in schools.

iv) To suggest appropriate strategies that the school administrators can take to eliminate examination irregularities.

The survey used a sample size of 434 respondents (drawn from thirty one secondary schools) consisting of school principals, teachers and students from both private and public secondary schools. The sample size also included the County Director of Education. Questionnaires for the principals, teachers and students were administered. Interviews with school principals and County Director of Education
were carried out in the study seeking to know the role of school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in KCSE. The study findings revealed that:

Various forms of examination irregularities were found to be: in the order of frequency, they include: collusion, smuggling of materials in examination room, possession of electronic devices in the examination center, leaked examination papers, writing on body parts and clothes and impersonation. The study revealed that the main causes of examination irregularities were: poor individual preparations for examinations, pressure to pass examinations, availability of leaked examination papers, laxity in invigilation and high competition. It was also revealed that many of the examination irregularities are not reported mainly to avoid cases with Kenya National Examination Council and to protect the candidates and the school from the consequences of cheating in examinations.

The role of school administrators in curbing examination irregularities in schools KCSE were found to be: frisking of candidates before entering examination room, playing an active supervisory role during examinations, providing adequate facilities for examinations both space and materials, issue rules and regulations to candidates as stipulated by KNEC, creating a mobile phone free zone in the examination center, identify the registered candidates, keep confidential confident, provide security of the examination papers, maintain discipline, witness the sealing of candidates scripts and opening of examination papers, release teachers of integrity to supervise and invigilate KCSE examinations, reporting any form of examination irregularity to the KNEC officials on the ground and to remain on duty throughout the examination period.
The study further found that cheating in KCSE examinations affects teaching and learning in schools. The main effects of cheating in KCSE were identified to include: kill the teaching spirit, demoralization and rejection of honest teachers who do not compromise integrity, encourage truancy among teachers, affects syllabus coverage and leads to unhealthy competition. The study also found that cheating in KCSE examinations affect learning. The major effects identified include: destroy schools reputation, lowers hard work among students, the school learning culture is destroyed, leads to cutting of classes by students, stifles initiative and critical thinking in learners, erodes the respect for teachers, brings shame and demoralize students.

The study also revealed that the main strategies to curb examination irregularities were:
Guidance and counseling of students on examination taking skills; effective study habits and honesty in school life, thorough preparation of candidates for KCSE examinations, Good syllabus coverage and in time to allow for revision, sensitizing the students and staff on dangers of examination irregularities to candidates and the school at large and finally to expose students to many examinations to build confidence.
5.2 Conclusion

Based on the findings, the following conclusions based on research questions were made:

Various forms of examination irregularities were identified in the study area. The forms of cheating identified were collusion, smuggling of notes into examination rooms, possession of electronic devices in the examination room, leaked examination, impersonation, writing on body parts and clothes. It was noted that candidates use any psychological means to achieve what they aim in the public national examinations. Further external agents assist candidates cheat in examinations. It was also concluded that many cheating cases in examinations go unnoticed and not reported to the Examination Council.

The study concluded that there are host of factors that cause candidates engage in examination irregularities. These factors were lack of adequate individual preparation for examinations, availability of leaked examination papers, difficult examinations, pressure to pass with top grades, inadequate facilities, ranking of schools and promotion based of KCSE performance. Some of these causes originate from the candidate strong desire to pass with good grades. However some examination irregularities are initiated by external agents such as teachers, examination officials, and employers, among others.

From the study it can be concluded that the school administrators have host of responsibilities in ensuring examination irregularities do not occur in their schools. The role of school administrators were identified to be: play active supervisory role, maintaining discipline during examination period, provision of adequate facilities,
frisking candidates in collaboration with the supervisors and invigilators, providing
security to examinations to avoid leakage, witnessing opening of examinations and
sealing of candidates script, record in the log book all the activities of the
examinations, identification of the candidates Therefore school administrators
through the role they play in public national examinations can effectively ensure
education goals of a country are achieved.

The study also concluded that examination irregularities affect teaching and learning
in schools. The effects identified were: destroy school reputation, destroy the dignity
of students, lead to laxity in teaching and learning, lowers education standards,
encourage truancy, lead to unhealthy communication and strike. Institutions plagued
by examination irregularities are less attractive to the society. Examination
irregularities broods laxity among teachers and learners hence purposes of education
not attained.

The study further concluded that various measures can be employed by the school
administrators to ensure examination irregularities do not occur in schools. The
strategies identified were: good preparation of candidates, giving students many
exams to build confidence, guidance and counseling, starting right in provision of
strict supervision, penalties to be made effective for centers and candidates guilty of
cheating, sensitizing candidate on rules of examinations and having adequate
teachers. It was also concluded that the government, through the ministry of
education and KNEC to work hand in hand with the schools to ensure total
elimination of examination irregularities.
5.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were made:

The Ministry of Education should create an action plan for total elimination of examination irregularities within a specified time frame. This will ensure that examination malpractices are completely eliminated in schools.

The Examination Council should provide comprehensive assistance and training for examination officials on emerging issues of examination misconduct and how to handle them effectively. The examination officials are not trained, they are just sent by the school principals to centers needed to invigilate or supervise. They therefore lack knowledge on various issues of examinations misconduct and how to deal with the misconduct. Further the government through the Ministry of Education should eliminate promotion of teachers based on KCSE performance by the Teachers Service Commission. This acts as a catalyst in motivating teachers to collude with candidates for better grades. Instead value added progress should be used in promotion of teachers. Further teachers and principals in schools with cheating cases should not be promoted unless after thorough investigations.

Quality assurance team to be on the ground for assessment of schools and to ensure students are thoroughly prepared for examination through acquiring the abilities needed for the achievement of curriculum goals. Also to create Capacity building among the principals as they are the determinants in eradication of cheating in public national examinations.
Provision of adequate funds to ensure schools have adequate facilities and equipments required by candidates for examinations. Only the centers with enough facilities should be registered as examination centers. The government should be responsive to private sector offering secondary educating by providing support, facilities, bursaries and subsidized secondary school fees to students in private secondary schools. This ensures the students are well prepared for examinations due to availability of enough resources.

5.4 Suggestions for Further Research

The study recommends a further research be conducted in the country on the alternative forms of assessment to replace the high competitive KCSE examination. The mode of examination be reviewed such that there is cumulative assessment of students by Kenya National Examination Council right from form one to form four. This will ensure that a 2hr KCSE examination does not determine the future of a candidate. But adopt progressive assessment of learners since entering form one to form four.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

INTRODUCTION LETTER

RE: Request to fill the questionnaires for research purposes

I am a post graduate student at Kenyatta University taking a master of education degree course. This is a survey to gather information and opinion on role of school administrators in curbing examination malpractices in secondary schools in Nairobi County, so as to make suitable recommendations to school administrators on how they can effectively eliminate examination irregularities in school. Please note:

1) All your responses will be treated as confidential.
2) Do not write your name in the questionnaire but only give your most honest independent answers.
3) Your responses to questions will be used for research purposes only.
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APPENDIX II

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

Please respond to all the items in the questionnaire by ticking appropriately or writing your answers in the spaces provided to same questions.

Demographic information

1) Gender
   Male [ ]    Female [ ]

2) School type you head
   National [ ]    County [ ]    District [ ]
   Private [ ]

3) Experience in years
   0-1 [ ]    2-3 [ ]    3-4 [ ]    5 and above [ ]

4) What role do KNEC expect you to play during the KCSE examination period in your school?

5) Is the role you play as expected by the KNEC during KCSE examination comprehensive to ensure no irregularities occur in KCSE examination in your school?
   Yes [ ]    No [ ]

If No, suggest what else KNEC need to include in ensuring the principal is fully involved to curb irregularities in KCSE examinations in your school.
6) Do examination irregularities in KCSE occur in your school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

i. Suggest factors that may lead candidates to cheat in KCSE examination in your school .................................................................................................................................

ii. List the forms of examination irregularities that occur among the students in your school .................................................................................................................................

7) Suggest strategies that you can take to ensure no cheating occurs in KCSE examination in your school .................................................................................................................................

8) Does cheating in KCSE Examination have effect on teaching in your school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes Suggest the effect cheating in KCSE examination have on teaching in your school .................................................................................................................................

9) Would you say that cheating in KCSE examination affect learning in your school?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

If yes, suggest the effect cheating in KCSE examination on learning in your school .................................................................................................................................

Thank you for your response
APPENDIX III

QUESTIONNAIRES FOR TEACHERS

Please tick the appropriate in the space provided.

1) Gender
   Male [ ] Female [ ]

2) School type
   National [ ] County [ ]
   District [ ] Private [ ]

3) No of years you have worked in this school.
   0-1 [ ] 2-3 [ ] 3-4 [ ] 5 and above [ ]

4) Have you ever worked with KNEC?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If yes, Tick the duty or duties you were assigned by KNEC.
   Supervisor [ ] Invigilator [ ] Examiner [ ]
   Others Specify............................................................................................................

5) Does cheating occur in KCSE in your school?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
   If yes, list the forms of cheating common in KCSE examination in your school
   ....................................................................................................................................
   .....................................................................................................................................
6) Would you say that all cheating cases in KCSE examinations are recorded and reported to KNEC?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If No, suggest reasons for not reporting the cases of irregularities noted

7) Suggest the possible causes of cheating among candidates in KCSE Examination in your school

8) Suggest the measures the school administrators may take to ensure cheating in KCSE examinations does not occur in your school

9) Does cheating in KCSE examination affect teaching in your school?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, suggest the effects cheating in KCSE examination has on teaching in your school

10) Does cheating in KCSE affect learning among students in your school?
Yes [ ] No [ ]
If yes, suggest the effects of cheating in KCSE examination on learning

Thank you for your response.
APPENDIX IV

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDENTS

1) Gender

Male [ ]  Female [ ]

2) School type

National [ ]  County [ ]
District [ ]  Private [ ]

3) Are you nervous when taking examinations?

Yes [ ]  No [ ]
If yes, give reasons ...........................................................................................................
If no, give reasons ...........................................................................................................

4) Have you ever seen a student cheat in any examination in school?

Yes, many times [ ]  Yes, a few times [ ]
Yes, once [ ]  No, I have never [ ]

5) Tick where the following happen during examinations

Copying from one another [ ]
Communicating answers in signs or any language [ ]
Getting access to an examination papers before the day of examination [ ]
Copying from notes or text books [ ]
Using mobile phones to get answers [ ]
6) Does cheating occur in every test?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

7) Have you ever cheated in exam?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

   If yes, what made you to cheat?
   Exam was difficult [ ]
   There was no teacher to supervise [ ]
   I had not prepared well for the examination [ ].
   Others also cheat [ ]
   Pressure from the parent [ ]
   I was nervous [ ]
   Others, specify ..........................................................

   If you have never cheated, what makes you not to?
   I feel guilty [ ]
   I always have confidence [ ]
   Teachers advice not to [ ]
   I fear being caught [ ]

8) Do you think it is good to cheat in examination?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]

9) Can school Principal help student cheat in KCSE examination?
   Yes [ ] No [ ]
Suggest ways he/she can assist students cheat in exams.

Give suggestions on ways the school principal can ensure no cheating occurs in examinations.

10) Does cheating in KCSE examination affect learning among students in your school?
   Yes [ ]    No [ ]

   If yes, state the effects cheating have on learning in your school.

11) Does cheating in KCSE examination affect teaching in your school?
   Yes [ ]    No [ ]

   Suggest the effects cheating in KCSE examination has on teaching in your school.

Thank you for your responses
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