

Factors That Influence Examination Malpractice And Academic Performance in Primary Science among Primary Six Pupils in Cross River State, Nigeria

BERNEDETTE UMALI CORNELIUS-UKPEPI & RITA ASU NDIKON

Department of Curriculum and Teaching,
Faculty of Education, University of Calabar, Calabar.
P.M.B.1115, Calabar.
berncornel@yahoo.com

Abstract

The focus of this study was to investigate factors that influence examination malpractice and academic performance in Primary Science among primary six pupils in Cross River State, Nigeria. Two hypotheses were formulated and tested. Two instruments used for data collection were examination malpractice questionnaire (EMQ) and a 50-item primary science achievement test. These instruments were administered to 1818 pupils out of 68,201 pupils in 70 schools. A proportionate stratified random sampling technique was adopted. The data obtained was analyzed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) statistical tool at 0.05 level of significance. One of the findings of this study was that there was a significant relationship between teachers' involvement in examination malpractice and pupil's academic performance in primary science. It was therefore recommended that teachers and parents should show good example to pupils, avoid putting pressure on them and if the pupils study adequately, it will help them to perform well in science and minimize examination malpractice.

Key words: Examination malpractice, Teachers, parents, Academic performance

1. Introduction

The poor and declining academic performance of students in Nigerian schools owing to examination malpractice is becoming so alarming that the achievement of the set goals of teaching science in primary school for sustainable science and technological development is endangered. Okafor (1999) maintained that there is a recurring story of poor academic performance in primary and secondary schools science. Examination malpractice is one of the common social ills threatening the educational sector at all levels and the fact that it is found among the primary school pupils is even more worrisome. This is because the primary school is the foundation of any child's educational development. Denga and Denga (1998) affirmed that examination malpractice is thriving in nursery and primary schools where one would have thought that the children are young and innocent.

Examination plays several important roles in the teaching-learning process. It is a necessary incentive to study, a means of getting feedback and a yard-stick for evaluating the effectiveness of instructional delivery, selection, placement, and for employment. Nowadays, it is widely used as a medium for promotion in many parastatals. But when the proper use of examination is abused by both the examinees, the examiners and the entire populace, a question may then arise as to what is the relationship between examination malpractice and pupils' academic performance in primary science?

Teachers have been variously accused of abating examination malpractice. Denga and Denga (1998) affirmed that teachers read answers to pupils in examination hall and even work sums for them to copy quickly before they are cleaned off. Based on this statement, teachers may feel that if the pupils fail to perform well, it will be a slap on their faces hence the public will know that they did not carry out their teaching effectively. As such, they resort to reading answers to pupils in a bid to assist them excel in the said examination. The authors further said that teachers do this to boast that their school has the highest number of credit and distinction passes, thereby making children believe that, that is the fastest way to achieve success. Also the World Bank Group (2001) affirmed that teachers and school reputations depend on the success of the students in public examinations. This is true where official league table of schools are published after examination.

Some teachers get involved in examination malpractice because of the financial benefits accruing from such illegal transactions. Sometimes they go as far as asking the students to pay a certain amount so that they can assist them to pass examination. Often times, teachers find it difficult to report cases of cheating for fear that students or their parents will confront them. In order to avoid such confrontation, some teachers always overlook incidents of

academic dishonesty by students. At times, they may prefer to leave the examination hall for a while or read a newspaper when they are supposed to be supervising the pupils. This encourages the pupils to do whatever they like.

When most teachers do not teach effectively and the students must pass examination, the resultant effect is examination malpractice. This implies that there is little incentive to cheat when learning is most highly valued by both teachers and pupils. But when grades matter most, cheating increases as students begin to use every available means to increase their class ranking or be seen as helpful to friends when they offer work to be copied. Examination malpractice is therefore induced by grading pressure at least as much as that of individual character failure (Newberger, 2000). Berliner(2008) affirmed that the pressure to score well on a single test is so intense that it leads to nefarious practices such as cheating on the test.

Parents also play a very important role in pupils' behaviour and academic performance in the school. Most often, some parents fail in their duty to provide necessary materials that will enable their children to learn and when the children are not performing up to expectations, the parents turn around to pressurize the pupils, blame the teachers or resort to fraudulent means to help the children pass examination. Corroborating this view, Denga and Denga (1998) affirmed that some rich parents tend to dangle money before teachers to assist their children pass internal examinations. Some parents also go to the extent of buying life question papers for their children thereby giving the children the impression that the end justifies the means. In a society where emphasis is placed on individual success, parents see nothing wrong in assisting their children to perpetuate the act of cheating as long as they succeed in the examination.

2. *Literature review*

The role of the teacher in accomplishing learning is to guide and direct learning to enable the pupils to achieve the set goals of education. But it is unfortunate that most teachers apart from carrying out the assigned duty of teaching indulge in teaching pupils how to cheat in examinations. According to Agbo (2003), among the forces behind examination malpractice is the teacher related factor. Most often gross un-commitment to duty, results in anxiety created by non-completion of syllabus. The author also said that some teachers are incompetent and so do not give the students the right requirement for examination. Pupils cheating behaviour have also been traced to the way teachers carry out their duty of teaching. Some teachers pay little attention to class teaching, as such, the scheme of work is never covered and at the end the pupils resort to cheating to meet up with those who have been taught adequately.

Some teachers who are assigned to supervise examination connive with students to cheat due to the level of poverty. The teachers often demand money from the students writing examination. Some may even collect a migre amount of N20 to N50 or N100 to allow students cheat. Confirming the above view, Ezezogor (1982) said that students' involvement in examination malpractice is due to teachers' encouragement. According to the author, teachers and principals aid students in buying questions paper of the examination to be written. For instance, in some secondary schools, there is what is popularly known as cooperation fee which is paid by every student who registered for such examination. This is to enable teachers, principals and supervisors to help them throughout the period of examination.

Okoro (2001) is of the view that the patterns of the examination questions set by the teachers sometimes encourage some students' to engage in malpractice. This implies that questions that require reproduction of facts by students will make them to find the facts somewhere when they cannot draw immediately from their memory.

Newberger (2003) claimed that the disinclination of the teacher to pursue evidences of cheating is based on sympathy, for students are trying to cope in a grade-oriented system. The author further posited that the overwhelming testimony of high school students is that when a student is caught cheating, the teacher out of sympathy, misguided or not, or out of desire to avoid personal confrontation with the student or the parents, often looks the other way. This is true even in Nigerian school system where teachers often do not report cases of cheating for fear that the students may think, they are wicked. Teachers therefore sympathize with students by hiding incidence of cheating during examination. Confirming this fact further Newberger (2003) said that a high school teacher teaching a class drawn from a low-achieving track, deliberately leaves the room for a few minutes during each test so that the students can swap answers. This action is rationalized on the bases that those students need 'all the help they can get'.

Kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) analyzed the results of 551 surveys of student test cheating at two public Universities in 12 separate classes taught by seven different instructors (teachers) in the 1993-1994 academic years.

Of the nine variables found to be strongly correlated to students' cheating on tests, three of these were under the direct control of instructors (teachers).

However, Gerdeman (2000) is of the view that students who perceive instructors (teachers) to be concerned for students and actively involved in the learning process are less likely to engage in dishonesty. If the teacher feels indifferent or if the subject matter seems unimportant or uninteresting, students feel less moral obligation to avoid cheating (Kerkvliet and Sigmund, 1999). A number of studies have indicated that the environment within the classroom or examination setting, as established by the teacher, can have significant impacts on cheating (Crown and Spiller, 1998; Roig and Ballew, 1994; Whitley, 1996). Furthermore, Genereux and Mcleod (1995) reported that permissive instructor attitudes and low instructor vigilance tend to increase cheating, while higher vigilance, use of essay examinations and spacing of students apart tend to reduce cheating. Also, a study carried out by kerkvliet and Sigmund (1999) on classroom setting revealed that higher number of test proctors, use of non-multiple choice examinations, and use of multiple version of an examination reduce cheating. Kohn(2007) affirmed that a de-emphasis on grades combined with frequent assessment using a variety of forms such as traditional tests and quizzes, homework, and observations, can relieve the grading pressures students experience that cause them to cheat in examination. Several other studies contended that examination content and structure as ordered by the teacher is also important, as students are likely to cheat on tests perceived to be unfair or confusing (Asmorth, Bannister, and Thome 1997; Genereux and Mcleod, 1995).

A study carried out by Evans and Craig (1990b) to evaluate the attitudes and perceptions of students and teachers about cheating behaviour revealed that by their attitudes and actions, teachers can affect cheating behaviour in their classrooms. It was also reported that teachers who were vague in explaining the relevance and/or purpose of learning could unknowingly promote cheating behaviour among students. The implication here is that when students have no idea why they are studying, or the topic is perceived as irrelevant to their lives, they interpret the exercise as a waste of time. This will consequently make them to look for shortcuts. The study also revealed differences in student and teacher perceptions with regard to the importance of teacher characteristics in affecting cheating behaviour among students. On the whole, students believed that teachers who were unfriendly, boring or dull and have high expectation are more likely to encounter classroom cheating. However, students also felt that teachers who require students to be accountable for their knowledge and apply their learning to real life situations actually discouraged cheating. This shows that unfriendly, boring or dull teachers and those who have high expectations from students encourage students cheating behaviour.

Evans and Craig (1990) pointed out that teachers do not take the problem of cheating (examination malpractice) as seriously as students. Also, McCabe (1981) in Neil (2003) conducted a study of nearly 800 college professors at different institutions located throughout the United States. A survey design was adopted and a questionnaire was used in gathering data. The data was analysed using simple percentages. The study indicated that college professors were reluctant to report cheating incidents. However, Neil (2003) opined that, this might not be true of independent school teachers, who are more legally protected and face less threatening circumstances than teachers in public high schools and colleges. The author further asserted that, at any level of education, to suspect a student of cheating is to be potentially drawn into a process that, at best, is awkward. Nevertheless, studies in deterrence theory as reported by the author, indicated that as the risk of getting caught raises, the amount of cheating declines.

Title and Rowe (1974) as cited by Neil (2003) conducted a study on "Fear and the student cheater", the study revealed that too much trust and familiarity in a class environment could lead to higher levels of cheating. Neil (2003) therefore reported that the most salient factor in reducing cheating in the study was the fear of getting caught and punished. Neil however, pointed out further that although the motives for cheating are complex, one cause may have something to do with the way teachers teach. Selman (1980) pointed out that many early adolescents have begun to recognize that fair relationships are ones that are characterized by reciprocity. This implies that the relationship teachers would have with pupils would to a large extent determine pupils' decision to cheat or not to cheat in examinations.

However, Stapper (2005) indicated that classes with more democratic structure often have high incidences of cheating. The author further said that these classes are often presumed to be a more caring environment conducive to adolescent growth. As revealed by Murdock, Hale and Weber (2001), it may be that when democratic participation structure is added to a model which already includes various dimensions of a positive classroom environment, both academically and socially, its unique variance represents a level of autonomy and lack of

monitoring exceeding that which can be effectively managed by students of this age. The author concluded that, at this age, students are less likely to cheat if their behaviour is monitored, though not controlled.

The implication of the above assertions indicates that democratic classroom climate is capable of increasing incidence of cheating among school children at an early age, most especially when the pupils are not monitored.

At variance with the above assertions is Lodge (1951) in Lindgren (1979) who concluded a survey of educational practices and found excessive cheating to be the norm in classrooms where teachers were coldly formal and autocratic, whereas, friendly democratic classrooms were characterized by less cheating. The author concluded that cheating was symptomatic of poor morale, caused at least in part by practices characteristic of teacher-centered, teacher-oriented classrooms.

The implication is that unfriendly and autocratic classroom environment influence pupils' cheating behaviour while friendly and democratic classrooms are characterized by less cheating. The positions of the two authors are at variance casting a shadow on which classroom climate is most appropriate. This issue has to be resolved by researchers through investigation.

There is a direct relationship between academic pressure and cheating as indicated by Lindgren (1979) in a survey study on the relationship between grading practices of teachers and cheating among students. The study revealed that students were more likely to cheat in courses taught by teachers who gave higher-than-average percentages of Ds and Fs and lower-than-average percentages of A^s and B^s. The author went further to state that the greater emphasis placed by teachers on tests and examinations and the greater disgrace attached to mistakes, the greater the fear and anxiety that students are likely to develop. A natural consequence of this fear and anxiety is a lowering of moral standards. Another study revealed that students tended to feel that the more anxiety and hostility were aroused by the teacher and his testing methods, the more justified they would feel in cheating and in permitting others to copy their papers (Steininger, Johnson, and Kirts (1964) in Lindgren, (1979).

From the foregoing, it can be deduced that the grading systems and testing methods and hostility by the teachers are the factors that make cheating prevalent among students. Also that fear and anxiety as a result of stress placed on tests and examinations by teachers are responsible for the lowering of moral standards among students.

Parents have a significant role to play in the academic attainment of their children. This is done by ensuring that the learning materials needed by the children are provided at the appropriate time and ensure that the students (children) take their studies seriously. But most often, parents mount pressure on the children so much that they always look for means of pleasing their parents which culminate in examination malpractice.

Denga and Denga (1998) asserted that parents, guardians, community leaders and teachers are guilty of collaborating in one way or the other to aid and abate examination malpractice. The authors further said that rich parents often dangle money on teachers and pressurize their children to pass with good grades. Also, that guardians who act as parents do parade the examination premises winking and whispering and desperate to help their wards to do well. In reference to this view, it can be inferred that parents and guardians pressure on their children to do well and the act of giving money to teachers can lead pupils to cheat their way out of school and feel that cheating is the right thing to do.

Sharing the same view point, pearling, Yarrow and Scar (1967) in Ikura (2004) asserted that children are more likely to cheat when their parents press them to succeed. The authors maintained that such parental pressure goes with children's rate of aspiration which invariably triggers them to cheat to achieve the desired goal particularly when previous examination results are poor. Buttressing the above assertion, Esu (2004) posited that one of the causes of examination malpractice is the non-challant attitude and permissiveness of many parents. The author further affirmed that parents also engage in buying question papers for their children and even bribe the examiners and supervisors so that students could be allowed to cheat. Failure to provide children with the necessary guidance and show wrong example by parents are factors that cause children to perform beyond expectation and cheat in examination.

Agbo (2003) carried out a study to investigate the forces behind examination malpractice. The study sample comprised of SS111 students from eight schools and remedial students of University of Jos. One of the questions that guided the study was, "Do parents have a part to play in examination malpractice?" Survey design was used for the study. The instrument for data collection was questionnaire. The statistical tool used for the analysis of the data was the simple percentages. It was revealed that non-seriousness on students' part, stress on certificate, make parents to bribe their way through examination. Buttressing the above view Offorma (2006) affirm thus:

Examination malpractice has eaten deep into the society and it is rampant that parents believe that their children cannot do well in school and external examination. So, they are ready to go

extra miles including hiring people to write examinations for their children and bribing the teachers and examiners with expensive gifts so that they can assist their children in any possible ways to succeed in the examinations (p.9).

Furthermore, Whitley and associates (2002) reported from their review of literature that academic dishonesty such as cheating and plagiarism was higher among students who feel pressure to succeed. This implies that when students feel pressured to succeed at all cost and cannot make it through hard work, the end result is cheating in order to stay on in school.

Psychologists are of the opinion that there is a direct relationship between the pressure to attain academic success and cheating (Lindgren, 1976). Siann and Ugwuegbu (1980) found in a study which affirms that examination malpractice and irregularities on the West African Examination School Certificate in Nigeria is ascribed to the nature of the educational competition to which students are conditioned. However, pressure and determination by the students should be the most important factors to make students work harder. But it is unfortunate that every person want a short cut to success instead of combining the two factors to succeed. A study conducted by Godfrey and Waugh (2001) on perception of students from religious schools about academic dishonesty, based on the reasons for the occurrence of cheating revealed that students tended to believe that cheating occurs when children are pressured by parents to succeed academically.

However, Greene and Saxe (1992) maintained that parents can discourage cheating by ensuring that children are not overly pressured in their academic endeavours. The Centre for Academic Integrity (2005) reported that parents contributed a great deal to the vague definitions of cheating. According to the U.S news as reported by CAI (2005), 20 percent of adults thought that doing homework for a child was fair. This therefore means that parents are to clarify this issue by guiding children in doing their homework and not to do it for them because it is a form of cheating when homework which is supposed to be carried out by children is done by their parents.

Vitro (1971) in Smith (2005) found that cheaters generally have parents who punished them severely or not at all. The authors' result suggested that a moderate degree of discipline results in children who internalize moral values and are more honest in their school work. Heitherington and Feldman (1960) in Smith (2005) found cheating more common among students who are less self-sufficient and who exert little effort in their studies.

Furthermore, Newberger (2003) asserted that children most especially boys are familiar with cheating well before they attempted to practice it academically. The author further said that they may have observed it or done it in family-life –cheating in games in order to win for example, or play groups. They may according to the author have heard parents boast of successful cheating. Corroborating the above view, Bandura (1977) affirmed that observational behaviour has significant influence on the children's' behaviour. This is because children observe other people whether parents, teachers or adult members of the society and imitate what they see them do. For instance, Bandura and associates (1963) in Elliot, Kratochwill, Cook and Travers (2000) carried out a study on the effects of live models, filmed human aggression and filmed cartoon aggression on pre-school children's aggressive behaviour. At the end of the experiments, all the children exhibited significantly more aggression than youngsters in a control group. Children therefore model adults in the society, teachers in class and parents at home and exhibit those behaviours they observe. Newberger (2003) is of the view that of the three parties most interested in the outcome of school cheating incident – the accused student, the teacher and the parents, each has a different perspective. The alleged pressure that leads to cheating is attributed by most high school students to their parents, their peers, and sometimes to their own personal calculations. The author maintained that parents may swing back and forth from parental role in which they are interested in remedying their sons, to over identifying with their sons. Its implies that parents reinforces cheating when they do not want their ward's cheating case public or make it a permanent blemish on their children's school record. They rather prefer to defend their children than frown at the cheating behaviour.

When students or children witness dishonesty in the environment within where they live or in the larger society, they also imbibe the habit of being dishonest in their dealings. Ali (1986) pointed out that children are simply modeling what they see go on in the society. They may have seen their parents use money to secure admission, jobs, and buy favour from other people etc. either for themselves or for the students. This may make them to adopt same lifestyle as being worthwhile in examination malpractice.

Apart from parental pressure on students to succeed, the society is also pressurizing pupils directly or indirectly by placing high premium on paper qualification. Nenty (1985) affirmed that the society is indirectly putting pressure on the children for success even under extremely deprived conditions. The author is of the view that children cannot be told that honesty pays but don't be a failure

3. Research method.

3.1 Purpose of the study

The major purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which examination malpractice relate to pupils academic performance in primary science. Specifically the study seeks to examine the extent to which:

1. Teachers' influence on pupils' cheating behaviour relates to their academic performance in primary science.
2. Parents' influence on pupils' cheating behaviour relates to their academic performance in primary science.

3.2 Research questions

In order to carry out the investigation on this issue, the following research questions are formulated to guide the direction of the study:

1. How does teachers' influence on pupils' cheating behaviour relate to their academic performance in primary science?
2. How does parental influence on pupils cheating behaviour relate to their academic performance in primary science?

3.3 Hypotheses

In an attempt to answer the above research questions, the following hypotheses are formulated to guide the study.

1. There is no significant relationship between teachers' influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science.
2. There is no significant relationship between parental influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science.

3.4 Design

The study adopted the Expost-facto research design. The population of the study consisted of all the 2005/2006 academic session of primary six pupils in the three Educational zones of Cross River State. The total was 68,201 pupils with 34396 males and 33805 females. A proportionate stratified sampling technique was used to select 70 schools out of 994 to participate in the study. A simple random sampling technique of hat and draw method was further used to select 1,818 pupils who participated in the study. Two instruments were used for data collection via-the perception of examination malpractice questionnaire(EMQ) and a 50 item primary science achievement test were administered after which data was coded for analysis. The instruments were face validated as well as content wise. The reliability was carried out using Cronbach Coefficient alpha method. The estimates ranged from 0.50-0.90 which were considered appropriate.

4. Data Analyses.

Ho1: There is no significant relationship between teachers' influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science. The result is presented in Table 1.

Ho2: There is no significant relationship between parental influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science.

The result is presented in Table 2.

4.1 Discussion of findings

Hypothesis 1 stated that there is no significant relationship between teachers' influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and their academic performance in primary science.

From the analysis, the finding indicated that there is a significant relationship between teachers' influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science. By implication, this means that, teachers have a significant influence on pupils' cheating behaviour which further affects the pupils' academic performance in primary science.

The finding of this study lends credence to Agbo (2003), who affirmed that among the forces behind examination malpractice is the teacher related factor which is gross un-commitment to duty. The probable reason

may be that teachers are not committed to the teaching of scientific concepts and to cover up their inadequacies, they help students in examination malpractices so that the students could pass examinations.

The finding of this study is in consonance with the opinion of Denga and Denga (1998), who affirmed that teachers get involved in examination malpractice dictating answers to children in examination hall in bid to boast that their school has the highest credit and distinction passes. They are therefore telling children that the fast way to move forward is to cheat. Hence, children imitate and model adult behaviour in the society (Bandura, 1977).

Furthermore, this study supports the finding of Genereux and Mcleod (1975), who found that permissive teacher attitude and low teacher vigilance tend to increase cheating which affects pupils' academic performance.

Studies such as (Kerkvliet and Sigmund, 1999; Pulvers and Diekhoff, 1999;) have also shown that teachers' attitude and actions influence student cheating behaviour, which may be evident in their academic performance. This is also in line with Evans and Craig (1990b) whose study revealed that teachers' attitudes and actions can affect students' cheating behaviour. The plausible reason of this corroboration may be that because teachers are not committed to their duties, the teaching of science concepts, they end up allowing pupils to cheat their way out. On the other hand, the teachers may be helping or allowing pupils to cheat in order to convince people that they have done their teaching effectively. Probably, if teachers teach science concepts effectively and are not permissive but strict, pupils will sit up and depend solely on their individual efforts than engaging in dishonest behaviours.

The result of the analysis of hypothesis 2 indicated that there is a significant relationship between parental influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and their academic performance in primary science, hence the null hypothesis was rejected. This finding implies that parents have a significant influence on pupils' cheating behaviour, which can affect their children's academic performance in primary science.

This finding is in line with the assertion of Offorma (2006), who affirmed that parents now believe that their children cannot do well in both internal and external examination. So they are ready to go extra miles including hiring people to write examination for their children as well as bribing teachers and examiners to assist their children to succeed in the examination. This is quite true when parents and guardians are seen hovering around examination premises looking for who will assist their children.

The finding also lends credence to Whitely and Associates (2002), who reported that academic dishonesty was higher among students who feel pressure to succeed. The likely reason for this could be that parents in many societies want their children to succeed by all means hence, they encourage their children to cheat by mounting pressure on them.

This study is in line with the study on perception of students from religious schools about academic dishonesty by Godfrey and Waugh (2000), who found that students tended to believe that cheating occurs when children are pressured by parents to succeed academically. Also these findings agree with Denga and Denga (1998), who opined that parents and guardians of wards in schools are guilty of collaborating in one way or the other to aid and abate examination malpractice. The authors further affirmed that rich parents always dangle money before teachers and pressurize their children to pass with good grades. This could be due to lack of moral conscience in the parents involved, because if parents are confident in their children's ability by doing their own homework, they may see no need of giving teachers money to help nor pressuring the children to do well by all means.

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings of the study, It was concluded that parents should show good example to their children by stop pressurizing them and trying to help them in wrong ways to pass examination. Also, teachers should teach their subjects properly, supervise the students adequately and report incident of cheating to help curb the ugly vice.

TABLE 1
Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (r) analysis of the relationship between teachers influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science.

Variable	N	Σx Σy	Σx^2 Σy^2	Σxy	r-value	
Teachers' influence (X)	1818	29186	528124	1259838	0.2383*	
Academic performance (y)		77011	3425696			
P < .05; df = 1816; critical r-value		=	0.1946			

Table 1 indicated that the Pearson Correlation (r) analysis is 0.2383, which is greater than the critical value of 0.1946 with 1816 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. From the result, the null hypothesis is rejected and the alternate hypothesis is retained. This means that teachers influence on pupils' cheating behaviour, has effect on pupils' academic performance hence, pupils will resort to cheating when they face difficulties in examination based on the non-challant attitude of teachers towards their duty and the conduct of examination.

TABLE 2
Pearson product moment correlation coefficient (r) analysis of the relationship between parental influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science

Variable	N	Σx Σy	Σx^2 Σy^2	Σxy	r-value	
Parental influence (X)	1818	28162	528135	1276452	0.6817*	
Academic performance (y)		77011	3425496			
P < .05; df = 1816; critical r-value		=	0.1946			

From Table 2, the Pearson Correlation analysis showed an r-value of 0.6817. This was observed to be greater than the critical r-value of 0.1946 with 1816 degrees of freedom at 0.05 level of significance. Going by the result, the null hypothesis of no significant relationship between parental influence on pupils' cheating behaviour and academic performance in primary science was rejected while the alternate hypothesis of a significant relationship was retained. This by implication means that parental influence on pupils' cheating behaviour has effect on their academic performance in primary science. Hence, the pupils will not study hard with the hope that their parents are there to assist them succeed by all means. On the other hand, they will imitate or model their parents' behaviour.

References

- Agbo, F.O (2003). An Investigation into the forces behind examination malpractice. A challenge for secondary school education in the 21st Century. *Journal of the Curriculum Organization of Nigeria* 10 (2) 344 – 347.
- Ali, A. (1986). School cheating behaviour in Nigeria primary, secondary and tertiary school system and the need for counseling examination candidates. *The Counsellor*. 6 (2), 37 – 45.
- Asworth, P; Banister, P & Thome, P (1997) Guilty in whose eyes? University, students' perceptions of cheating and plagiarism in academic work and assessment studies in their education. *Journal of Educational Research*. 22 (2). 187 – 203.

- Bandura, A (1977). *Social learning theory*. Eaglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: prentice Hall.
- Berliner, D. (2008). The near impossibility of testing for teacher Quality. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 56(3),205-213
- Centre for Academic Integrity (2005) C.A.I Retrieved on 18/9/2006 from www.academicintegrity.org.
- Newberger E.H. (2003). The men they will become: The nature and nurture of male character. Retrieved on 5/9/2004 from <http://www.elinewberger.com/>
- Denga, I.D & Denga H.M (1998). *Educational malpractice and cultism in Nigeria*. Calabar: Rapid Educational Publishers Limited.
- Esu, A. E.O (2004, May). Dimensions and dangers of examination malpractice. Unpublished public lecture of National Youth Fellowship Conference. Uyo.
- Evans, E.D. & Craig, D. (1990b) Adolescent cognition for academic cheating as function of grade level and achievement status. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 5, 325 – 345.
- Ezeogor, S.A. (1982). West African Examination leakages. *Journal of all Nigerian conference of principals of secondary schools*. 21, 130-137
- Generux, R.L. & Mcleod, B.A. (1995). Circumstances surrounding cheating. A questionnaire study of college students. *Research in Higher Education*, 36 (6) 687–704.
- Gerdeman, R.D. (2000) *Academic dishonesty and the Community College*. Columbus: Eric Clearinghouse for Community Colleges.
- Godfrey, J.R. & Waugh, R.F. (2001) Perceptions of students from religious schools about academic dishonesty. *Issue in Educational Research*. 8 (2), 1-29 Retrieved On 9/5/2005 from <http://cleo.murdoch.edu.au/gen/iier8/gpdfrey.html>.
- Godfrey, J. R. (2002). Academic dishonesty in schools: The intermediate Certificate policies of the board of secondary schools studies 1937–1957. Retrieved on 11/1/2005 from <http://education.curtin.edu.au/iier/iier12godfrey.html>.
- Greene, A; & Saxe, L. (1992). *Everybody (else) does it: Academic Eastern Psychological Association*. Boston: University press.
- Ikura, T.D. (2004). Effect of examination malpractice on academic achievement of secondary school students in vandeikya L.G.A of Benue State. Unpublished B.Ed project.
- Kerkvliet, J. & Sigmund, C.L. (1999). Can we control cheating in the classroom? *Journal of Economic Education*, 30 (4), 331 – 351.
- Kohn, A. (2007). Who’s cheating whom? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 89(2), 89-97.
- Lindgren, H.C. (1979) *Educational psychology in the classroom* (6th ed) New York: John Willey & Sons.
- Murdock, T. B.; Hale, N. M. & Webber M. J. (2001). Predicators of cheating among early adolescents: Academic and social motivations. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*.26. Retrieved on 8/9/2005 <http://search.epnet.com/>.
- Neil, G. J. (2003). Social factors influencing cheating. Retrieved on 9/5/2005. From www.nais.org. 9/5/2005.
- Nenty, H.J. (1985). Fundamentals of statistics and evaluation. Unpublished Monograph: University of Calabar, Calabar.
- Nenty, H. J. (1985). The effects of performance attribution of attitude to study achievement and tendency to cheat in examination. *The Progress of Education Lix* (19) 11,222-234.
- Newberger, E. H. (2003). “The men they will become: The nature and nurture of the male character” retrieved on 5/9/2005 from www.schoolforchaimpains.com/characterNewbergercheating3.html.
- Offorma, G.C. (2006, February) Curriculum issues in the 21st century. Keynote address presented at the 2nd Annual Conference Curriculum organization of Nigeria, Calabar Chapter, held in CRUTECH, Calabar.
- OKafor, P.N. (1999). The effects of cooperative learning and conceptual change pedagogical strategies on students achievement and attitude toward Chemistry. Unpublished doctoral degree thesis. University of Ibadan.
- Okoro, E.C. (2001). The impact of examination malpractice on the functionality of education in Nigeria. *International Journal of Administration, Planning & Research* 1(1) 105 – 114.
- Pulvers, K. & Diekhoff, G.M (1999) The relationship between academic dishonesty and college classroom environment. *Research in Higher education*. 40, 487-498.
- Siann, G. & Ugwuegbu, D. C. E. (1980). *Educational Psychology in a Changing world*. London: George Allen & Unwin.
- Smith, S.L (2005). At what age do children start cheating. Retrieved on 2/10/2005. From

Cronk@missouriv.western.education.

Stapper, C. (2005). The prevalence of cheating among American students and its role in middle school. [www.tcnj.edu/stapper 2/cheating.htm-21k-cached](http://www.tcnj.edu/stapper2/cheating.htm-21k-cached).

Whitley, B.E.; Nelson, A.B. & Jones, C.J. (1999). Gender differences in cheating attitudes and class cheating behaviour: A meta-analysis, sex-role. *A Journal of Research*, 13 (5), 657-660.

Whitley, B. E & Keith-Spiegel, P (2002). Academic dishonesty: *An educator's guide*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Whitley, B. E. (1996) Factors associated with cheating among college students. *A Review Research in Higher Education*, 39 (3), 235 – 274.

World Bank Group (2001). Public examination system malpractice. Retrieved on 17/9/2004. From <http://www.worldbank.org/education/examination/malpractice.asp>.

This academic article was published by The International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE). The IISTE is a pioneer in the Open Access Publishing service based in the U.S. and Europe. The aim of the institute is Accelerating Global Knowledge Sharing.

More information about the publisher can be found in the IISTE's homepage:

<http://www.iiste.org>

The IISTE is currently hosting more than 30 peer-reviewed academic journals and collaborating with academic institutions around the world. **Prospective authors of IISTE journals can find the submission instruction on the following page:**

<http://www.iiste.org/Journals/>

The IISTE editorial team promises to review and publish all the qualified submissions in a fast manner. All the journals articles are available online to the readers all over the world without financial, legal, or technical barriers other than those inseparable from gaining access to the internet itself. Printed version of the journals is also available upon request of readers and authors.

IISTE Knowledge Sharing Partners

EBSCO, Index Copernicus, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, JournalTOCS, PKP Open Archives Harvester, Bielefeld Academic Search Engine, Elektronische Zeitschriftenbibliothek EZB, Open J-Gate, OCLC WorldCat, Universe Digital Library, NewJour, Google Scholar

