

JOURNAL OF RESEARCH



Educational Management

Volume1 No 1

Dec. 2004

Published by

Department Of Felulational Management, Faculty of Education, Lagos State University, Djo Lagos Nigeria

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIPALS'
ADMINISTRATIVE STYLES AND EXAMINATION
MALPRACTICE: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE
ACHIEVEMENT OF THE SOCIAL STUDIES
OBJECTIVES IN LAGOS STATE PUBLIC
SECONDARY SCHOOL

BY

JIMOH A.S.

CURRICULUM STUDIES DEPARTMENT, FACULTY OF EDUCATION, LAGOS STATE UNIVERSITY, OJO.

ABSTRACT

The paper tried to discover the administrative style that is common among Lagos State Public Secondary Schools' Principals and how this contributes to the rampant examination malpractice in our secondary schools.

Forty-five secondary schools' examination officers/chairmen of examination committees of τ^s randomly selected secondary schools in the state were served the self-developed Questionnaire on Principals' Administrative Styles and Examination Malpractice in Secondary Schools for collecting data.

The data collected were analyzed with the simple percentage and the "t" test statistic.

It was discovered among others, that the public secondary schools' principals were democratic in their administration and that despite the merits in democracy, the administrative style provides fertile ground for examination malpractice because principals have over

trusted their sub-ordinates who handle their schools' examinations.

INTRODUCTION

Prior to the emergence of the Nigerian National Policy on Education (1977), emphasis was on the "summative examination" for placement, promotion of students and employment.

At the primary school level, the terminal examinations with particular emphasis on the third term or e...d of year examination determined students capability to move to higher classes and the First School Leaving Certificate Examination was mainly for certification. The story was the same at the secondary level with the popular School Certificate Examination for certification.

Entrance to higher institutions of learning w_{\ast} , based partly on the quality of the certificate obtained and qualifying examinations (entrance examinations and / or interview).

The Nigeria National Policy on Education (1977, 1981 and 1998) however. recommended the 6-3-3-4 system and de-emphasized the end of programme examinations especially at the primary and JSS levels. It emphasized continuous assessment for primary school certification, continuous assessment and examination co. ducted by public examination bodies for the junior and senior secondary school certification.

Despite the above, examinations at the secondary school level still enjoy prominence.

"Examination" is a word students (at all levels) despise hearing. It sends shivers down their spines, especially the ill prepared ones.

Examination, according to the Oxforc' Advanced Learners" Dictionary, is testing of knowledge or ability. It is a common means of testing the extent to which the learner has acquired. a imilated or mastered the knowledge or skills being transmitted to him by t teacher. This is measured through the scores obtained in a given test or e. m.

Certificate and performances in examinations are the basic requirements for entrance and recruitment into Nigerian Higher Institutions of learning. Therefore, the rush for certificates and higher education, the high competition for the few available slots in educational institutions and job

scarcity made successful performance in examinations "a must" for Nigerian students. The continued emphasis on examination, paper qualification, fear of failure and scramble for the limited job opportunities led ill-prepared students to device various means of passing their exams (legally or illegally).

CASES OF EXAMINATION MALPRACTICE

Examination malpractice, in Nigeria, according to Omolewa (1976) in Ayodabo (2002) is dated back to June 1948 and as early as 1880 in the London University Examinations. However, the first recorded incidence of examination malpractice in Nigeria was the leakage . examination papers of the Cambridge School Certificate Examination in 1914. In 1967, a tribunal of enquiry was set up to unravel the circumstances that led to the mass leakage to check future occurrences. However, since then, the West African Examination Council has recorded widespread leakages (Adeyegbe .994 in Fabiyi 2002).

Examination malpractice takes different forms, ranging from bringing materials with relevant information into examination halls to bringing in dangerous weapons, and charms to scare examination officers, stealing other candidates' scripts, impersonation, bullet or missiles (arm and ammunitions), notes in tissue papers, dubbed materials concealed in female wrappers, walkie-talkie, use of high-technology micro-computers, "expo" (leakage before exam), "contractor" invigilators, text messaging through GSM, writings on suckling babies' bodies, collusio, among supervisors, invigilators, teachers, schools' heads and touts etcetera (Fabiyi 2002, Avodabo 2002).

As examination regulations toughen up, examinees were getting more sophisticated in devising means to beat them. This has been a headache to all stakeholders in the educational system.

ADMINISTRATIVE STYLES

Administration is a process of structuring, organizing and ruiding situations so that members of a group can achieve goals with minin meffort and time. It is the work a manager or an administrator perfor to cause people to take effective action. He manages, makes decisions, decelops the staff and motivates his workers.

Some administrative or leadership styles practiced are authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire types.

The authoritarian administrator is selfish, ruthless, wicked, greedy, loves power, and flattering. The control power and decision-making structures are concentrated on him alone. The democratic administrator on the other hand, shares out his responsibilities among his followers. He accommodates suggestions and initiatives. The laissez-faire administrator is a leaderless type. It means "let alone". It is a situation where power is totally among the people. There is virtually no law. Followers are free to do their wish (Seville 1972 & Gibbs 1954).

A typical Nigerian secondary school is often characterized by teachers' and students' indiscipline ranging from examination malpractice, improper dressing, lateness to school and poor attitude to academic work. The administrative or leadership style of some principals give room for participation which some teachers and students abuse.

As the administrator of the school, the principal's administrative style dictates the teachers' and students' mode of discipline.

OBJECTIVES OF SOCIAL STUDIES

The social studies education is a subject that has a broad based focus and input from various trad, ional disciplines dealing with the various problems exuding from mankind's relationship with this environment.

The purposes of this broad based nature are:

- To develop in the young learners some positive attitudes of togetherness and appropriate values of honesty, integrity, hard work, fairness and justice at work and at play as their contributions to the development of the (Nige ian) society.
- To use education for eveloping effective and skilled citizenship in the learners.
- To make them acquire realthy social attitudes and ideas and to develop in them appropriate and useful skills.
- To make learners become "good citizens" capable of and willing to contribute to the development of the society and

 To inculcate the right types of attitudes, skills and values (Akinlaye 2003, Adetoro 2000, Ezegbe 1988 and Ivowi 1993).

If the subject is so embedded with these enormous tasks, no wonder it was made a core subject at the primary and junior secondary school levels as a means of academically molding learners towards developing acceptable social manners. However, is the inculcation of these reasured values and attitudes being conscientiously pursued at the Nigerian secondary schools with the thriving incidence of examination malpractices? Will this criminal act not derail the actualization of these laudable objectives?

These and many more unanswered questions prompted this researcher to investigate the examination malpractice issue from the perspective of the principals' administrative styles with the hope of proffering some lasting solutions.

Various attempts have been made by educators and researchers to find out the causes, effects and probably proffering solutions to examination malpractice. Surprisingly, no one seems to recognize the importance of the principals' administrative styles in effecting discipline or otherwise in secondary schools' examinations. A principal's leadership or administrative style and his roles during examinations dictate to some extent, the students' and teachers' mode of discipline during examinations.

The public secondary schools, being the major suppliers of student inputs to the Nigerian tertiary education, therefore, necessitated the study to discover the administrative styles common among Lagos State Public Secondary Schools' Principals and their contribution or otherwise to the rampant incidence of examination malpractice in the secondary schools.

PURPOSE

The study finds out the type of administrative tyles common among Lagos State Public Secondary Schools' Principals a: their relationship with examination malpractice in public secondary hools.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The following questions were answered:

(1) What administrative style is common among Lagos State Public Secondary Schools' Principals?

- (2) Do principals provide necessary preventive measures against examination maloractices?
- (3) Do principals effectively supervise examinations in their schools?
 - (4) Is there any relationship between principals' administrative styles and examination malpractice in secondary schools?

METHODOLOGY

SAMPLE: The sample for the study was made up of 45-examination committee officers/chairmen from 45 randomly selected secondary schools in Lagos State.

INSTRUMENTATION: A self-constructed questionnaire on "Principals' Administrative Styles and Examination Malpractice in Secondary Schools" was used for obtaining data for the study.

The questionnaire contained 70 items divided into 5 sections (A-E). Section A sought for information on demographic data, section B contained 27 items that focused on principals' administrative styles, section C has 19 items which focused on measures at preventing examination malpractice. section D contained 8 items aimed at discovering principals' supervisory roles during examinations and section E also has 8 items to discover existed cases of examination malpractice and how they were handled.

VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF INSTRUMENT: The instrument was given to co-lecturers and specialists in educational measurement and research design after the initial draft. Their contributions were considered in the final draft. The instrument was pre-tested using ten teachers. The result showed no ambiguity in the design, wordings, and an indication of easy analysis of responses. It was then self administered to the respondents and collected back immediately to ensure complete return.

DATA ANALYSIS

The analysis was dor by applying the simple percentage to questions 1 to 3 and the "t" test statis formula established at 0.05 level of significance to question 4.

OUESTION ONE

What administrative style is common among Lagos State Public Secondary Schools' Principals? Table 1 below presents the analysis.

Table I:

Lagos State Secondary Schools Principals' Administrative Styles (In Percentages).

Democratic Administration

| No | Statement | S. | Λ | D | SD | N/R | Total |
|----|---|---------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1. | My principal allows us (teachers) to contribute to decision making on school matters | (18) 40 | (18) 40 | (6), 13.33 | (3). 6.67 | * | (45) 100 |
| 2. | Issues are always extensively discussed with teachers before the principal takes action | (9) 20 | (30) 66.67. | * | (6) 13.33 | * | (45) 100 |
| 3. | Official information are always communicated round all teachers before action is taken | (12) 26.67 | (15) 33.33 | (12) 26.67 | (3) 6.67 | (3) 6.68 | (45) 100 |
| 4. | My principal creates environments that allows suggestions, ideas and innovations. | (18) 40 | (24) 53.3 | (3) 6.7 | * | * | (45) 100 |
| 5. | My principal is always fair and firm on all issues | (9) 20 | (27) 60 | (3) 6.7 | (3) 6.7 | (3) 6.7 | (45) 100 |
| 5. | My principals always persuades and cincourages workers to seek definite objectives enthusiastically | (9) .20 | (18) 40 | (6) 13.3 | (3) 6.9 | (9) 20 | (45) 100 |

| No | Statement | SA | Λ | D | SD | N/R | Total |
|-----|---|---------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| 8. | Teachers are always free to discuss their problems with our principal | (12) 26.7 | (21) 46.7 | (6) 13.3 | (3) 6.7 | (3) 6.7 | (45) 100 |
| 21. | My principal knows how to settle disputes, bind groups gether and motivate schers effectively | (9) 20 | (27) 60 | (6) 13.3 | (3) 6.7 | * | (45) 100 |
| | Total | (96) 26.67 | (180) 50 | (42) 11.67 | (24) 6.67 | (18. 5 | (360) 100 |

AUTHORITARIAN ADMINISTRATION

| | STATEMENT | SA | Λ | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|---|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-----|-------------|
| 7 | My principal only involves the vice principals in his decision aking processes | (9) 20 | (6) 13.33 | (15) 33.33 | (15) 33.33 | * | (45) 100 |
| 9 | Only the principal, vice principals, and heads of departments are involved in decision making on school issues. | * | 6.6 | (21) 46.7 | (18) | 6.6 | 100 |
| 10 | Official information are always restricted the principal and the Beads of departments | * | (3) | (21) 46.7 | 46.7 | * | 100 |
| 11 | Information always becomes stale before reaching the members of staff. | (6) 13.3 | (12) 26.7 | (18) | (9) | * | (45) 100 |
| 12 | My principal takes decisions on his own which must always be nding on both teac rs and students. | (9) 20 | (3) 6.7 | (21) 46.7 | (12) 26.7 | * | (45) 100 |
| 13 | The incipal applies strice int measures in orde. 10 achieve discipline in the school. | (24) 53.3 | (9) | (12) 26.67 | × | * | (45) 100 |

| | STATEMENT | SA | A | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|---|---------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|-----|-------------|
| 14 | My principal ensures strong adherence to school's rules and regulations irrespective of any condition. | (21) 46.67 | (12) 26.7 | (9) | (3) | ak | (45) 100 |
| | TOTAL | (69) 21.9 | (48) | (117) 37.14 | (78) 24.76 | (3) | (315) |

| | EZ FAIRE ADMINIST STATEMENT | SA | A | D | SD | N/R | TOTA L |
|-----|--|-------|-------|-------|------|-----|-----------|
| 15 | My Principal hardly | (3) | (3) | (12) | (27) | | (45) |
| J | comes out of his office before closing hours. | 6.6 | 6.6 | 26.7 | 60 | * | 100 |
| 16 | The principal's roles are | (ć, | (3) | (9) | (27) | | (45) |
| 10 | always performed by vice principals and teachers. | 13.3 | 6.7 | 20 | 60 | * | 100 |
| 17 | Teachers and prefects | (9) | (6) | (18) | (12) | | (45) |
| 1.7 | always do the administration and control of students | 20 | 13.3 | 40 | 26.7 | * | 100 |
| 18 | Teachers in my school | (21) | (18) | (3) | (3) | | (45) |
| 10 | are given absolute freedom to effectively perform their duties. | 46.7 | 40 | 6.7 | 6.7 | * | 100 |
| 19 | Students in my school | (3) | (12) | (18) | (12) | | (45) |
| | are given absolute freedom with little administrative interference to enable effective academic attainment | 67 | 26.7 | 40 | 26.7 | * | 100 |
| | TOTAL | (42) | (42) | (60) | (81) | | (225) |
| | 10171 | 15.67 | 18.67 | 26.67 | 36 | * | 100 |

Q26 Democratic (27) 6 Autocratic (9) 20% Laissez Faire (9) 2 6

Table I shows that 76.67% (26.67 + 50) of the respondents agreed that their p.incipals exhibit democratic leadership/administrative styles while 18.33% disagreed. 61.9% (24.76 + 37.14) disagreed that the administrative style of their principals is authoritarian, however, 37.141% agreed. While 62.67% (26.67 + 36) were of the opinion that their principals are not laissez faire but 37.34% took them to be.

On further probe, question item 26 succinculy shows that 60% of the respondents were of the opinion that their principals are democratic, while 20% agreed with autocratic and laissez faire respectively.

*With the above analysis, it could be concluded that Lagos State Public Secondary Schools' Principals are democratic in their administrative styles.

OUESTION TWO

Do Public Secondary Schools' Principals provide necessary measures against examination malpractice? The analysis of question two is presented on table 2 below.

TABLE II: PREVENTIVE MEASURES AG AINST EXAMINATION MALPRACTICE (IN PERCENTAGES).

| | STATEMENT | SA | Α | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|--|------|------|----------|------|------|-------|
| 28 | There is an | (27) | (12) | (3) | | (3) | (45) |
| | examination committee in my school. | 60 | 26.7 | 6.7 | * | 6.7 | 100 |
| 29 | The committee is | (18) | (24) | | | (3) | (45) |
| | solely responsible for all examination matters. | 40 | 53.3 | <i>*</i> | ¥ | 6.7 | 100 |
| 30 | We have an | (18) | (12) | (12) | (3) | | (45) |
| | examination officer in our school. | 40 | 26.7 | 2647 | 6.7 | * | 100 |
| 33 | My principal always | (9) | (21) | (9) | | (6) | (45) |
| | supervises the duties of the examination committee or officer. | 20 | 46.7 | 20 | ٠ | 13.3 | 100 |
| 14 | My principal always | (12) | (18) | (6) | (6) | (3) | 5) |
| | moves round the examination hall during exams. | 26.7 | 40 | 13.3 | 13.3 | 6.7 |)() |
| 35 | Exam malpractice | (12) | (24) | (6) | -(3) | | (45) |
| | committee exists in my school. | 26.7 | 53.3 | 13,3 | 6.7 | * | 100 |

| _ | STATEMENT | SA | ٨ | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|--|----------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| :6 | There is a disciplinary committee in my school. | (21) 46.7 | (9) 20 | (3) | (3) 6.7 | (9) 20 | (45) 100 |
| 11 | My principal is stricter with external exams because he wants to pro 21 the image of the school | (21) 46.7 | (15) 33.3 | (9) 20 | 8 | * | (45) 100 |
| | TOTAL. | ·1381 38.33 | (135) 37.5 | (48) 13.33 | (15) 4.17 | (24) 6.67 | (360) 100 |

NEGATIVE STATEMENTS

| | STATEMENT | SA | A | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|---|------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-------------|
| 31 | The officer s solely responsible for all examination matters. | (9) 20 | (9) 20 | (21) 46.7 | (3) 6.7 | (3) 6.7 | 100 |
| 32 | Examination is solely left in care of the vice principal (Academics) | (3) 6.7 | (12) 26.7 | (27) 60 | (3) 6.7 | * | (45) 100 |
| 38 | My principal is stricter with internal exams than external examinations. | (9) 20 | (6) 13.3 | (18) 40 | (12) 26.7 | * | (45) 100 |
| 39 | My principal believes that well prepared students need no trict monitoring in external exams. | (3) 6.3 | (6) 13.3 | (33) 73.3 | (3) 6.3 | * | (45) 100 |
| 40 | He is not strict with external exams because he wants majority of his students to gain admission to higher institutions of learning. | * | (3) 6.7 | (24) 53.3 | (18) 40 | * | (45) 100 |
| 42 | Only students are allowed to give little assistance to each other doing exams | * | (3) 6.7 | (24) 53.3 | (18) 40 | * | (45) 100 |
| 13 | Teachers as allowed to assist stuc its during external examples. | × | * | (12) 26.7 | (38) 73.3 | * | (45) 100 |
| 44 | Teachers may give little assistance to only deserving students during exams. | (3) 6.7 | * | (18) 40 | (24) 53.3 | × | (45) 100 |

| | STATEMENT | SA | A | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|---|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|------------|--------------|
| 45 | Some teachers organize assistance to students without the principal's knowledge. | (12) 26.7 | (15) 33.3 | (12) 26.7 | (6) 13.3 | у: | (45) 100 |
| 46 | Students must be assisted in external exams to avoid violent reprisal on the school. | * | (3) | (15) 33.3 | (27) 60 | * | (45) 100 |
| | TOTAL | (39) 8.67 | (57) 12.67 | (204 45 TE | (147) | (3) 0.6 | (450) 100 |

Table II shows the affirmative response of the subjects to the positive statements, 75.83%, (i.e.37.5 + 38.3) and their negative responses to the negative statements, 78%, (i.e. 45.33 + 32.67). These percentages, being higher than the negative responses, (17.4% i.e. 13.33 + 4.17 and 21.34% i.e.8.67+12.67), affirmed that administrative measures were precided by the principals to prevent examination malpractices.

QUESTION THREE

Do public secondary schools' principals effectively supervise examinations in their schools? The analysis is presented on table III below.

TABLE III: PRINCIPALS' SUPERVISORY ROLES IN EXAMINATIONS (IN PERCENTAGES)

| | STATEMENT | SA | A | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|--|-------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-----|-------------|
| 47 | General supervision | (18) | (18) 40 | (9) 20 | * | * | (45) 100 |
| 48 | Monitoring students' suspicious movements | (12) 26.6 7 | (21) 46.67 | (12) 26.7 | * | * | (45) 100 |
| 49 | Monitoring teachers suspicious/fo ul movements | (12) 26.7 | (21) 46.67 | (12) 26.7 | * | * | (45) 100 |
| 50 | Only registration of students for examinations | (3) 6.7 | (9) | (21) 46.67 | (12) 26.7 | * | (45) 100 |

| | STATEMENT | SA | Λ | D | SD | N/R | TOTAL |
|----|---|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| 52 | Leaves the invigilators and the external supervisor to take charge. | 6.7 | (15) | (15) | (9) | (3) 6.7 | 100 |
| 53 | Gives ne invigilations and external supervisor free hand to operate | (15) | (15) | (15) 33.3 | 34 | * | (45) 100 |
| 54 | Inspects the question paper packs before opening and distributing. | (6) 13.4 | (15) 33.3 | (15) | (6) 13.3 | (3) 6.7 | 100 |
| 50 | Registers students for exams. | (12) 26.7 | (21) 46.67 | (9) .20 | (3) 6.7 | * | (45) 100 |
| 51 | Does not absolutely leave the supervision to external examiners. | (9) | (24) 53.3 | (9) | * | (3) | 100 |
| | TOTAL | (90) 22.22 | (159) 39.26 | (117) 28.89 | (30) 7.41 | (9) 2.22 | (405) 100 |

The analysis on Table III shows that 61.48% affirmed the various supervisory roles performed by principals during examinations. This shows that the principals effectively supervise examinations.

QUE! TION FOUR

Is the: any relationship between the administrative style and incidence o exam: ation malpractices in schools? The analysis is presented on Tables

IV an V below.

TABLE IV: CASES OF EXAMINATION MA! PRACTICE AND THEIR TREATMENT IN LAGUS STATE PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS (IN PERCENTAGES).

| | STATEMENT | YES | NO | NR | TOTAL |
|----|-------------------------------------|------|-------|------|-------|
| 55 | There has been case(s) of | (24) | (21) | | (45) |
| | exam malpractice in my school | 53.3 | 46.7 | * | 100 |
| 56 | The Case(s) was/were | (9) | (33) | (3) | (45) |
| | (always) dismissed. | 20 | 73.3 | 6.7 | 100 |
| 57 | Culprits were warned | (12) | (27) | (6) | (45) |
| | verbally. | 26.7 | 60 | 13.3 | 100 |
| 58 | Culprits were warned in | (15) | (24) | (6) | (45) |
| | writing. | 33.3 | 53.3 | 13.3 | 100 |
| 59 | Culprits were suspended | (18) | (18) | (9) | (45) |
| | for some time | 40 | 40 | 20 | 100 |
| 60 | Culprits were expelled | | (42) | (3) | (45) |
| | from the school after proved guilty | * | 93.3 | 6.7 | 100 |
| 61 | Culprits were handed over | (6) | (36) | (3) | (45) |
| | to the police | 13.3 | 80 | 6.7 | 100 |
| 62 | Culprits were (always) | (15) | (24) | (6) | (45) |
| | pardoned. | 33.3 | 53.3 | 13.3 | 100 |
| | | (99) | (225) | (36) | (360) |
| | TOTAL | 27.5 | 62.5 | 10 | 100 |

Table IV shows the responses of the subjects to items on the incidence of exam malpractice and its treatment in the public secondary schools.

As high as 53.3% of the respondents agreed that there have been cases of examination malpractice in their schools (item 55). On the various treatments of such cases, only 27.5% agreed that such cases were treated as suggested by the items while 62.5% said no.

It could therefore be concluded that while e mination malpractice cases are rampant in secondary schools, they are beging treated with levity.

It was concluded under question one that the principals in the Lagos State Public Secondary Schools are democratic Principals. This was shown on table I with 76.67% (or 276) positive responses. However, Table IV (item 55) shows that 53.3% (or 24 respondents) said there have been various cases of examination malpractice in their schools.

The analysis of the relationship between the administrative style and incidence of examination malpractice in public secondary schools is presented on Table V below.

TABLE V: RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PRINCIAPLS' DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATIVE STYLE AND INCIDENE OF EXAMINATION MALPRACTICE IN LAGOS STATE PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS (IN PERCENTAGES).

| NADIADI ES | F | X | X | CAL-T | TABLE-T |
|-------------------------------|-----|-----|------|-------|---------|
| VARIABLES Leadership Style | 360 | 276 | 0.77 | | 1.65 |
| Incidence of Exam Malpractice | 45 | 24 | 0.53 | 0.21 | |

Since the calculated 't' (0.21) was lesser than the table value (1.65) at 0.05 level of significance, it was concluded that there is no relationship between the | incipals' democratic administrative style and examination malpractice in the public secondary schools.

DISCUSSION

The study has tried to look into the administrative style common among the Lagos State Public Secondary Schools' Principals and how this influences (the ever increasing rate of) examination malpractice with a resultant inability of achieving the social studies objectives at the secondary school level.

It was discovered that the principals were democratic in their administrative styles (Table I) because as high as 76.67% and 60% testified to this. The democratic principal is believed to share out his responsibilities among his followers, to assist his group to reach goals and achieve objectives, to provide necessary information, suggests alternative courses of action and stimulates self-direction of members. He gives room for participation by staff and students.

Does the freedom provided encourage both students and teac. rs to abuse the opportunity? Is it a license to turn the principals to "Mr Nobody" in examination administration and control? Should it be a license for examination malpractice?

If democratic leadership is a panacea for achieving school's goals and objectives as well as the social studies objectives, such should not be done through undisciplined and malicious means.

However, observation by the researcher resealed that what the respondents called democratic is total neglect of duty. The principals are tilting more towards laissez faire than democracy. They give too much "freedom" to their teachers, invigilators, examination officers and even the supervisors who are "contractors" and "collaborators" themselves.

It was further discovered that the secondary schools' principals provided necessary measures against exam malpractice (Table II) and that they effectively supervise examinations (Table III). If necessary measures provided by the principals have not been able to curb examination malpractice in the secondary schools, then what has gone wrong?

Majority of these principals are old fashioned who cannot counter the various strategies devised by this modern exam cheats who are so exotic and scientific in their strategies. Middlemen invigilators, touts, use of walkie-talkies, high technology micro computer, text messaging through GSM, false pockets, body tattooing, knee socks and oxford bags, supervisors connivance, super-prints, ECOWAS, and non appearance are some of the strategies adopted. (Sunday Jacob and Lar 2001). These principals are not capable of countering majority of these strategies.

The study revealed that cases of examination malpractice were neither effectively handled nor treated accordingly (Table IV). Principals handled exam malpractice cases with levity. This is an indirect encouragement to the exam cheats. Principals need to be more serious about exam malpractice. They should handle them with all seriousness demanded.

The principals only (rarely) prove a police security, monitor students being searched and checked into examinally, inspect the question packs before opening, occasionally go round are halls and then retreat to their offices. What happens thereafter is obtivious to them. The activities of the supervisors, invigilators and other teachers thereafter are unknown to them. Are these principals even sincere themselves?

The analysis shows that there is no significant relationship between the democratic administrative style and the incidence of examination malpractice in secondary schools. This is because the "t" calculated, 0.2 is lesser than the table value of 1.65 (Table V). This means that democratic leadership does not encourage exam malpractice. Thin, where is the problem from? Attention must be directed to the teaquers, invigilators. supervisors and the activities in the examination halls. If principals were truly democratic, rather than laissez faire, exam malpracie, would not be rampant in our schools. Total neglect of duty should a be likened to democracy. Sincerity is lacking in our schools. Democratic leadership should not mean to "over trust" the teachers and invigilators. Item 45 of table II revealed that teachers deliberately anize assistance for some students without the principals' knowledge. This is to extort some money from these undeserving innocent students. The teacher's have therefore betrayed the trust reposed in them by the principals. Hence they (the principals) should handle them (the teachers, invigilators and supervisors) with the same suspicions they handled students.

Nobody is trustworthy or should be trusted on examination malpractice issues.

Examination malpractice is antisocial and a crime. It is a gross deviation from the tenets of the social studies education. Every secondary school student must have acquired some of the principles of the social studies being the only core subject that inculcates acceptable moral and social values at JSS level (Jimoh 2003). However, this is indirectly being "washed" off the minds of these young learners via the principals' ineptitude and teachers' and invigilators' greed perpetuated through examination malpractices.

The thriving nature of examination malpractices contributes to the difficulty in realizing the social studies objectives of making learners to become "good citizens" and to develop the right types of values and attitude in them. This is evident in our contemporary higher in titutions of learning where cultism, lawlessness and all sorts of devian behaviours are the order of the day.

CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were made from the study:

1. Principals of Lagos State Public Secondary Schools are democratic in their administrative styles.

- 2. Cases of examination malpractice were neither effectively handled nor treated with the seriousness they demand thereby encouraging the cheats to involve themselves more.
- 3. The democratic administrative styles of principals provide fertile grounds for examination malpractices in secondary schools.
- 4. Principals do not effectively supervise exams rather they have over trusted their teachers, exam officers, the invigilators and supervisors to the detriment of the standard of the exams.

SUGGESTIONS

If

ol

th

H

C:

10

11

di

e

r

3

The following are hereby suggested as the way forward:

- Admin trators and employers into the school system should critically scrutimize individuals' records (right from the first day of appointment) before appointing them as principals instead of solely basing such appointment on years of experience and certificates.
- Schools' administrators should place exam supervision and administration in the hands of only trusted teachers.
- Principals should take exams more serious and remain in the halls from the beginning to the end of each paper.
- Principals should practice what Saville (1972) called situational leadership. That is, adopting the type of leadership/administrative style that suits a particular situation. Where a situation calls for a democratic style, an autocratic style or a laissez-faire style, it should be so adopted. This will checkmate any emergency situation that may occur.
- Exam b. dies/ministries of education should make every school's principal "a sitting" supervisor in exam halls and should adequately remunerate them.
- Exam bodies should adequately monitor such principals and blacklist any principal or school found wanting.
- The various decrees (decree 20 of 1985 and decree 27 of 1973) promulgated by the Nigerian Military Administrators should be revisited, revie ved, passed as bills, approved and enforced by the Nigerian government to bring some sanity into our examinations.

References

Adetoro, R.A. (7. 00): <u>Issues in Social Studies and Problems of Nation Buildin: in Nigeria.</u> Abeokuta. Goad Educational Publishers.

- Akınlaye, F.A. (2003): <u>Fundamentals of Social Studies Curriculum Planning and Instruction.</u> Agege, Lagos, Pumark.
- Ayodabo Olu (2002): "Anxiety as a cause of examination malpractice"

 <u>Educational Perspective: Journal of Faculty of Education</u> 5 (2) 5867 Agust 2002. LASU. Edittex Publishers.
- Ezegbe. M.C. (1988): <u>Foundations of 'Social Studies.</u> Umahia, Dalton Publishes.
- Fabiyi. A.I. (2002): "The Management of Schools Examinations: Challenges for Stake Holders". Paper presented at the vorkshop on examination malpractice for Stakeholders of Education in Ojo L.G.A. LASU.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (1977, 1981, 19 6): <u>National Policy on Education (1st, 2nd, 3rd Editions)</u> Yaba, Lagos. NERDC Press.
- Gibbs C.A. (1954):<u>Leadership in Lindsey and Gardiner. A Handbook in Social Psychology.</u> London. Cam Mass Wesley.
- Hormby, A.S. (1954): Oxford Advanced Learners' Dictionary (special Price New Edition). Oxford, New York. Oxford University ress.
- Ivowi, U.M.O (1993): <u>Curriculum Development in Nigeria.</u> Ibadan. Sam Booman.
- Jimoh, A.S. (2003): "The Capability of Social Studies to Inculcate Moral and Social Values into Learners". <u>Educational Perspective</u>, <u>Journal of Faculty of Education</u>. 6 (1) 97 106, January 2003. LASU. Edittext Publishers.
- Saville, R. (1972): <u>Conflict: New emphasis on Leadership.</u> New York. MacGraw Hill.
- Sunday Jacob and Lar, T.D. (2001): "Forms and Reasons for Examination Malpractice: Implications for National Development". <u>Academy Congress Publication</u> 355 365, Nov. 2001. The Nigerian Academy of Education.