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Chapter 1

The Problem and Purpose of the Study

1.0 Introduction

The National Examinations Council of Tanzania (NECTA) was established by Parliament Act No. 21 of 1973. The Act gave NECTA the mandate to conduct National Examinations including The Primary School Leaving Examination (PSLE). Since its establishment, NECTA has been conducting the PSLE examinations in collaboration with the regions and the districts. Regional and District Examinations Committees have been established to ensure the smooth running of these examinations because candidates are living in those areas. Members of the Regional Examinations Committees are the Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS), the Regional Education Officer (REO), Regional Academic Officer (RAO), Regional Security Officer (RSO) and Regional Police Commander (RPC). Members of the District Examinations Committee are Municipal /District Executive Director (DED), District Education Officer (DEO), District Academic Officer (DAO), District Security Officer (DSO) and District Police Commander (OCD).

PSLE, which is conducted annually for children who complete standard 7 include five subjects. The subjects are Hisabati (Mathematics), English Language, Sayansi(Science, Maarifa ya Jamii (Social Studies) and Kiswahili. PSLE is a very important examination as it is used to decide which of the few children (60% is the present transition rate) are selected for secondary education.

It is due to the importance of this examination that NECTA and the Ministry of Education have put in place strict regulations to be observed in its conduct. Such regulations emphasise accurate registration of candidates, proper supervision and invigilation, collection of scripts and various documents and PSLE marking.

Although no systematic evaluations have been carried out recently on the conduct of PSLE in Tanzania, it is generally believed that the examination has been implemented successfully but not without challenges. It was therefore considered necessary to carry out a study which would help to assess the extent to which PSLE in Tanzania Mainland was conducted according to laid down regulations and procedures.
1.1 Background to the Study

One of the indicators of a good system of education is the quality of people produced in terms of competences needed for social, political and economic development of the nation. In order to measure the competences attained by Primary School Leavers through the education system, NECTA administers PSLE at the end of a seven year of Primary Education Programme. PSLE is regarded by the public as a high stake examination. The results of PSLE are used for selection of students to join Government secondary schools. The quality of students joining secondary education depends on the validity of scores attained by students in their PSLE. Despite the sensitivity of decisions made on the basis of PSLE results, the administration of the examinations has never been free of challenges. NECTA has been experiencing cases of cheating and malpractice during examinations. NECTA has also been experiencing cases of non compliance to examination procedures which in turn complicates the whole process of compiling examinations results. Some of such challenges include failure of invigilators to take appropriately the attendance of candidates whereby those who actually attended are shown as absentees and vice versa. As the number of candidates grows annually, NECTA found it imperative to conduct an evaluation study in order to establish reasons for malpractice as well as non-compliance to examinations regulations and procedures. It is anticipated that the findings of this study will open up a fresh page for all stakeholders involved in administration of PSLE.

1.2 Purpose of the Study

MoEVT and NECTA have made a lot effort to ensure a smooth conduct of PSLE in the country. Despite the efforts, there are still reports from REOs and invigilators indicating that all is not well in the conduct of PSLE. There are challenges associated with failure by some officials to adhere to registration procedures and deadlines, some invigilators assist candidates during examinations and other irregularities and malpractices. Given such challenges, NECTA decided to undertake an evaluation study to determine whether laid down procedures for the conduct of PSLE in Tanzania Mainland were being observed. It is expected that the findings of this study would help to improve the conduct of PSLE in the country.

Specifically the purpose of the study was to:

i) examine the strategies used by teachers to prepare PSLE candidates.
ii) assess the invigilators and teachers’ understanding of procedures for conducting PSLE in the country.

iii) establish strategies used by students and invigilators in examination malpractice

iv) assess the environment in which examinations are stored at regional, district and school levels.

v) gather recommendations from various stakeholders that may contribute to the improvement of the management and administration of PSLE.
Chapter 2
Methodology

2.0 Introduction
This section presents the methods used in the study. Sample and sampling procedures are explained as well as the process used in developing data collection instruments and piloting of the instruments. Furthermore, data collection procedures, data analysis and presentation of the findings are described. Finally, validity and the reliability of the instruments used are briefly discussed.

2.1 Area of Study
The study was carried out in thirteen regions of Tanzania Mainland. The regions and districts were randomly selected. The selected regions (districts in brackets) included Kilimanjaro (Hai & Same), Mwanza (Magu), Shinyanga (Shinyanga Rural & Kishapu), Tabora (Tabora Urban & Nzega), Dar es Salaam (Temeke & Ilala), Dodoma (Kondoa), Morogoro (Morogoro Rural, Morogoro Urban & Kilosa), Iringa (Iringa Rural, Kilolo & Makete), Kigoma (Kasulu, Kigoma Urban, Kibondo), Pwani (Bagamoyo), Mtwara (Masasi & Mtwara Rural), Mbeya (Ileje) and Tanga (Lushoto).

2.2 Methods
The study used both quantitative and qualitative methods. The main instruments used to collect data were questionnaires, focussed group discussion guides, in-depth interviews guides and a checklist.

Questionnaires were administered to primary school pupils, secondary school students, REOs and DEOs. REOs and DEOs were asked to provide information on the registration procedures, preparation of examination centres, training of supervisors and invigilators. They were also asked to provide information on the safety and security procedures observed when they receive, store and distribute examination papers. DEOs, head teachers and teachers were asked to provide information on PSLE supervision, preparation of pupils for examinations and how they deal with incidences of cheating in examinations.
Focused group discussions were used to obtain data from students on the major reasons which lead to cheating and the people involved. They were also asked to provide possible solutions to the problem of cheating in examinations. A Check list was used to assess the quality of examinations strong rooms in the REOs and DEOs offices. The checklist aimed to check whether there were reliable padlocks, active fire extinguishers, sufficient light, room size, strength of the walls, availability and quality of iron grills, secure doors, and roofs. In depth interviews were held with RSOs, DSOs and RPCs. They were asked to provide information on their experiences in the administration and security of examinations, the challenges they face and how they deal with them.

2.2.1 Development of Instruments

Instruments for the study were prepared in a five days workshop that took place in Dodoma. A total number of twenty three participants were involved in the process of developing the instruments. They included DEOs, REOs, School Inspectors, Ministry of Education officials, as well as NECTA and TIE staffs. The instruments developed were the questionnaires, semi-structural interviews questions and focused group discussion guides questions. In addition, participants developed a checklist for assessing the quality of strong rooms.

The participants identified key areas and respondents to be involved in the evaluation study. The questionnaires involved both closed and open-ended questions. On one hand, the questions varied from one group to another in accordance with their roles and responsibilities in PSLE administration. For example, REOs and DEOs were required to provide information on the registration procedures, preparation of examination centres, training of Supervisors and Invigilators and on the way they receive, store examinations and distributing them. They were also asked to state prevalence of examinations cheating incidents, reasons for malpractice and to recommend ways of improving the conduct of PSLE. Head teachers were requested to provide information on PSLE Supervision, how they prepare students for examinations and occurrence of cheating in examination. Classroom teachers were also asked same questions except the issues regarding preparation of candidates. Primary and Secondary school students were requested to provide information on preparations of candidates and occurrence of cheating. A focused group discussion was considered appropriate to provide detailed descriptions of the issues raised in the students’ questionnaires.
On the other hand, RSOs, DSOs and RPCs were asked about their experiences on examination Invigilation, the challenges they face and how they deal with those challenges with the views of overcoming them. Furthermore, the participants prepared a checklist for direct observation of strong rooms used to store examinations. The checklist contained the following items: room size, strength of the walls, availability and quality of grills, doors, and roofs. The checklist also aimed at soliciting information about the availability of reliable padlocks, fire extinguisher and sufficient light.

2.2.2 Piloting of the Instruments
In order to improve the validity and reliability of the instruments, a pilot study was conducted in Morogoro for five days during school sessions. Five primary schools and two secondary schools were involved in the study. Five head teachers and ten classroom teachers participated in the pilot study. Findings from the pilot study were used to refine the instruments before the main study.

2.2.3 Study Sample
A total 2059 participants participated in the study these including 777 primary school students (312 standard VI, 465 standard VII), 649 primary school teachers and 146 Head teachers from 148 primary schools in 26 districts who were randomly selected. The sample also included 420 Form One students from 84 secondary schools. Furthermore, it also included 19 DEOs, 9 REOs, 19 DSO, 9 RSO and 9 RPC. A convenient sampling technique was used which depended on the availability of the respondents. In this study the Heads of primary schools, DEOs, REOs, DSO, RSO and RPC could be conveniently reached in their respective working stations.

2.2.4 Data collection Procedures
A total of 24 persons from NECTA, TIE and MoEVT were involved in data collection process. The fieldwork took 14 days including weekends. For the purpose of authenticity, data collection took the normal protocol procedures which included obtaining consent of Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS) on their respective regions. RAS permitted the data collectors to visit the districts after required consent of the REOs to work in schools. The regional officials (i.e. REO, RSO and RPC) were interviewed first before meeting participants at district and school levels. At the district level the DEOs, DSOs and OCD were interviewed first followed by the teachers, head teachers and students from the selected primary schools.
At secondary school level, Form One students were interviewed. A focused-group discussion comprising five students from both primary and secondary schools was conducted. The administration of questionnaires for primary and secondary school students took about 45 to 60 minutes, while for the teachers, head teachers, REOs, and DEOs the completion took one hour and 30 minutes. The interview scheduled for RSO, RPC and DSO took about 45 to 60 minutes. The interviews were conducted in Kiswahili and the interviewers recorded the information by writing on the notebooks provided.

2.2.5 Data Analysis Procedures
A combination of quantitative and qualitative data analysis approaches were used to analyse the data. For quantitative data, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS version 11.00) was used for computing frequencies and cross-tabulation of various responses. Some of the open-ended questions responses were summarized into a number of different categories for entry into SPSS. These categories were identified after looking through the range of responses received from the respondents. Cross tabulations were done in order to cross check the information provided between and within the groups. Also, content analysis was used to analyse information obtained from the individual interviews and focus group discussions.
Chapter 3

Presentation and Analysis of Findings

3.0 Introduction
This chapter presents the findings of the evaluation study. In order to make the readers understand the procedures for understanding the conduct of PSLE examinations each section is preceded by explanation of NECTA expectations in each of the activities. The themes to be used in this presentation are Preparation of candidates, management and administration of PSLE and ways to improve its conduct. For each theme the study present the nature of responses from the respondents.

3.1 Preparation of Candidates
The study sought to establish how students are prepared for PSLE. Data for this purpose was collected from students and teachers. They were asked whether there are specific instructions given to pupils before undertaking PSLE. They were also asked about the kind of strategies used to ensure confidence and readiness of pupils in undertaking PSLE

Findings of the study show that a high proportion of students, head teachers and DEOs indicated that frequent tests and examinations were used as means of preparing students for PSLE as summarized in Table 1. In term of frequency, both students and head teachers indicated that the tests and examinations were done at least 1 to 5 times at school, ward, district and regional levels. On the other hand 16 (2.1%) students said, there were neither tests nor local examinations. Also, 7 (0.9%) of students and 4.7% of Head teachers did not answer the question. All DEOs indicated that, there were mock examinations administered at districts and regional levels once per year. In addition, students were asked to state if there are any instructions given to them in undertaking PSLE. The findings show that 91.2% of Primary and 91.4% of Form One students indicated that there were some instructions given before sitting for PSLE, and most of these instructions were provided by Head Teachers and Classroom Teachers.
Table 1: Students, Head teachers and DEOs responding to strategies and techniques used to prepare PSLE candidates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories of Responses</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Secondary n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing frequent tests and examinations</td>
<td>754 (97.0)</td>
<td>302 (72.8)</td>
<td>140 (94.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making frequent revision particularly on difficult topics.</td>
<td>134 (17.3)</td>
<td>68 (16.1)</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading various books and past examination papers</td>
<td>224 (28.8)</td>
<td>117 (27.8)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working cooperatively is encouraged and enhanced</td>
<td>89 (11.4)</td>
<td>41 (9.7)</td>
<td>4 (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers use extra time for teaching</td>
<td>131 (16.9)</td>
<td>88 (20.9)</td>
<td>31 (20.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching students techniques of tackling examination questions</td>
<td>282 (36.3)</td>
<td>158 (37.8)</td>
<td>7 (5.0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers encouraging students to support each other in the examinations room</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19 (4.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the importance of the PSLE in the lives of school leavers and parents, it is not surprising to learn that students, teachers, district and regional authorities prepare their students through tests mainly. What is surprising is the excessive use of tests and examinations and encouraging students to support one another in the examinations room while knowing clearly that this was in contravention of the regulations.

3.1.1 Importance of Frequent Tests for PSLE Candidates

Primary school students, head teachers and DEOs were asked about their perceived importance of tests and examinations. The findings show that 739 (95.1%) students indicated that it is important to have the frequent tests as a way of preparing for PSLE. They further indicated that such tests help them to familiarize themselves with the questions in the National Examinations. They also indicated that such tests facilitate the development of thinking skills and confidence in answering examination questions, foster memorization and encourage students to work hard so as to pass their national examinations. On the same issue 84.2% of DEOs and 90% of head teachers indicated that frequent tests are important because they help teachers and students to identify topics which need more attention and topics which are yet to be covered. They also indicated that such tests help students to make self assessment and reflection on their learning process and enable students to gain experience in doing examinations.
3.1.2 Registration of Candidates

Accurate registration of candidates is an important measure to ensure that only qualified candidates are registered for PSLE. The study had as one of its aims to find out how the registration process was handled. Issues that were investigated with regard to registration of PSLE candidates included the DEOs experience in the registration process, registration of the promoted and repeating students, tools used in the registration process and verification of the registration of PSLE candidates.

As regards their experience, DEOs were asked to state the number of times they had been involved in the registration of PSLE. It was revealed that 19 (100%) DEOs had participated in the registration of the PSLE candidates in their respective areas though, their experiences differed. 14 (73.7 %) of them indicated they had an experience of more than five times while 5 (26.3%) had less than 5 times experience.

With regard to the tools used in the registration of PSLE candidates DEOs were asked to list the tools they normally used. The findings indicate that 18 (97.3) DEOs use the registration tools such as OMR, M1, M2, M3, admission register, attendance register and TSM9\(^1\) forms. Only one DEO (2.7%) indicated that he used only M1 forms in the registration process.

As regards the registration of the promoted and repeating students DEOs were asked to provide their experience. It was revealed that 18 (94.7%) of DEOs had no experience with the promoted students and 1 (5.3%) sought permission from the Chief Education Officer as this expected by NECTA. For the repeating students 9 (47.4%) indicated that registration of such students was subject to the permission of Chief Education Officer (also it is in line with NECTA’s expectations) while, 10 (52.6%) indicated nothing.

REOs were asked to explain the procedures they used to in verify the registration of PSLE candidates; 66.7% indicated that they use M1, M2\(^2\) and M3\(^3\) to cross check information in OMR while 11.1% used TSM1 of two years back and cross check with quarterly report parallel to admission register. Also, 11.1% stated that they used attendance registers,

\(^1\) TMS9 stands for “Takwimu za Shule za Msingi Na 9 or Primary School’s Statistics No. 9”
\(^2\) M2 and M3 forms are used during marking process
admission registers with M1 form, whereas 11.1% used to read thoroughly various reports and verify the arrangement of names and see if they were in alphabetical order.

It is encouraging to note that registration procedures were well checked and followed by both DEOs and REOS. This will minimise the possibility of cheating at the registration points.

3.1.2.1 Challenges in the Registration and Verification Procedures

It is believed conducting examination is sometimes a tricky and challenging process. In recognition of this fact the study tried to find out the challenges faced by DEOs and REOs in the registration and verification processes.

Both REOs and DEOs were asked to state if they experienced any challenges in the registration process. DEOs listed the following as their major challenges:

- Difficulty in identifying repeaters, sometimes candidates changed their names without permission from relevant authorities, e.g. Happy changed to Happiness.
- Shortage of registration forms and storage facilities.
- Lack of assessment feedback from NECTA to schools.
- Misspelled names and incorrect entries in some schools.
- Some candidates intentionally skipped signing M1, and some head teachers signed on behalf of the candidates.
- Omissions in entry forms.
- OMR numbers contradicted those in M1.
- Delay in the announcement of the National Registration Dates.
- School number used as part of the candidate’s registration number.
- Lack of clear distinction between males and female names.
- Truancy among candidates.
- Students who have been for a long time allowed to sit for PSLE.

As regards the verification of registration procedures, REOs listed the following as main challenges:

- Inclusion of invalid and unreliable data (change now and then).
- Missing candidates.
- Mixing males and female names.
- Poor checking of information regarding registration by DEOs.
- Inadequate personnel in REOs’ office.
• Teachers signing M1 on behalf of the candidates.
• The same registration number given to more than one candidate.
• Incorrect entries in the respective forms.
• Delayed information to REOs.

As these findings indicate, there are many challenges facing the REOs and DEOs in the registration and verification process. It looks like the process involves a lot of documentation. Whether all this cumbersome process is necessary is an issue that needs to be examined.

3.2 Management and Administration of PSLE

The study sought to establish how PSLE is managed at the regional, district and school levels. Different questions were asked according to various roles they have in PSLE management and administration. Issues investigated included how examination centres are identified, conditions of examination rooms, storage of examination, appointment of invigilators and security people, invigilation seminars, examination invigilation and cheating incidents.

Data for these issues were collected from REOs, DEOs, RPC, RSO, DSO, Classroom teachers and Head teachers.

On the criteria used in the selection of the examination centres all REOs and DEOs mentioned the following:
• Examination centres should be accessible to the served schools and have a reliable means of communication.
• Have strong buildings with maximum security
• Availability of social services.

REOs and DEOs were also asked to give their views on whether the selected examination centres met the conditions for proper storage of examinations. 77.8 % of REOs and 94.1 % of DEOs said the selected examination centres met the criteria while 22.2% of REOs and 5.9 % of DEOs said the examination centres in their areas did not meet the requirements, that is, the centres were far from the served schools and had unreliable means of communication.

3.2.1 Receipt and Storage of Examination

The study sought to establish whether the existing strong rooms at regional, district and school levels met the criteria laid down by NECTA. The study also tried to find out if
districts have reasonable number of selected examination catchments centres and if they were capable of receiving, storing and distributing examinations timely.

REOs and DEOs and Head teachers were asked to provide information on the quality of existing strong rooms in their respective places. The findings show that 55.6 % of REOs said that the existing “strong rooms” in their regions did not meet the standards. Some (44.4%) indicated that the strong rooms are small and cannot meet the demand of PSLE following an increase in the number of primary schools in the country.

With regard to the required characteristics of the strong rooms, REOs mentioned the following:

- Strong doors and grills,
- Strong padlocks,
- Built in an area where there is proper security,
- Presence of strong walls,
- Enough light,
- Large enough to accommodate future demands.

At the district level 77.8 % of DEOs indicated that strong rooms in their districts meet the standards set by NECTA while 22.2 % of them said that they do not meet the standards. REO like DEOs said that strong rooms do not meet demand due to the increase of primary schools in their districts.

At school level, 62.4 % of head teachers showed that “examination storage rooms” in their schools meet the standards set, whereas 30.4% indicated that they do not meet the standards. With regard to characteristics of examination storage rooms in schools, the findings show that 95% of head teachers indicated that their examination storage rooms have strong doors and walls and maximum security. However, 55.9% of classroom teachers who have an experience of invigilating PSLE indicated that examination storage rooms were in accordance with the standards recommended by NECTA. A total number of 236 (36.36%) teachers identified different areas that needed to be innovated so as to meet the standards of the strong room. The areas included walls, doors and fire protection.
3.2.2 Quality of Examination Rooms

The study intended to establish if the head teachers and DEOs understand the standards set for examination rooms. The findings indicate that both DEOs and head teachers mentioned the required criteria by NECTA. Those mentioned include:

- adequate space
- light
- furniture
- ventilation
- the room capacity to accommodate not more than 30 students
- walls not to carry maps, posters and written information

Concerning the arrangement of desks and candidates’ examination numbers, the findings show that the criteria and procedures used by both DEOs and Head teachers include:

- arranging one candidate per desk with a minimum distance of 1 metre apart,
- sitting plan according to M1,
- where possible the room should have three rows for the candidates,
- the examination numbers of the candidates should be fixed on top right corner of the desk and the arrangement of streams should be in accordance to “KA”, “KB” and “KC”.

3.2.2.1 Challenges in the Preparation of Examination Rooms

It was anticipated that there would be challenges in the preparation of examination rooms. DEOs and Head Teachers were asked to state the challenges they face during preparation of examinations rooms. The findings show that 42.1% of DEOs and 37.1% of Head teachers admitted that there were challenges in the preparation of the examination rooms. The teachers mentioned small examination rooms compared to the number of candidates, inadequate furniture, dilapidated furniture, examination rooms painted with sketches, truants reporting at examination centres on the examination day, and poor ventilation in some of the rooms, big number of candidates in one room, some schools deliberately breaching the regulations set by NECTA, for example, disorganizing the serial arrangement of the candidates’ examination numbers and ignoring fixing the examination numbers of candidates on their desks as the list of challenges.

---

4 KA, KB, and KC stand for class size of 10, 20, and 30 candidates respectively.
3.2.2.1 Ways to deal with the challenges in the preparation of examination rooms
The study sought to find out different ways used by different officials in dealing with the challenges they face in preparing examination rooms. DEOs indicated that they sensitize community members to participate in building more classrooms, they also remind teachers and head teachers on their responsibilities in ensuring a well arranged of examination rooms. It was indicated that District Examination Committees conduct thorough inspection of the examination rooms prior to the commencement of examination administration.

3.2.3 Appointment of Invigilators
REOs and DEOs were asked about the criteria used to select the Invigilators and involvement of the security officials in the identification of invigilators. The findings show that DEOs and REOs select invigilators basing on the criteria of teaching experience of not less than three years, possession of Teacher Service Department (TSD) number, integrity, possession of Grade A Certificate or Diploma in Education, good health, commitment to work and diligence demonstrated at examination centres. These criteria are in line with NECTA expectations. In addition, once appointed by DEOs and REOs, all invigilators are supposed to undergo vetting process. However, the findings of the study revealed that vetting is not done in most of the regions. It was indicated that the process of identifying possible invigilators takes time because DEO do rely on suggestions from Ward Education Coordinators and Head Teachers. By the time they get all the names, they find themselves with little time to sort out those who have previously failed to observe examination regulations. However, given the increasing number of malpractice cases, REOs and DEOs indicated that it is necessary to vet all the invigilators.

Furthermore, the findings show that all DEOs faced different challenges in selecting the invigilators which include difficulty in identifying teachers who were trustworthy and committed, receiving names of teachers who do not meet the set criteria from ward education coordinators and shortage of qualified teachers’ in some areas.

3.2.4 Invigilation Seminars
3.2.4.1 The Conduct of Invigilation Seminars
Invigilation seminars are important for both experienced and inexperienced supervisors. This is to ensure that they both understand all the regulations to be observed. Teachers were asked to provide views on how examination invigilation seminars are conducted focusing on areas
of emphasis and the quality of teaching. DEOs were asked about their responsibilities, time taken to conduct seminars as well as preparation of handouts for participants.

The findings indicate that 98.3% of teachers said that invigilators were trained before undertaking the task of invigilation of PSLE. However 1.7% of them said they were not trained. Also, 94.4% of teachers indicated that the Education Officers (REOs and DEOs) were the key persons who facilitate the seminars. However, in some cases RSOs, DSO and other officials like NECTA staff and school inspectors participate in facilitating the seminar. Regarding the competence of facilitators it was revealed that 95.9% of respondents found that seminar facilitators were very competent. However, 3.9% of them said they are somehow competent while 0.2% of teachers said that facilitators were not competent. With regard to instructions given during the seminar, respondents reported that the instructions given are well understood. However, they suggested that actual demonstration of opening and closing of examination security envelopes should be done during the seminar to ensure that all invigilators are conversant with what they were expected to do.

3.2.4.2 Duration and Number of Participants in a Seminar Room

It well understood that a conducive learning environment contributes to better learning. The study sought to establish how well the seminars were conducted in terms of duration and number of participants per seminar. The findings show that with regard to the number of participants involved in the seminar per session ranged from below 100 to above 500. A large proportion of respondents (62.89%) showed that the number of participants were 200 per session. The remaining proportion showed that there were more than 200 participants per session. Regarding the duration of seminars, the findings show that 26.32% of teachers indicated that seminars take 1 – 5 hours while 67.30% indicated that seminars take 6 – 10 hours. However, they indicated that time taken for actual instruction (demonstration) related to invigilation examination is very little. Most of the time is spent on distribution of examination materials and on instructions related to consequences for failure to keep confidential matters related to examinations.

3.2.5 PSLE Invigilation

The study sought to find out the experience and various roles played by Head Teachers and Classroom Teachers in their capacity as examination invigilators. They were asked to indicate their roles before commencement of examinations as well as during and after
examinations. In addition, REOs were asked about the performance of the Invigilators during the invigilation process.

The findings indicated that most of the teachers and head teachers who participated in this study had experience in PSLE invigilation; though their experiences varied in terms of number of times they invigilated. The findings show that 69.5% of Teachers’ indicated that they had invigilated from 1 to 5 times while 60.4% of head teachers’ indicated that they had invigilated more than 5 times, Table 2 summarizes.

Table 2: Teachers and Head Teachers Experience in Invigilation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Head Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whether one has invigilated exam</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>(79.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>(19.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(0.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of times invigilated</td>
<td>1-5 times</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>(69.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 5 times</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>(30.5)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to their roles before commencement of examinations, the findings show that some of their responses were in line with NECTA’s expectations. For example, 423 (65.47%) of teachers had indicated to check the environment inside and outside the examination room/rooms. However, the findings show 123 (19.22%) of teachers indicated to check the envelope/envelopes containing question papers. This implies that most of the invigilators do not follow the guideline that required them to carry out all the activities.

3.2.5.1 Invigilators’ Knowledge on Opening and Closing of Security Envelopes

Both Teachers and Head teachers were asked about their knowledge in using examination envelopes. The findings show that 89.0% of head teachers and 76.9% teachers know how to open and close the envelopes while 9.7% of head teachers and 12.8% of teachers said to have little knowledge in using the envelopes. 1.3% of head teachers and 10.3% of teachers indicated that they have no knowledge on how to use the examination envelopes.

The study also aimed at establishing whether teachers understand the kind of items according to NECTA instructions that should be enclosed in the worked scripts returning envelopes (BKM). According to NECTA’s instructions the worked scripts, empty answer sheets, security report (U1 & U2), supervisor’s report (FBM2), attendance report (M1), FBM1 and
sitting plan must be enclosed in BKM. The findings show that apart from worked scripts 77% of teachers were not aware that FBM2 is also supposed to be enclosed in BKM.

### 3.2.5.1 Working with Attendance Forms (M1)

Both Teachers and Head Teachers were directed to indicate when the candidates are required to sign M1 forms. The findings show that only 39.7% of teachers and 21.6% of head teachers indicated that candidates were required to sign attendance forms after finishing each subject. In addition, with regard to when the supervisor should take attendance of candidates using M1 forms, the findings show that 92.3% of teachers compared to 31.0% of head teachers were aware of the time for taking candidates’ attendance as they indicated that, they take attendance before starting of examinations.

Teachers were also asked to explain the importance of the attendance form. The findings show that they found the form important because it helped to ascertain that those sitting for the examination are the ones who were registered for the examination.

### 3.2.6 Challenges in the Invigilation of PSLE

The study sought to find out whether teachers and head teachers have encountered any challenge in invigilating PSLE. Findings show that 78.8% of teachers and 62.2% of head teachers have not encountered any challenge while 20.2% of teachers and 27.7% of head teachers indicated that they have encountered some challenges. Some of the challenges mentioned were:

- Parents asking invigilators to open question papers envelopes before the commencement of examination by host teachers.
- Asked to assist candidates after opening the examinations.
- Shortage of answer sheets.
- Candidate’s missing TMS9 form
- Truant students appearing at examination centres.
- Delay in delivery of stationery

In addition, teachers indicated that they faced more challenges than head teachers. Such challenges included attempts by host to bribe them in order to provide an opportunity to assist pupils in their examinations, candidates frequently going out of the examination rooms, Head teachers demanding to keep the examination papers, candidates attempted to go out of the
examination room with question papers. However, a challenge that was unique to Head teachers is the requirement by NECTA for them to complete many forms giving much information during the examination. Other challenges mentioned included late arrival of invigilators or late collection of worked scripts.

REOs were asked to give their views on the performance of invigilators. It was the opinion of REO that the majority of invigilators were doing good job but there are some who violate the procedures. The violations committed include failure to collect some of the worked scripts and failure to take properly the attendance of pupils. In dealing with such irregularities, several forms of punishments are used such as giving them warning, demotion or even termination of their services through their disciplinary authority that is Teacher Service Department (TSD).

3.2.7 Incidences of Cheating in Examinations

All groups of respondents were asked on whether or not they have heard about examinations cheating in their areas, the type of cheating and reasons for cheating. They were further asked about individuals involved in cheating and their suggestions on ways to curb cheating in examinations.

The findings show that all groups of respondents were aware of cheating incidences during PSLE but with different magnitudes. They indicated that the incidences of examination cheating starts from the period of registration (e.g. in filling TSM9 forms and filling of continuous assessment cards), examination and selection of the candidates to join Form One in secondary schools. Groups responses on the incidences of examination cheating as shown in Table 4.
Table 3: Responses on Cheating Incidents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cheating incidences</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Primary n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates copying answers from one another</td>
<td>235 (30.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates entering examination rooms with un-authorized materials</td>
<td>124 (16.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person from outside doing the examination or writing answers for the candidates or on behalf of the candidates</td>
<td>131 (16.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination question papers are sent outside the examination room whilst the examination is in process</td>
<td>10 (1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination envelopes are opened before examination commencement time</td>
<td>34 (4.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, RPC, RSOs and DSOs mentioned the incidences of pre-arranged techniques, whereby candidates are informed about certain sounds outside which symbolise examination answers such as the use of:

- Local drums, when hit twice that means the answer is “B”.
- The voice of axe, e.g. cutting the tree thrice time means the answer is “C”.
- Misallocation of examination number whereby the bright students do examination on behalf of poor students unknowingly. In this situation, candidates to be assisted are given the examination numbers of bright students, whereas the bright students are given the examination numbers of students who are bright.
- Allowing illegal candidates to sit for examination using the name of truant pupils,
- Forgery in TSM9,
- Laxity in inspection before the commencement of examinations which make it easy for candidates to sneak in answers.
- Pre-arranged entertainment to the invigilators on the first day at the examination centre as means of corrupting them. Such kind of entertainment makes them negligent in invigilation. In some cases host teachers are allowed to enter in the examination room to provide assistance to selected students
  - Bribing the supervisor at the examination centre with the intention to help the students in the examination rooms. The heads of schools in the region were argued to use capitation money in their schools to bribe the invigilators. Sometimes, in some areas parents/guardians are required to contribute 20,000/= to 30,000/=, for bribing the invigilators.
In focussed group discussions, both primary and form one students mentioned the incidences of subject experts outside the examination rooms being involved in solving the examination questions and providing answers to the students during the examinations session. They claimed that the incidences are pre-arranged by the school authorities. When they were asked to elaborate on the issue, they described different techniques and strategies used by the school authorities as follows:

(i) The use of thermos [tea flask] brought to the invigilator containing examination answers written in pieces of paper,
(ii) Some candidates get outside the examination room with question papers,
(iii) The use of visitors books containing examinations worked out answers,
(iv) Candidates collect answers from toilet rooms,
(v) Pieces of paper containing answers are fixed in pens’ top-covers and given to targeted candidates.
(vi) Exchanging examination answer scripts during examination,
(vii) The teachers pass through the class helping intended candidates,
(viii) The use of mobile phone inside the examination room, whereas the invigilator send and receive information to facilitate cheating.

Furthermore, the respondents gave more elaboration on the incidences where examination’s question envelopes were opened before the commencement of examination. They said this was done by pointing targeted candidates to inspect previously opened question papers envelopes. In addition, they expressed the way candidates managed to copy the distributed answers. They said, “Even the desks are arranged in away that you can read from your neighbour”. In other cases “the candidates involved in cheating are arranged to sit close to each other”.

3.2.7.1 Reasons for Cheating in Examination

The respondents highlighted numerous social, political, and economic reasons for cheating. The responses are summarized in Table 5.
Table 4: Responses on reasons for cheating in PSLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for Cheating</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>DEOs</th>
<th>REOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor preparation of PSLE candidates</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral decay</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal income/corruption among teachers</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of being punished for their schools, district, region having poor performance</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents influences towards illegal practices</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of chances in secondary schools</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools’ owners attract more students to join their schools</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.7.2 Individuals Involved in PSLE Cheating

All groups of respondents were asked to mention individuals whom they thought were involved in PSLE cheating. The findings show host teachers, and invigilators were highly involved in examination cheating as summarized in Table 6.

Table 5: Respondents Indicating Individuals Involved in PSLE Cheating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parties</th>
<th>Primary Students</th>
<th>Secondary Students</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Head teachers</th>
<th>DEOs</th>
<th>REOs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head Teacher/host teachers</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invigilators</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Guardians</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools’ owners</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education leaders at school, wards, district and regional level</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NECTA officials</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Police</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.7.3 Measures to curb Examination Cheating

REOs and DEOs were asked to mention different measures they used to deal with people involved in examination cheating. They said that Head Teachers, REOs, DEO, and invigilators proved to be involved in cheating cases were demoted. They however lamented that disciplinary procedures were slow and ineffective. On future measures to be taken to combat cheating in PSLE, the following was recommended:
- Making sure there is a strict security. That is, proper monitoring of all examination procedures/process.
- Strict vetting of all officials dealing with examination administration.
- To have strong and effective invigilation in the examination centres, whereby invigilators and teachers should obey and implement examination regulations.
- Host teachers should not be in their school’s surroundings during the examination.
- Students should be empowered to report all examination irregularities in the examination room to concerned authorities.

### 3.2.8 Suggestions on Improving the Conduct of PSLE

Except students, all groups of respondents were asked to give their views on improving the conduct of PSLE. The findings show that the major area that needed to be improved is the invigilation process. This includes the re-allocation and appointment of invigilators to avoid using the same invigilators and security personnel in examination invigilation regularly. It was also suggested that, host teachers should participate in the invigilation seminars so that they could be made aware of examination guidelines and regulations. Other recommendations were:

- improve supervision allowances
- educate the society and teachers about the consequences of examination cheating;
- take appropriate and effective measures against those involved in examination cheating, including banning examination centres found to be involved in cheating
- have effective transport for examination distribution and collection of worked scripts,
- empower teachers to increase their competence in teaching,
- abandon punishment on poor performing schools, districts or regions, and find appropriate means of encouraging them to do better, and
- make PSLE as a means of completing successfully a given stage of education.
Chapter 4

Conclusions and Recommendations

4.0 Conclusions

The study intended to evaluate the conduct of the PSLE on selected districts and schools. On strategies used to prepare PSLE candidates the study revealed that, the candidates were registered in M1 registration forms however, some were not adequately filled example, repeating of some candidate number in M1. If the problem is detected by the invigilator and he or she corrected without notifying NECTA for corrections, errors will definitely affect the examination results due to the flow or serial arrangement of numbers and names of candidates keyed in NECTA’s Data Base. Giving frequent tests and examinations as a strategy for preparing students reveals that teaching and learning activity is overpowered by frequent tests especially for standard seven students. NECTA expects that teaching that teaching and learning activity should continue taking its overall place rather than coaching candidates with NECTA examination past papers. A student develops expected competences when teaching is carried out followed by exercises and tests pertaining to the topics taught or learned.

On invigilators and teachers’ understanding of procedures for conducting PSLE, the study revealed that, there are some invigilators who do not include FBM 2 Forms in returning scripts envelopes which make it difficult for markers in understanding the way the examination was conducted in a particular room and in-case of any problem it becomes difficult to solve it. Also, some do not take candidates attendance in MI form during examination but the just fill in the attendance forms without a thorough check of present and absent candidates. As a result, NECTA finds it difficult to solve problems related to attendance of candidates. It was also revealed that, vetting was not done to all invigilators. This might encourage invigilators to neglect NECTA regulations in invigilating the examinations. However some of the respondents reported that, the invigilation allowances given to them was not enough.

On strategies used by students and invigilators involved in examination malpractice, the findings revealed that, there are various strategies used which differ from one school to another/one region to another. Despite the efforts done by NECTA in making sure that there
was no cheating in examinations, challenges are still there since new cheating methods are always invented.

Also the findings revealed that, storage facilities in some areas were not adequate. There is a need of making sure that all strong rooms and the storage facilities are in a good order so as to make sure that the examinations are in a safe place.

Furthermore, some of the respondents reported that, there is no cooperation among the Examination Committee members. This will definitely affect the efficient running of PSLE.

4.2.1 Recommendations

On the basis of the findings of the study it is recommended that:

- Examinations Committee should put more emphasis to invigilation in making sure that they follow all the guidelines provided to them. Also they should encourage team work.
- The Ministry of Education and Vocational Training should conduct seminars encouraging teachers to concentrate much on teaching rather than relaying on giving students frequent tests and examinations.
- Storage facilities should be maintained to accommodate the increasing number of schools. They should meet all the security criteria to make sure that the security of examination is guaranteed.
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