Volume 15 Issue 60
Originally issued as H9

Global Journal of human-social science: H Interdisciplinary
Volume 15 Issue 9 Version 1.0 Year 2015
Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)
Online ISSN: 2249-460X & Print ISSN: 0975-587X

Nigeria, National Association for Exceptional Children Junior Academics' Mentors and Quality Research Assurance

By Vitalis Ugochukwu Eke, Igba Innocent Ushi & Iheke Chinasa Brown

University of Calabar, Nigeria

Abstract- This study investigated National Association for Exceptional Children (NAEC) Junior academics' mentors and quality research assurance. The study was all about members of NAEC in Nigeria who are junior academics and the status of their mentorship by senior academics and quality research assurance as a result in Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. Purposive sampling technique was used to draw 24 paper presenters that are junior academics in the NAEC 2015 annual Conference held in Port Harcourt, River State of Nigeria. The sample was made up of junior academics that were drawn four each from among those on attendance from six geopolitical zones of Nigeria. All the states in Nigeria are zoned into six that guided the researcher in reaching the sample. An instrument for data collection named Junior Academics Mentors' Activities for Quality Research Assurance Questionnaire (JAMAFQRAQ) was constructed by the researcher. The instrument was validated by experts in Special Education, Measurement and Evaluation and Guidance and Counselling.

Keywords: junior academics, mentors, NAEC, quality assurance, research.

GJHSS-H Classification: FOR Code: 139999



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:

© 2015. Vitalis Ugochukwu Eke, Igba Innocent Ushi & Iheke Chinasa Brown. This is a research/review paper, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial 3.0 Unported License http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/), permitting all non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Nigeria, National Association for Exceptional Children Junior Academics' Mentors and Quality Research Assurance

Vitalis Ugochukwu Eke [α], Igba Innocent Ushi [σ] & Iheke Chinasa Brown [ρ]

Abstract- This study investigated National Association for Exceptional Children (NAEC) Junior academics' mentors and quality research assurance. The study was all about members of NAEC in Nigeria who are junior academics and the status of their mentorship by senior academics and quality research assurance as a result in Nigeria. The study adopted a descriptive survey design. Purposive sampling technique was used to draw 24 paper presenters that are junior academics in the NAEC 2015 annual Conference held in Port Harcourt, River State of Nigeria. The sample was made up of junior academics that were drawn four each from among those on attendance from six geopolitical zones of Nigeria. All the states in Nigeria are zoned into six that guided the researcher in reaching the sample. An instrument for data collection named Junior Academics Mentors' Activities for Quality Research Assurance Questionnaire (JAMAFQRAQ) was constructed by the researcher. The instrument was validated by experts in Special Education, Measurement and Evaluation and Guidance and Counselling. The reliability coefficient of .84 as a measure of internal consistency was established through the use of Cronbach Alpha statistical technique. Frequencies, percentages and means were the descriptive statistics used for analysis of data collected. The results showed that the junior academics of NAEC are not exposed nor made to have access to all the useful principle standards that could assure quality of their research works and their senior colleagues that are regarded as their mentors do not make available for them adequate supervision activities that can guarantee improved quality assurance of their research works. Based on the findings of this study, recommendations were made which include among others that it should be made a tradition in the NAEC annual conference that one of the lead papers should address strategies of assuring quality research by curious investigators and inculcation of mentorship spirits among senior members to the junior academics.

Keywords: junior academics, mentors, NAEC, quality assurance, research.

I. Introduction

National Association for Exceptional Children (NAEC) is a very popular and famous organisation in Nigeria. It is an association for the special educators and allied professions. It was called and identified as National Council for Exceptional Children (NCEC) until this year, 2015 that it marked its silver jubilee (25years) that the name changed to NAEC. It is on record that within these past 25 years NAEC has organised 25 conferences and published 25 volumes and 30 issues of its Journal, "The Exceptional Child" (NAEC,2015). Beyond that the Association has published 10 volumes of the Association's book of readings and some dedicated text books to her deceased members (NAEC). This is a wonderful break through such that the consistency of the Association in publication deserve kudos. Above all, the current President of the Association, F. B. Obi (personal communication, 7th August, 2015) asserted that all the publications of the Association from 2013 would be online. This adds feather in the cap of the leadership of this association.

There is now high hope that the publications shall be online such that it shall enjoy wider readership. Every curious member especially the upcoming junior academics that are members shall be poised to publish in the Journal of the Association. Curiosity sets the tone for any research activity. Isangedighi (2012) opined that the process called research is a product of a curious mind with a desire to improve upon the ways things are working. This shows the importance of research. Research is the fountain of knowledge and an important source of providing guidelines for solving problems. Kpolovie (2010) recalled that any problem of study worth working should among others be characterized by the following.

> It must appreciably advance knowledge in the chosen field when solved; it must be of genuine interest to the investigator; a problem which the investigator has no personal, social, cultural or religious bias on; a problem that the researcher has the necessary skills, abilities and background knowledge to investigate; a problem which when conclusively studied will not produce doubtful results because the instruments used for data collection are of satisfactory validity and reliability; it must meet the scope, topical requirements and significance of value of the institution or journal to which the findings will be submitted; a problem which is capable of producing findings that will be of great practical value and utility to society, scientists, educators other professionals and the general public ... (p.12).

Author α σ ρ: Department of Special Education, Faculty of Education, University of Calabar, Nigeria. e-mail: arikpoikpi@yahoo.com

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

The above truly addressed quality of researches to be carried out. Kpolovie has uncovered qualities of research. It is indeed germane for all research considered fit for publication to be of great quality. Harvey and Green citing in Ugodulunwa (2015) identified different approaches to the definition of quality: exceeding high standards; quality as culture; fitness for purpose; ...quality as transformative. Ugodulunwa viewed quality assurance as continuous process of evaluating the quality of a system, institution or programme. Ogunleye (2013) perceived quality assurance as a planned and systematic review process of how goals of an institution are being achieved, enhanced and sustained. The term quality stands for worth of something. It could be seen in this paper as worth of research where quality is assured for work to be considered publishable.

In the last conference of NAEC, over 36 papers were presented mostly by the members who are junior academics. Each of the papers was presented during the plenary sessions. There were criticism of each of the papers such that most of the junior academics learnt much from the critiques of the senior academics charged with the function. There were areas of agreement and disagreement that left members that are junior academics much confused. This was what made the president of NAEC (F. B. Obi, personal communication, 7th August, 2015) to opine that there should be a forum where acceptable method of writing papers be made bare. That means there should be ethics to guide every researcher especially the junior academics to improve on their writing skills.

There will be established publication ethics to improve upon the existing one. Global Science Research Journals (2013) that publish Journal of Special Education and services has publication ethics to be adhered to strictly. The publication ethics disallows fabrication and falsification, plagiarism, simultaneous submission of works, duplicate publication, redundant publication, improper author contribution or attrition ,citation manipulation. Any failure to observe the foregoing attracts sanctions. This is a guide and caution for all persons aspiring to publish in this journal to be very much alert.

The junior academics might joy in established ethics to guide them attested to by all and limit any seeming or their embarrassment in plenary. Proper guide by senior colleagues is advantage to the junior ones. One wonders if actually these young and junior academics are guided in their respective institutions by the senior academics that may be members of NAEC. These senior academics ought to monitor and mentor these junior academics to improve their quality of research. Shavelson and Towne in Ugodulunwa (2015) identified useful standards for assessing quality of research.

> Presence of a significant question to be investigated empirically to contribute to knowledge; application of methods that can best address the question of interest; basing. Research on clear reasoning that is justified by relevant literature; providing necessary information that will aid replication of study; ensuring that the design, methods and procedures are clear, transparent and objective; provision of detailed description of sample, sampling, intervention and comparison groups; using appropriate and reliable conceptualization and measurement of variables; evaluating alternative explanation for any findings; assessing possible impact to a peer review process; adhering to quality standards for reporting ... (p.7)

The foregoing could serve as useful principle standards for the junior academics in NAEC to be encouraged by their mentors to assure quality research work. This is by way of exposing the junior academics to the foregoing such that those standards are made accessible to them. In the same vein, European Association for Quality Assurance in High Education citing in Ugodulunwa (2013) disclosed the roles and responsibilities of supervisors to include

> Providing satisfactory guidance and advice to students on research projects, standard expected, planning and setting targets and milestones, literature and source of information, research design, methods, instrumentation and procedure; encouraging students to procure necessary materials, attend lectures/seminars on research process, avoid plagiarism; ensuring students are aware of the need to comply with ethical and safety standards of their institution; monitoring of students' progress on the project should be carried out through regular scheduled meetings and discussions with students; provide timely and constructive feedback on students' work; encouraging students to prepare work and present at seminars and conferences and providing advice on research report writing for seminar, conferences and examination criteria..(p.8)

The above activities could also be taken up by the mentors of the junior academics that could be members of NAEC so as to assure quality research. The above venture might be a saving grace to junior academics in the present day syndrome of one either publishes or perishes. Another axiom has it that one either makes oneself visible or that nobody asks for one. In a study by Asim and Eni (2015) on use and misuse hypotheses and statistical tools to test such hypotheses in educational research in University of Calabar ,Nigeria, they found that that out of 90 cases, less than half, specifically, 43 (47.8%) were appropriate while 47 (52.2%) were inappropriate. They also found that the most popular technique was abused hence instead of

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

calculating Phi coefficient, some students used Pearson's product moment correlation. Asim and Eni then recommended organising refreshers courses for supervisors of graduate Theses to enable them guide students properly on how to state hypotheses correctly and subsequent selection of appropriate technique to test their hypotheses and that graduate courses on statistical methods should be reviewed and made to emphasize more on real life cases and not on formulae. The above revelation by Asim and Eni epitomizes the significant role of mentoring the young junior academics. Their study highlighted the need of expertise of the mentors to be able to equip the junior academics well. The foregoing testifies heated argument that arise even among some senior academics in plenary sessions and or in theses defence to the chagrin of junior academics on which way to go. In another study by Ekeh and Opara (2013) on the extent of research mentoring among a sample of 436 out of 587 junior academics in University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria the result showed that the junior academics are not adequately mentored in research by their senior colleagues and that no significant difference existed in the extent junior academics were mentored in research by their senior colleagues due their areas of specialization. Eke and Opara recommended therefore correction of imbalance in research mentoring opportunities and that there should be encouragement of effective utilization of research mentoring hence an indispensable approach for the improvement of research standard and development of education and the nation. The above investigators had said it all and if such is true also in the area studied by them the quality of research by these junior academics can be imagined. In fact there may not be assurance of quality. Though the investigators made recommendations to improve on the quality which squarely rests on the mentoring some time ago, one wonders the present status of mentoring not only there but in other areas. This brings NAEC junior academics to mind.

The works of junior academics that are members of NAEC call for proper survey of the useful principle standard disposed and made accessible to them in NAEC and or in their respective institutions by their mentors. In this study junior academics include the graduate assistants, assistant lecturers, lecturer two and lecturer one or other junior academics within this bracket. They need mentors to truly forge ahead. Hornby (2007) perceived mentor as an experienced person who advises and helps somebody with less experience over a period of time. Sadker and Sadker in Ekeh and Opara (2013) conceived mentor as a guide or an adviser, someone who has experience with the challenges that the trainees face, the ability to communicate that experience and the willingness to do so. The junior academics are faced with challenges and utilization of experience of the mentors seem a panacea. It is worthy to note that mentor not only should acquire the experience but have the ability and willingness to give such out to others that are with less experience. These are two different things. A mentor is not only perceived as a guide but should actually guide not only an adviser but should be advising.

There is need to uncover supervision activities availed the junior academics by their mentors to assure their quality research in this noble Association. There were over 36 papers in the last conference that were shared into four groups during the plenary session to be presented and defended. Most of the papers were done by junior academics and criticisms of their works, presentation and defence aroused the curiosity of this researcher to investigate mentorship of senior academics in their respective institutions and or in NAEC conferences for improved quality papers. The status of mentorship of these curious junior academics might add value to quality of NAEC journal. This is apt hence the journal of NAEC: "The Exceptional Child "goes online to enjoy wider readership with guarantee of quality assurance.

II. Statement of Problem

Research is indispensable for every academic. Quality research assurance is now in vogue. Every young and junior academic is eager to publish. The lee way for the junior academics to publish assured quality works is mentorship spirit of senior academics. The willingness and ability of the mentors to guide, advise and monitor these young upcoming junior academics that are very eager to learn maximally improve quality assurance of their research works.

It seems that these young and junior academics are not mentored let alone adequately mentored for writing quality research papers. Some do not even know how to articulate a researchable topics let alone the ones that are topical. Most of them hardly can state good research questions and hypotheses with appropriate statistical tools. Some who do it right cannot justify it in their defence. They often abuse publication ethics. This gives rise to poor quality of research work by these honest and curious junior academics left on their own to carry out studies with their very limited experience.

In view of the above scenario in NAEC and for the sake the status of its journal, it is apt to investigate Junior academics' mentors and quality assurance of their research works. No study available to the researcher has addressed above subject matter among the junior academics of NAEC. Members of NAEC are spread across all the states in the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria. It is then apt to carry out this study to deduce comprehensive findings and conclusion. The researcher considers the study germane in view of the future of the junior academics

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

and quality assurance in their research works in not only in NAEC but beyond. This is also because the journal of NAEC is now on line and most of the works that may form bulk of the articles might be coming from the junior academics. It is based on the above premise that the researcher wished to carry out study on NAEC Junior academics' mentors and quality research assurance.

III. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to investigate NAEC Junior academics' mentors by the and quality research assurance in Nigeria. Specifically, the study sought to

- Identify useful principle standards accessible to junior academics to assure quality research.
- Find out supervision activities availed the junior academics to assure quality research.

IV. Research Questions

Two research questions guided the study.

- What are the useful principle standard accessible to the junior academics to assure quality of their research?
- What are the supervision activities availed the junior academics to assure quality of their research?

V. Method

The study used a descriptive survey. Purposive sampling technique was adopted to draw the sample. This was used because out of the presenters of 36 papers in the plenary session of the last NAEC 2015 Conference most of them are works of junior academics. They are graduate assistants, assistant lecturers, lecturer two and lecturer one or those in that bracket were considered special population for this study. The researcher also had to witness their presentation in the plenary session inquired to uncover they belong to above population. Beyond that the researcher found the geopolitical zone each junior academic come from hence all the states in Nigeria are divided into six : South East, South South, South west, North North, North Central and North East. Four (4) junior academics in each of these zones were drawn to make up the sample of 24 through purposive sampling technique. That means that 24 junior academics that were authors/co-authors of the papers and personally presented in the conference served as the sample. The researcher generated instrument named Junior Academics Mentors' Activities for Quality Research Assurance Questionnaire (JAMAFQRAQ). The items for the instrument were guided by works of Shavelson and Towne and that of European Association for quality association for quality assurance as cited in Ugodulunwa (2015). The items were adapted and adopted to serve as item statements in the instrument for the junior academics. The instrument was later face and content validated by three experts; one each from Special Education, Measurement and Evaluation and Guidance and counselling. The reliability of the instrument was determined through Cronbach Alpha and it has reliability coefficient of .84. The instrument elicited information on useful principle standards the junior academics are accessible to and the supervision activities available to the junior academics to assure their research qualities. A descriptive statistics of frequencies, percentages and means were used to describe data obtained where any item with mean equal or more than 2.50 was adjudged principle standard accessible to the junior academics(PSA) and if less it was perceived as not accessed (NE) for items 1 through 10. But for items 11 through 20 where the mean score was 2.50 and above it was regarded Supervision Activities Available(SAA) but when less than the bench mark it became Supervision Activity not Available (SANA).

VI. Results

The results of the analysis of the data obtained are shown in the table below. The statistics used is mainly descriptive tool of means (x)

a) Research Question 1: What are the useful principle standard accessible to the junior academics to assure quality of their research?

Table 1 : Descriptive analysis of principle standard for quality research for jnr. academics

SN	Statements	Always	Often	Rarely	Never	Mean
1	There are significant questions that contribute to the knowledge to be investigated empirically by the jnr. Academics	4 (16%)	3 (12%)	10 (41%)	7 (31%)	2.10
2	There are methods to be applied that address question of interest of the jnr. Academics.	3 (12.5%)	2 (8.3%)	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.7%)	1.92
3	There are relevant literature to justify reasons for research for the jnr. Academics	8 (33.3%)	8 (33.3%)	6 (25%)	2 (8.3%)	2.92
4	There are pieces of information that aid replication of study for the jnr. Academics.	7 (31%)	8 (33%)	6 (25%)	3 (12%)	2.79
5	Clear, transparent and objective design, methods and procedures are ensured for the sake of the jnr. Academics	3 (12%)	4 (16%)	7 (31%)	10 (41%)	2.00

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

6	Samples, sampling, intervention are provided in details for the jnr. Academics	4 (16%)	2 (8.3%)	7 (31%)	10 (41%)	1.92
7	Conceptualization and measurement of variables considered reliable are used appropriately by the jnr. academics.	2 (8.3%)	3 (12.5%)	9 (37.5%)	8 (33%)	1.86
8	Findings are evaluated for the jnr. academics for alternative explanations	3 (12.5%)	4 (16%)	9 (37.5%)	8 (33%)	2.08
9	Researchers are submitted by the jnr. Academics for peer review process	2 (8.3%)	3 (12.5%)	7 (31%)	12 (50%)	1.79
10	Quality standard for reporting are adhered to by the jnr. Academics.	2 (8.3%)	2 (8.3%)	8 (31%)	12 (50%))	1.50

From the above it shows that out of all the useful principle standard those accessible to the junior academics to encourage and inspire them for quality research are only two out of ten. These are items 3 and 4 that addressed being disposed to relevant literature and information that aid replication of study .Their mean scores are 2.92 and 2.79 respectively. They are therefore deduced as principle standard accessed (PSA) where as the other eight are adjudged as principle standard not accessed (PSNA) hence none has mean up to 2.50 let alone above the bench mark. This result suggests that the junior academics are not able to have access to the useful principle standard that can guarantee quality assurance of their research works most probably because are disposed to them.

b) Research Question 2: What are the supervision activities availed the junior academics to assure quality of their research?

Table 2 : Descriptive analysis of supervision activities available to jnr. Academics for quality assurance in research

SN	Statements	Always	Often	Rarely	Never	Mean	Dec.
11	Provision of satisfactory guidance and advice by mentors.	2 (8.3%)	3 (12%)	10 (41%)	79 (37.5%)	1.75	
12	Proper research design, methods, instrumentation and procedure exposed to jnr. academics	3 (12.5%)	2 (8.3%)	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.7%)	1.92	
13	Encourage the jnr. Academics to procure necessary materials, attend lectures/seminar on research process.	8 (33.%)	7 (31%)	3 (12%)	6 (25%)	2.70	
14	Instruct the jnr. academics to avoid plagiarism because of the implication.	7 (31%)	8 (33%)	4 (16%)	5 (20%)	2.70	
15	Ensure that the jnr. academics are aware and abide by ethics and standard accepted.	2 (8.3%)	3 (123%)	11 (45.8%)	8 (33%)	1.95	
16	Assisting the jnr. Academics' progress on research upon their request.	4 (16%)	4 (16%)	8 (33%)	8 (33%)	2.17	
17	Provision of timely and constructive feedback on jnr. Academics' research works.	3 (12%)	2 (8.3%)	10 (41.7%)	9 (37.5%)	1.95	
18	Inspiring jnr. Academics to prepare works and present at seminars and conferences.	8 (33%)	8 (33%)	4 (16%)	4 (16%)	2.83	
19	Effective supervision of the jnr. Academics research works to be published.	2 (8.3%)	3 (12.5%)	9 (37.5%)	10 (41.7%)	1.88	
20	Mentors being dedicated and selfless to raise the jnr. Academics research expertise.	2 (8.3%)	2 (8.3%)	9 (37.5%)	11 (45%))	1.79	

In Table two, results showed that out of supervision activities expected of the mentors, only three are availed the junior academics. These are items 13, 14 and 18 that addressed encouraging jnr. Academics to procure necessary materials and attend lectures/ seminar on research process, instruction to avoid plagiarism and inspiring the jnr. Academics to prepare work and present in seminar and conferences. Their mean scores are 2.70, 2.70 and 2.83 respectively. These are taken as the supervision activities available(SAA) The other seven in as much as their mean scores are below 2.50, are assumed as expected supervision activities not available(SANA). The above results uncovered the status of mentorship of the jnr. Academics which has implication for assurance of quality of their research works.

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

VII. Discussion

In table one it was found that useful principle standards made accessible to the junior academics are being disposed to are relevant literature and information that aid replication of study. These findings corresponds with that of Kpolovie(2010) in his assertion that background knowledge of a problem makes any study outstanding and this can arise of reviewing relevant literature. The findings of this study are reinforced by Shavelson and Towne in Ugodulunwa (2015) hence among the identified useful principle standards are relevant literature and getting information that aid replication. According these authors the foregoing improve quality assurance of research. It was further noted that other eight useful principle standards articulated by the authors are not accessed by the junior academics. This definitely could underscores the quality of the research works of these junior academics. The issue of design and statistical tools are not being properly exposed and made accessible to the junior academics might pose problem to young researchers as has been uncovered in a study by Asim and Eni (2015) on evaluation use and misuse of statistical tools by graduate students in University of Calabar, Nigeria. In the study they found that that out of 90 case, less than half, 43(47.8%) were appropriate while 47 (52.2%) were inappropriate. They also found that the most popular technique statistical tools use by these graduate students was abused. The above students could be junior academics. The findings of this study ignored area of problem that is topical that can contribute to knowledge. This was reiterated by Kpolovie (2010) as he affirmed that any problem of study worth must appreciably advance knowledge in the chosen field when solved.

In table two, the findings revealed that there are only three supervision activities availed the junior academics for quality assurance of their researches. These findings addressed encouraging junior Academics to procure necessary materials; attend lectures/seminar on research process and instruction to avoid plagiarism and inspiring the junior academics to prepare works and present at seminar and conferences. These findings have support of European Association for Quality Assurance in High Education as cited in Ugodulunwa (2015) that identified responsibilities of supervisors to include encouraging students to prepare works for seminars and conferences, avoidance of plagiarism and encourage students attend lectures/ seminar on research process. These findings have the sympathy of Global Science Research Journals (2013) that in outlining its publication ethics emphasized avoidance of plagiarism among others That notwithstanding there are other seven important supervision activities of the mentors not availed the junior academics that are prone to assure improved quality research of the junior academics. That has shown in this study that the junior academics are not sufficiently mentored. The above finding has the backing of a study by Ekeh and Opara (2013) on the extent of research mentoring among junior academics in University of Port Harcourt, Nigeria where the result showed that the junior academics are not adequately mentored in research by their senior colleagues.

VIII. Conclusion

Based on the findings of this study, it is concluded that the useful principle standard accessible to the junior academic are grossly insufficient to assure quality of their researches. It is also concluded that supervision activities availed the junior academics by their mentors cannot guarantee quality assurance of their researches.

IX. Recommendations

It is based on the conclusion reached above as a result of findings of this study that the following recommendations are made.

- There should be a forum to be organised by NAEC among the senior academics to articulate publication ethics to guide junior academics for improved quality research.
- All the senior members of NAEC in different academia should take a refresher course on best practices and institute uniform approach in research quality assurance and be made able and willing to impart same to junior academics.
- There should be forum for all members of NAEC, a few months before the annual conference in each geopolitical zone or in the state chapters of NAEC to review topical problems, design and statistical methods from the subject matter of the theme of the Conference to real life cases to guide improved skills of writing quality research papers.
- It should be made a tradition in the NAEC annual conference that one of the lead papers should address strategies of assuring quality research by curious investigators and inculcation mentorship spirits among senior members to the junior academics.
- Every junior academics should read and commit to memory recognized local and foreign books on Advanced research and should be ready to consult the senior academics that may or may not be NAEC member for clarifications if need be.
- The team of Editorial crew of the NAEC journal "The Exceptional Child" should articulate standard for articles considered publishable in the journal to make the junior academics to sit up and lease with mentors to produce good works of global standard for the sake of the status of the journal now online.

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

References Références Referencias

1. Asim, A. E & Eni, I. E. (2015). Evaluation of the Use and Misuse of Statistical Techniques in Educational Research in University of Calabar. *Nigeria Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation*. 14(1) 183-195.
2. Ekeh, P. U & Opara, I. M. (2013).Research Mentoring of Junior Academics-Implication for Improvement of Research Writing. *Nigeria Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation 12(1) 86-99.*
3. Global Science Research Journal. (2013). *Publication Ethics.* Retrieved from http/www.global-scienceresearchjournal.org/gjss june.2015/6
4. Hornby, A. S. (2007). *Oxford Advanced learners Dictionary.* New York: Oxford University Press.
5. Isangedighi, A. J. (2012). Educational Research in Context. In Isangedighi, A. J. (Ed.) *Essentials of Research and Statistics In Education and Social Sciences*. Calabar: Eti-Nwa Associates.
6. Kpolovie, P. J. (2010). *Advanced Research Methods*. Owerri: Springfield Publishers Ltd.
7. Ogunleye, A. (2013). Quality assurance and quality indicators in open and distance education: Context, concerns and colleagues. *International Journal of Educational Research and Technology*. 4(2), 49-62. Retrieved from http://www.soeagra.com/ijertsept.-2015/8.pdf
8. Ugodulunwa, C. A. (2015). Quality Assurance Assessment and Evaluation in Nigeria. *Nigeria Journal of Educational Research and Evaluation* 14(1) 1-23.
9. National Association for Exceptional Children (2015, August). *News Bulletin: Maiden Edition.* Calabar: The Author.

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)

This page is intentionally left blank

© 2015 Global Journals Inc. (US)