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Abstract
Examination cheating remains one of the most serious threats to the validity and reliability of examination results and certification at all levels of Nigeria education system. Several approaches in the past to ameliorate the problem had not given the expected result, hence, the roles of assessment. The study investigated the effect of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency of secondary school students. Quasi experimental design of the pre-test and post-test control group were used for the study. Senior Secondary School class three (SSS3) students constituted the population, while one hundred and twenty (120) students selected through stratified random sampling technique formed the sample. Examination Reaction Scale (ERS) was the instrument for data collection. The reliability coefficient of ERS was 0.72. The hypotheses were tested using ANCOVA. Findings showed that there is a significant difference in the cheating tendency of students with differences in the perceived purpose of assessment \( F(3,115) = 71.32, p<0.05 \). There is no significant interaction effect of gender and perceived purpose of assessment on students’ cheating tendency \( F(3,111) = 1.81, p>0.05 \). Based on the findings, it was concluded that assessment can reduce cheating tendency. It was recommended that workshop on the modern assessment practices should be organized for teachers.
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Introduction
Education is very indispensable in the economic, political and social development of any nation. It is one of the yardsticks used to measure the level of development of any nation. It is however, no surprise that nations and even the whole world prioritize education in their developmental effort (Ogbonnya, 2010). The Federal Government of Nigeria recognized this in her National Policy on Education where it was stated clearly that “education is an instrument par excellence for effecting national development” (FRN, 2014). In every society, government, communities, private organization and
individuals established schools to socialize the youths, and prepare them to function as good and functioning citizens. Schools also prepare manpower for the society, to drive the economic and other developmental needs of the society. The survival of the society revolves around the effectiveness of the school playing its role (Monday, 2019).

The value and functionality of any educational system could be seen to be in its ability to actualize the goals of education. A machinery through which the extent of knowledge and skill acquisition is determined at each stage of education, is usually set up. This is in form of examination (assessment). Educational assessment is an important segment of teaching and learning process. It is used to determine the quality of education. In the realization of this; Ukwuije (2012) opined that to meaningful research, teaching and learning can take place in the absence of proper assessment of students before, during and after instruction. It is a task that must be done, a *sine qua non* However, whatever action that undermines assessment, will definitely pose a great threat to the validity and reliability of assessment results and certification (Hassan & Ogunmakin, 2010). Examination cheating remains one of the most serious threats to the validity and reliability of assessment results in Nigeria. It is one of the major problems confronting the educational system today. It shows the level of moral decadence in the country. Examination cheating in Nigeria is so endemic as it pervades internal and external examinations (Adesina, 2005; Alutu & Aluede, 2006; Fasasi, 2008); found among able and disabled students (Gesinde & Busari, 2007); all levels of education (Adesulu, 2006); not exclusive of students, common among parents, teachers, school administrators, examination bodies, security agents (Sunday, Ogidigbo & Bassey, 2010); it cuts across all religions, states, tribes and geographical zones of Nigeria (Weekly Times, 17th and 18th February, 2017; Next newspaper, 17th October, 2010).

The trends and dimensions of examination typology and its complexities over the years have caused a serious worry to many Nigerians. According to West Africa Examinations Council (WAEC, 2000-2010), annual statistical report of examination malpractices as cited in Arijesuyo and Adeyoju (2012), the national Examination Malpractice Index (EMI) has remained persistently high ranging between 5.47 and 12.87 during WAEC/ SSCE examinations (2000-2010). Indicating that for every 100 candidates that wrote SSCE in the stipulated period, in Nigeria, at least 8 of them were involved in examination malpractices. Examination cheating has economic, political and social implications for Nigeria. According to APA (2010) and Onyechere (2010), the five major post primary examination bodies in Nigeria cancel an average of 420,000 results annually on the account of examination malpractice. This translated to about $140m (₦21bn) wastage. Examination cheating makes the goal of education unattainable. The country will end up producing graduates who lack the knowledge, skill and competence in what they have learnt in schools. It also makes certificates lose credibility, as such, certificates emanating from countries noted for examination cheating are disbelieved or disregarded.

Perceived purpose of assessment can be viewed from three areas according to Joshua (2019); these are:

(i) Assessment of learning (AoL),
(ii) Assessment for learning (AfL) and
(iii) Assessment as learning (AaL).

Assessment of Learning (AoL) according to Joshua (2019) is an assessment practice in which assessment information are gathered at the end of the teaching-learning process. Joshua posited that AoL divorce assessment from teaching, or place assessment as a follow-up activity to teaching (assessment comes at the end of teaching, or assessment caps up teaching). Assessment is basically carried out to ascertain what learning has taken place for terminal decisions to be taken on the results. The results from AoL are used to rank the students’ achievement levels against a standard, award grades, and take such decisions as promotion, demotion, repetition of class, withdrawal from class, course, programme or school. It is summative in nature, and typically involves use of tests (standardized or teacher made).

Assessment for Learning (AfL) is a more recent concept according to Joshua (2019). It is a process of seeking for and interpreting assessment data for use by learners and their teachers as feedback to modify teaching strategies and learning experience, all to improve learning outcomes. It embeds assessment processes throughout the teaching and learning process to constantly adjust instructional strategy to bring about the desire learning outcomes. The UK Assessment Reform Group cited in Joshua (2019) identified seven (7) key characteristics of AfL:

(a) It is embedded in a view of teaching and learning of which it is an essential part.
(b) It involves sharing learning goal with learners.
(c) It aims to help learners know and recognize the standards for which they are aiming.
(d) It involves learners in self-assessment (and peer assessment).
(e) It provides feedback that leads to learners recognizing their next steps and how to take them.
(f) It is underpinned by the confidence that every students can improve, and
(g) It involves both teacher and pupils/students reviewing and reflecting on assessment data. AfL makes for active involvement of learners in the classroom during the teaching-learning process, and turns them into assessors as well.

It is formative in nature and sees assessment as an integral part of teaching, occurring throughout the learning process, and preparing the learners for the ultimate summative assessment.

Assessment as learning (AaL): Through this process according to Schraw as cited in Manitoba Education Citizenship and Youth (MECY, 2006) students are able to learn about themselves as learners and become aware of how they learn – become mega cognitive (knowledge of one’s own thought process. Students reflect on their work on a regular basis, usually through self and peer assessment and decide (often with the help of the teachers, particularly in the early stages) what their next learning will be. Schraw cited in MECY (2006) further stressed that AaL helps students to take more responsibility for their own learning and monitoring further directions.
Some of the teachers’ roles in the Assessment as Learning according to Schraw cited in MECY (2006) are:

1. Provide regular and challenging opportunities to practice, so that students can become confident, competent self assessors.
2. Create an environment where it is safe for students to take chances and where support is readily available.

Statement of the Problem
Educators have traditionally relied on assessment that compares students with more successful peers as a means to motivate students to learn, but recent research suggests students will likely be motivated and confident learners when they experience progress and achievement, rather than the failure and defeat associated with being compared to more successful peers (Stiggins, 2001). This form of assessment to compare individuals with peers could result into unnecessary competition and anxiety. According to Gielen, Dochy, and Dierick (2003), the way students prepare themselves for an assessment depends on how they perceive the assessment (before, during and after the assessment), and these affects can have either positive or negative influences on learning. If it is perceived in a negative way, they will prepare for cheating. Several approaches to curb the menace of examination cheating in Nigeria in the past had not given the expected result, hence the role of assessment in addressing the problem. Therefore, this study examined the effect of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency among secondary school students in Ondo State, Nigeria.

Purpose of the Study
The main purpose of this study therefore is to investigate the effects of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency among secondary school students in Ondo State. Specifically, the study sought to examine:

(i). effect of Assessment of learning (AoL), Assessment for Learning (AfL) and Assessment as Learning (AaL) on cheating tendency of secondary school students.
(ii). interaction effects of gender and perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency of students.

Hypotheses
To find the solution to the problem of this study, the following hypotheses were raised:

1. There is no significant effects of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency of students.
2. There is no significant interaction effect of gender and perceived purpose of assessment on students’ cheating tendency.
Methodology
The study adopted a pretest-posttest, quasi experimental research design. The students were assigned to three experimental (treatment) groups and one control group. The perceived purpose of assessment (Assessment of Learning, Assessment for Learning and Assessment as Learning) were assigned to experimental group 1, group 2 and group 3 respectively, while no perceived purpose of assessment was assigned to control group. In this study, the researcher manipulated the effects of independent variables on the dependent variable (cheating tendency).

The design is as shown below:

\[ O_1 \times X_1 \; O_2; \; Q_3 \times X_2 \; O_4; \]
\[ O_5 \times X_3 \; O_6; \; O_7 - O_8 \]

Where \( O_1, O_3, O_5, O_7 \) represent pre-test. \( O_2, O_4, O_6, O_8 \) represent the post-test.

The population of the study consisted of all the entire public senior secondary school students in Ondo state. The sample consisted of 120 senior secondary school students randomly selected from the three senatorial districts in Ondo state using stratified random sampling technique. Four local government areas were randomly selected from 18 LGAs in the state. One school was randomly selected from each of the selected LGAs. Thirty students comprised of 15 males and 15 females were selected from each of the selected schools using intact classes. The only instrument for data collection was students’ Examination Reaction Scale (ERS) personally developed by the researcher. It consists of 20 items to elicit information on students’ cheating tendency, structured in 4-likert format. Convergent validity was used to ensure the validity of the instrument. ERS was administered with similar scale developed by Hassan (2008) concurrently to 20 non-participating SS3 students. Using Pearson product moment correlation, the correlation co-efficient of 0.72 was obtained. Cronbach Alpha was used to ascertain the reliability of the instrument. The reliability co-efficient obtained was 0.63.

Treatment package in the study
The SS3 students perceived purposes of assessment were classified into four categories in the study, namely:

1. Assessment of Learning (AoL) purpose
2. Assessment for Learning (AfL) purpose
3. Assessment as Learning (AaL) purpose
4. No specified purpose of assessment

Each of the purposes constituted the group for Groups I, II and III for experimental, while Group IV for control. The treatment session lasted for a term (12 weeks). The four groups were taught five similar topics in SSS3 first term syllabus in Mathematics (Surd, Matrices, Arithmetic of Finance, Application of linear and quadratic equations and Trigonometry) but each of the groups were given different perceived purposes of assessment orientations during the course of teaching in the term. For group 1, the subjects were made to be aware that their assessment would take place at the end of the twelve
weeks. The assessment scores would determine promotion, classification, withdrawal and repeatability according to their performance level. No test or assignment or test was given to the subjects throughout the experimental session. For experimental group II, subjects were made to be aware that the purpose of assessment was to identify area of their difficulties in pedagogical activities and in test taking as it affects performance. The essence of test was meant for remediation and corrective measure for improved performance.

As a result, subjects were given constant exercises or assignments or tests, feedbacks were given on their performances, appropriate remediation was carried out on their areas of difficulties. This procedure was observed for the period of experimental session. For experimental group III, subjects were given the purpose of assessment orientation as taking responsibility for one’s own learning and monitoring future works. In this regard, before the final test, subjects were helped by the teacher to become active participants in the process of assessment and stewards of their own learning, setting their own goals and developing the skills necessary to achieve them through self-and peer assessment as well as a teacher assessment. Students were allowed to take control of their learning and were helped to set realistic and useful learning goals. Here, students reflect on their work on regular basis, usually through self and peer assessment and decide (often with the help of the teacher, particularly in the early stages) what their next learning will be. For control group, subjects were not given any specified assessment orientation purpose. They were made just to receive instruction without any definite assessment purpose.

A pretest was conducted before the experimental session. Examination Reaction Scale (ERS) personally developed by the researcher was administered to the students to ensure that in terms of cheating tendency, they were all comparable. After the treatment session, a post-test was conducted using the same Examination Reaction Scale (ERS) personally developed by the researcher. The respondents’ responses were collected on spot on the completion of the administered instrument. Data collected were assigned numerical value, coded and analyzed through the use of mean, standard deviation. Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) was used to analyze and test for significance difference. LSD Multiple Classification test was used to determine source of difference.

**Results**

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant effects of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency of students.

To test this hypothesis, the mean scores of students relating to cheating tendency before and after being exposed to treatment were initially computed and compared with those in control group. The results are presented in Table 1:
Table 1: Mean scores and standard deviation of students’ cheating tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Purpose of assessment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean difference</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of Learning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.73</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>47.23</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment for Learning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55.80</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>41.50</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>-14.3</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment as Learning</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>56.37</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>31.97</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>-24.4</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No specified purpose (control)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54.97</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>54.83</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 showed that students with Assessment of Learning; Assessment for Learning; Assessment as Learning and No specified purpose (control) had mean scores of 54.73, 55.80, 56.37 and 54.97 respectively in cheating tendency prior the treatment. This shows that the students are comparatively equal in cheating tendency. On exposure to treatment, students with Assessment as Learning had the least mean score of 31.97 on cheating tendency, closely followed by those exposed to Assessment for Learning with a mean score of 41.50. This was followed by students exposed to Assessment of Learning with a mean of 47.23. Students exposed to no specified purpose of assessment (control) are the least in the ranking order with the highest posttest mean of 54.83. This implies that the three experimental treatments are potent in reducing cheating tendency among secondary school students. Assessment as Learning is the best in reducing cheating tendency, closely followed by Assessment for Learning. Assessment as Learning is the least. No specified purpose of assessment cannot reduce cheating tendency. To test for significant effect of perceived purpose of assessment therefore on cheating tendency, data in Table 1 above was analyzed using ANCOVA, the result is shown in Table 2:

Table 2: ANCOVA Summary of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8403.584a</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2100.896</td>
<td>53.490</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4009.029</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4009.029</td>
<td>102.072</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>39.217</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39.217</td>
<td>.998</td>
<td>.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>8403.489</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2801.163</td>
<td>71.319</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4516.783</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>39.276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>244010.000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>12920.367</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) $R^2$ Squared = .650 (Adjusted $R^2$ Squared = .638)

From Table 2, the value of F calculated is 71.32 and p value is 0.00. Since the p value is less than 0.05, the hypothesis earlier stated that there is no significant effects of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency of students is hereby rejected at 0.05 level of significance. It shows that there is a significant difference in the cheating tendency of students with differences in the perceived purpose of assessment ($F_{(3,115)} = 71.32, p<0.05$).
In order to determine the source of significant differences on cheating tendency of students, LSD Multiple Comparison was employed. The result is presented in Table 3:

Table 3: LSD Multiple Comparison of purpose of assessment and cheating tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I)PPOA</th>
<th>(J) PPOA</th>
<th>Mean Difference (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval for Difference</th>
<th>Lower Bound</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AoL</td>
<td>AfL</td>
<td>5.809</td>
<td>1.620</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>9.017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AaL</td>
<td>AfL</td>
<td>15.382</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>12.168</td>
<td>18.595</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No purpose</td>
<td>AfL</td>
<td>-7.584*</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.789</td>
<td>-4.378</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No purpose</td>
<td>AaL</td>
<td>-13.392*</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-16.599</td>
<td>-10.185</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AoL</td>
<td>AfL</td>
<td>-15.382*</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-18.595</td>
<td>-12.168</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No purpose</td>
<td>AfL</td>
<td>-22.965*</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-26.177</td>
<td>-19.754</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AoL</td>
<td>AaL</td>
<td>7.584*</td>
<td>1.618</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>4.378</td>
<td>10.789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AaL</td>
<td>AaL</td>
<td>13.392*</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>10.185</td>
<td>16.599</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No purpose</td>
<td>AaL</td>
<td>22.965*</td>
<td>1.621</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>19.754</td>
<td>26.177</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: PPOA = Perceived Purpose of Assessment

From Table 3, significant difference was found between Assessment of Learning and No purpose of assessment (p<0.05); and Assessment as Learning and No specified purpose of Assessment (p<0.05).

Hypothesis 2: There is no significant interaction effect of gender and perceived purpose of assessment on students’ cheating tendency.

In order to test this hypothesis, the cheating tendency scores of students exposed to Assessment of Learning; Assessment for Learning; Assessment as Learning and No specified purpose (control) were computed and subsequently compared for statistical significance using Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA) at 0.05 level of significance based on gender. The results are presented in Table 4:

Table 4: 4 X 2 ANCOVA showing cheating tendency of students in the perceived purpose of assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Partial Eta Squared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8619.829*a</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1077.479</td>
<td>27.811</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3240.122</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3240.122</td>
<td>83.630</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>6796</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6796</td>
<td>.175</td>
<td>.676</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assessment</td>
<td>8345.468</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2781.823</td>
<td>71.801</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>10.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.015</td>
<td>.259</td>
<td>.612</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment*gender</td>
<td>210.568</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>70.189</td>
<td>1.812</td>
<td>.149</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>4300.538</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>38.744</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>244010.000</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>12920.367</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The result in Table 4 revealed that there is no significant interaction effect of perceived purpose of assessment and gender on students’ cheating tendency ($F_{(3,111)} = 1.81$, $p>0.05$). Therefore, the null hypothesis earlier stated that there is no significant interaction effect of gender and perceived purpose of assessment on students’ cheating tendency is not rejected. Similarly, the main effect of gender ($F_{1,111} = 0.259$, $p>0.05$) on cheating tendency is not statistically significant, but the main effect of perceived purpose of assessment on cheating tendency is statistically significant ($F_{(3,111)} = 71.80$, $p<0.05$)

**Discussion of Findings**

Findings from hypothesis 1 clearly indicated that there was a significant difference in the cheating tendency of students with differences in the perceived purpose of assessment. Assessment as Learning was the best perceived purpose of assessment that can reduce cheating tendency closely followed by Assessment for Learning. The finding is in accordance with the findings of Adeyemo (2003) and Fakolade (2015) where summative tests evoke more test anxiety than formative. The reason for the similarity in the studies was that both high test anxiety and cheating tendency are unwelcomed behaviours that can affect students’ performance negatively. In this present study also, Assessment for Learning which is otherwise known as Formative assessment is better than Assessment of Learning which is Summative testing in Fakolade (2015). Assessment as Learning is now a new invention in assessment practice which previous researchers have not yet extensively worked upon. The findings is also in accordance with the finding of Joseph (2018) which revealed that students exposed to meta-cognition learning strategy had the least adjusted mean score on test anxiety. According to Joseph, meta-cognition constituted effective learning strategy for reducing test anxiety. In this present study, Assessment as Learning which is the assessment for promoting meta-cognitive skills of the learner also constituted effective perceived purpose of assessment for reducing cheating tendency among secondary school students. The similarity in the findings is not coming as a surprise. If students are allowed to discover themselves, work at their own pace and be their personal assessors (metacognition), there cannot be any anxiety, therefore, cheating tendency cannot come up. As earlier pointed out, by Gielen et al (2003), the way students prepare themselves for an assessment depends on how they perceive the assessment (before, during and after the assessment), and these affects can have either positive or negative influences on learning.

Findings from hypothesis two revealed that scores on the cheating tendency of male and female students were not significantly different in relation to their perceived purpose of assessment. The potential of male and female students on cheating does not relate to gender but rather to perceived purpose of assessment. This finding is in accordance with the finding of Fakolade (2015) where scores of male and female students in test anxiety does not relate to gender but rather to their perceived purpose of testing. Similarity in the two studies is not coming as a surprise. Anxiety does not only manifest in either male or female students; it can be manifested in both sexes. Anxiety correlated positively with cheating tendency and it was the best predictor of cheating tendency among some psychological variables.
(Osakuade, 2013). Therefore, there are bound to be cheating tendency in both male and female and not strictly peculiar to a particular sex.

**Conclusion**

Based on the findings of this study, it was concluded that:

1. Perceived purpose of assessment such as (Assessment of Learning, Assessment for Learning and Assessment as Learning and No specified purpose) elicit different levels of cheating tendency among secondary school students.
2. Assessment as Learning was the best perceived purpose of assessment that can reduce cheating tendency close followed by the Assessment for Learning.
3. There is no difference in the effect of male and female on cheating tendency and perceived purpose of assessment of secondary school students.

**Recommendations**

Based on the findings and conclusion of this study, it was recommended that:

1. To help students shun cheating tendency, stakeholders in education sector should reduce the perceived threat (such as test anxiety) of evaluative events in schools’ examinations.
2. Repeated Assessment for Learning and Assessment as Learning for students are likely to enhance their perceptions of test preparedness for summative assessment, thereby reducing cheating tendency.
3. Secondary school teachers should be properly trained on how they can integrate Assessment for Learning and Assessment as Learning into school assessment practice.
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