

Relationship between selected Home determinants and examination cheating among secondary school students

John Timon Odhiambo Owenga

*PhD in Educational Psychology, Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science & Technology,
P.O. BOX 210, BONDO-KENYA*

ABSTRACT

The present study investigated the relationship between selected home determinants and examination cheating among Kenyan secondary school students. This study used a Sequential Explanatory design. The target population was 51,900 students in Kisumu County within 153 public secondary schools categorized as 2 National secondary schools, 21 extra county schools, and 130 county and sub-county schools. A simple random sampling technique was used to determine sample size which comprised of 380 respondents since the study was confined within specific ecological boundary which was public secondary schools. Data collection instruments included questionnaires, for general data collection from the respondents and in-depth interview schedules for one to one interview of respondents. The finding of the study shows that there was statistically significant positive correlation [($r=.082$, $n=360$, $p=.120$ (ns)] between Home determinants and overall perceived level of exams cheating. It is evident from the model that home characteristics accounted for 0.7%, as signified by coefficient $R^2 = .007$, of the variation in perceived level of examinations cheating among students in secondary schools. It is evident that the Home determinants had no statistically significant influence on examinations cheating among the secondary schools students. This shows that home determinants is not a significant predictor of perceived level of examination cheating with calculated effect size [$F(1,358) = 2.434$, $p=.120$ (ns)] which indicates that there was quite an insignificant amount of variance in level of examinations cheating caused by variability in the home determinants of cheating among the students. This suggests that .007% of the variance in the perceived exams cheating was accounted for by the home determinants of examination cheating among the secondary school students. It was therefore concluded that teacher counselors to assess and identify those students at risk and change their perception on examination cheating due to parental influence.

KEY WORDS: *Home determinants; examination cheating; Kenyan; secondary school students; parental influence; peer influence; sibling's involvement.*

Date of Submission: 08-07-2020

Date of Acceptance: 23-07-2020

I. INTRODUCTION

Examination cheating is not only a problem in Kenya but also a worldwide phenomenon. According to Cizek (2003), cheating in examination can be defined as “fraud, dishonesty or deceit in academic assignment or using, or attempting to use, or assisting in academic assignment or using, or attempting to use, or assisting others in using materials that are inappropriate or prohibited in context of the academic assignment in question. According to Barkely (2009) study in USA, students always prefer shortcut in achieving their grades and maintaining their sense of personal integrity or otherwise, rather than investing their time and effort on serious academic work and this prevalence of academic dishonesty has gravening effects at personal, school, home or community levels. Examination cheating according to McCabe and Pavella (2006) in USA is due to academic integrity in examination handling which is so much compromised that something ought to be done. Examination malpractice is a deliberate move which is well planned and organized by the parents, peers and executed by the students (Candidates) according to Kisamore, Stone, and Jahawar (2009).

Cheating means: deprived of some things valuable by use of deceit or fraud such as cheating in school assignment, writing on palms as indicators of low self-efficacy, (Christine, Graven, Gary & Rydall, 2015). Thorough adherence to the examination rules is enough to raise the learners self-efficacy and hence to stamp out the act of examination cheating (Anderman & Murdock, 2007). However, the most preferred deterrents to discourage cheating in classrooms were: - the use of different forms of tests by teachers, giving information to students by teachers why they should not cheat and thorough invigilation and watching of students as they take exams and also that moral development is a long term strategy to stamping out examination cheating and recommended that students need to be developed morally in order to avoid cheating (Davis, Drinan & Gallant, 2012, Happed & Jennings, 2008).

Parents look for short cut for their children by giving them synthesized notes and impersonation support given that most of the impersonations are propagated by the parents or home factors where one may use his or her siblings to impersonate them, (Fasasi, 2008) while in a separate study in USA, Kisamore, Stone and Jahawar (2009) emphasized that cheating is normally allowed by the parents and also supported the idea of parents pressurizing their children to do well thus there are parents who even encourage their children to copy the work of the brighter pupils in order to pass a test or examinations. The study further showed that methods or ways involved in exam cheating may be so many but the fact remains that whether it is one or more it's unacceptable to use ulterior methods to do or pass examination. Bandura (1986) asserted that low self efficacy among students is one of the main factors determining examination cheating in schools. Adeyemi (2010) confirmed that interaction with peers who have inclination to examination cheating can also lead to examination malpractice.

The study was guided by the Theory of Planned Behaviour. The theory of Planned Behaviour is a theory about the link between beliefs and behaviour which was proposed by Ajzen, (1991) to improve on the predictive power of the theory of reasoned action by including perceived behavioural control, relations among beliefs, attitudes, behavioral intentions and behaviours in various fields, (Ajzen, 1991 & Stone, 2009). Theory of reasoned action was an invention by Fishbein and Ajzen in (1975), which explains that there is a high correlation of attitudes and subjective norms to behavioural intention and subsequently to behaviour (Ajzen, & Fishbein, 2005). This theory also states that expectations such as motivation, performance, feelings, and behavioral reactions are always not spontaneous but planned.

Literature on home determinants of examination cheating exists. For example, In USA, According to McCabe and Trevino (2012), Home is where the student comes from to school and the home environment may play a role in propagating examination cheating tendencies among students because Home factors are key players in examination by students. After exams the students have to face parents and siblings. People at home expect them to excel, hence pressure from home. According to Wehman (2009) some students, reported that they have exerted pressure from parents back at home to do well. Some even confessed, to have had support from the parents and senior siblings when it comes to handling exams. Strom & Strom (2007) revealed that greater percentage of impersonation is done by close relatives' or rather senior siblings of the candidates which are a home related factor, where a sibling perceived to be better academically is used to take exams for the one less or in the area and those involved include those having cheated, have helped others or have seen others cheat so they eventually encourage their siblings taking exams to do the same while parents in this case come in handy in propagating the vice. According to Ojerinde (2002) parental involvement at home is a factor that can't be wished away given that the parents are the ones responsible for improper home training, defective supervision, Inadequate provision of learning materials which affects the students self confidence and hence leading to examination cheating. Ijaya (2001) cited lack of proper parenting at home due to divorce and family problems as a determinant to examination cheating at home. According to McCabe and Trevino, (2006) study in USA, many students feel that their academic achievement belongs to their parents, and they therefore has it that their examination results are to appease their over demanding or expecting parents. The study further states that, this has actually prompted some parents to look for alternative ways of passing exams for their children, in which cheating plays a major role. This was also supported by Luthy, Padgett and Toner, (2009) study which indicated that it's the parents who are responsible for cheating tendencies in their children due to their failures in inculcating ethical perspective and standards at home and that Home environment which is open to cheating becomes a rich bed for promoting examination cheating compared to a home that resists cheating (Karthi and Venlcaresh, 2011).

A study carried out by Hudson and Miller, (2005) study in U.K, suggested that examination irregularity is hammered into the minds of the students by their peers and parents at home. The study showed that parents support cheating by financing the act and even by buying of live examination papers. The study further stated that the peers determine cheating through impersonation and passing of information on cheating. The study findings were supported by Mark, (2014) who revealed that academic dishonesty can be prompted by parents and peers of the student who give them moral and material support in cheating. The reviewed study was carried out in the United Kingdom which is more industrialized with more job opportunities, a more reduced level of high stake examinations and hence a lower influence to cheat in examinations than in Kenya where the present study is carried out. A study by Thonoghdeth and Vongdeuan (2013) in India indicated that parents as external factors play a role in influencing examination cheating tendencies among students whose main habitat they control and that the parental influence can be both direct and indirect. The study further indicated that Examination malpractices at home level are mainly influenced by several factors which include parental influence, peer pressure, siblings and even technological and media influence and that those influencing examination cheating at home level are those who may have participated in cheating those who have helped others to cheat in examinations and those who have seen other cheat in examination.

Ojo and Olumuniwa (2011) observed that parental influence has a strong hold on the words in escalation of examination misconduct in Nigeria. The study strongly suggested that major determinants of examination cheating are mainly given credence by both teachers and parents. According to Umaru, (2013), in a study carried out in Nigeria showed that cheating is more likely among students with support of parents and siblings than among those with little parental influence and that parents and older siblings have a direct link and influence on examination cheating than even teachers. Kagendo, (2015) study also revealed that schools rely on parents to support any effort to make students pass examination. The parents must confirm to the teachers that they approve of the intention to involve their children in activities which also include examination cheating. The parents sometimes are asked to pay for the purchase of examination by the school authorities a syndrome of constant examining of students which is in itself examination irregularity, (Isangedighi, 2007).Ruto, Kipkoeh and Rambaei,(2011) also revealed that pressure from parents, teachers and even peer group also plays a major role in propelling examination cheating tendencies in many learning institutions in Kenya.

In Kenya, there is evidence of cheating as indicated by the number of examination results canceled by KNEC. It is evident that each year has cases of exam cancelation. It can be noted from the table that the peaks of exam cheating cases are in the year 2011, 2013, and 2015 while the rest of the years (2012, 2014, and 2016) have been registering reduction in number of examination cheating cases. This is an indicator that some attempts are made to try to eliminate the vice of examination cheating but the culprits always try to invent new cheating tactics every time they are discovered. The present study investigated the relationship between selected home determinants and examination cheating among Kenyan secondary school students.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study used a Sequential Explanatory design in Mixed Methods approach whose characteristics is collection and analysis of quantitative data followed by collection and analysis of qualitative data (Onueghbuze & Mayo 2013). Its purpose is to use qualitative data to help explain the results or findings by quantitative data. It explores, explains and interprets the phenomenon under study using both quantitative and qualitative information. The target population was 51,900 students in Kisumu County within 153 public secondary schools categorized as 2 National secondary schools, 21 extra county schools, and 130 county and sub-county schools with a total student population of 51,900 in Kisumu County (MOEST 2014). A simple random sampling technique was used to determine sample size which comprised of 380 respondents since the study was confined within specific ecological boundary which was public secondary schools. Data collection instruments included questionnaires, for general data collection from the respondents and in-depth interview schedules for one to one interview of respondents. To ensure that data collection instrument is valid, the instruments were pre-tested in one of the selected schools using a reasonable number of respondents. Experts from Department of Psychology and Educational Foundations of Jaramogi Oginga Odinga University of Science and Technology were consulted about the content validity of instrument, ambiguity of question items and their relevancy. To ascertain the reliability of the instruments, a pretest (pilot) study was carried out in one of the schools within the county which was not part of the study. Quantitative data was analyzed by descriptive statistics and inferential statistics. In addition, Creswell (2014) highlights the analysis steps in qualitative analysis to include; Preliminary exploration of data by reading through it several times, coding data by segmenting and labeling of text, using codes to develop themes by aggregating similar codes together and connecting the interrelated themes.

III. FINDINGS & DISCUSSION

To investigate whether there was any statistical relationship between home determinants and exams cheating, the null hypothesis was tested. To do this, a Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was computed, with overall scores from the two home determinants (Parental involvement and Siblings influence) put together as the independent variables, while the level of exams cheating as the dependent variable. The p-value was set at .05, the null hypothesis was rejected when the p-value was less than .05 but it was accepted when the p-value obtained was greater than .05. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality. Table 1 shows the correlation analysis results in SPSS output.

The relationship between perceived parental involvement and perceived examinations cheating among secondary school students was investigated by testing the null hypothesis. A Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was used. Initial analyses were performed to ensure that the assumptions of normality were not violated. Scores on measure of parental involvement in exams cheating was used as the independent variable against scores on measure of exams cheating as the dependent variable. The p-value was set at .05, the null hypothesis was rejected when the p-value was less than .05 but it was accepted when the p-value obtained was greater than .05. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality.

Table 1. Correlations between Exams Cheating and Parental Involvement

		Exams Cheating	Parent Involvement
Exams Cheating	Pearson Correlation	1	.085
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.106
	N	360	360
Parent Involvement	Pearson Correlation	.085	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.106	
	N	360	360

The finding of the study shows that although there were some weak positive correlation between parental involvement and overall perceived level of examinations cheating, it was not statistically significant [(r=.085, n=360, p=.106(ns)]. Given that the relationship was not statistically significant, the hypothesis that, “there is no statistical significant relationship between parental involvement and exams cheating” was not rejected. Hence, it was therefore concluded that examinations cheating does not significantly correlate to parental involvement.

Given the fact that there was some positive correlation noted between parental involvement and examinations’ cheating but it was not significant, a further investigation was done to compare the strength of the correlation coefficients for two separate groups of male and females separately. The finding indicate that correlation between parental involvement and exams cheating for females was r =.003 and r =.060 for males. Although some slight difference was noted between the two groups, none had significant correlation. Hence, it was concluded that despite the fact that a positive correlation was established between parental involvement and exams cheating, there was no sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis.

The study sought to investigate whether there is statistical significant influence of siblings on exams cheating among secondary school students. It was done by use of a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation analysis, whose result is shown SPSS output in Table 4.36

Table 2: Correlations on Siblings and Exams Cheating

		Exams Cheating	Siblings Influence
Exams Cheating	Pearson Correlation	1	.178**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	360	360
Siblings Influence	Pearson Correlation	.178**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	360	360

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

From Table 2, it is evident that although there is statistically significant positive correlation between the two variables [r=.178, n=360, p=.001], it was quite small and almost negligible. However, a coefficient of determination was computed to estimate the level of influence of sibling on exams cheating. This was done using of regression analysis and the result was as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Model Summary on Regression Analysis of Influence of Sibling and Examinations Cheating

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.178 ^a	.032	.029	.54455

a. Predictors: (Constant), Siblings Influence

It is evident from the model that sibling only accounts for 3.2% ($R^2 = .032$) of the variation in perceived level of examinations cheating among students in secondary schools. Further, However, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was computed as shown in Table 4.38 to determine whether sibling was a true significant predictor of exams cheating.

Table 4: ANOVA –Influence of Sibling on Exams Cheating

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	3.469	1	3.469	11.698	.051 ^b
	Residual	106.161	358	.297		
	Total	109.630	359			

- a. Dependent Variable: Exams Cheating
 b. Predictors: (Constant), Siblings Influence

The findings of the study revealed that sibling is not a statistical significant predictor of indulgence in examinations cheating among the students in secondary schools [F (1, 358) = 11.70, p =.051]. This finding indicates that although sibling has a positive relationship with examinations cheating, it is not a significant predictor of examinations cheating. This is in line with Ashworth (2006) study which reiterated that it is the parents who look for short cut for their children by giving them synthesized notes and impersonation support while siblings play a very minimal role that can as well be denied by the student or the parents.

The relationship between perceived parental and siblings’ involvement, and perceived examinations cheating among secondary school students were investigated by testing the null hypothesis: *There is no statistical significant relationship between Home Determinants and examinations cheating among secondary school Students*. A Pearson product-moment correlation analysis was used. Initial analyses were performed to ensure that the assumptions of normality were not violated. Scores on measure of parental involvement in examinations cheating were used as the independent variables against scores on measures of examinations cheating as the dependent variable. The p-value was set at .05, the null hypothesis was rejected when the p-value was less than .05 on both the variables but it was accepted when the p-value obtained was greater than .05. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality.

The finding of the study shows that although there were some weak positive correlation between parental and siblings involvement and overall perceived level of examinations cheating, it was not statistically significant [(r=.085, n=360, p=.106(ns)] and [r=.178, n=360, p=.001] respectively. Given that the relationship was not statistically significant, the hypothesis that, “*there is no statistical significant relationship between parental involvement and examinations cheating*” was not rejected. It was therefore concluded that examinations cheating does not significantly correlate to parental involvement. Hence the Null hypothesis was upheld that there is no statistically significant relationship between Home Determinants and examination cheating among secondary school students in Kisumu County.

Siblings’ involvement was also observed as theme during the in-depth interview, since several respondents gave credence to it. It emerged from the analysis that several students cheat due to siblings influence. Their expressions were found to be related to siblings’ involvement in exam cheating and accounted for alarge number of responses. It was established that teachers’ influence and syllabus coverage accounted for several responses which was slightly higher than technology, exam management and parental influence which were also significantly observed by the respondents. The expressions of the respondents were transcribed and were found to be significant in showing that exam cheating also has home determinants. The responses or expressions by the various respondents gave indications that siblings’ involvement is a home determinant to examination cheating given that several respondents gave expressions:

I can also cheat in examinations because my own brother who did his exams and passed well has been telling me that without cheating, or using support, you can’t make it. He tells me that their school prepared them early for exams by giving them papers that were complete reflection of the exams they sat. (Student 4)

This explanation by Student 4 above gives a picture of sibling influence in examination cheating. This statement according to study by Utti A (2012) showed that there is a complete relationship between the learners and their siblings who have succeeded in passing exams. The later students normally borrow a lot from their accomplished siblings and this can be a very important door to cheating. However, Utti; (2012) contradicted the findings that show that the parents are involved in cheating, by stating that, “most parents remain waiting and hoping for the best results from their children urban in most cases they have entrusted to the teachers.

“The students usually get ideas of haw to cheat from home, especially their brothers and sisters who are either in other schools or have completed school and passed. We in day school have no better ideas of cheating, but our students do since they interact with others after school.”(Head teacher. 1)

The statement by Head teacher 1 can be taken as an indicator that cheating is propagated much at home by the peers and siblings. Parents are however taken to be so ignorant by the teachers that they can't affirm their involvement in examination cheating tendencies. The principal above brings in the idea of day scholars and boarders and seems to sound alarm that boarders cheat more than day scholars, and if day scholars cheat, then the idea is from their brothers and sisters in boarding schools, the sentiment that was contradicted by Principal 1 that "cheating is not in schools but outside schools. The boarders are not in a better position to cheat than day scholars since the teachers seem to be very vigilant in this matter. If all our boarding schools are involved in cheating then the idea is from home especially from their peers and brothers or sisters. The information by the principal can be corroborated by a study carried out by Epple and Richard (2011), who indicated that the greatest peer influence on students is home based and usually from the achievers like the siblings of the students. The study finding was also supported by Ojo and Olumuniwa (2011), which noted that as much as parental influence is key to the behaviour of students in school, the sibling's involvement is so profound since the social status of the two are at par. Similarly, Ong'ong'a and Akaranga (2013) in Kenya also agreed that siblings are the ones who are used in cheating at home since they are the ones who take part in impersonation cases.

Other respondents also reported that,

We as parents have no idea about examination cheating since we have entrusted our children with the teachers. However, we are aware that some schools cheat in order to pass well. We attribute this act to the teachers and friends of our children. We agree that they can also get ideas from their brothers at home, though good parents should discourage this act. (Parent. 2)

The report by Parent 2 shows that most parents are not involved in examination cheating neither do they encourage their children to cheat in examinations though they are aware of the existence of examination cheating among students in school. They are also non-committal to the involvement of the siblings in the vice but accredit cheating to teachers and the peers of the students. The presentation by parent 2 is however contradicted by Nwankwo (2011) study which noted that the parents are the ones who empower both the siblings and teachers to assist their children who are faced with examinations. Nwankwo (2011) observed that the peers and siblings are just but intermediaries while the parents, teachers and students are the players. This was given credence by Claudio, and Marco, (2012) that parental background matters when it comes to cheating in examination. Some parents' background is so religious and uncompromising to any deviant behaviour such as examination cheating tendencies among the school students. This one shows that in such families not even the siblings or parents can tolerate examination cheating at any cost. According to Claudio & Marco (2012), the students may still be involved in examination malpractices, but this would be majorly influenced by either peers or teachers, who keep this secret from parents. In this case the home plays a great influence as a strategy to examination cheating tendencies.

However, what came out clearly from the study was that some parents pay teachers to help student in cheating. This was confirmed by nearly two thirds (62.3%) of the respondents who held the belief that parents use money to entice teachers to bait exams cheating. The findings are in line with Kusnoor and Falik, (2013), Parents may propagate cheating just due to desire for personal gratification which comes out of the performance of their children in examination. There is a psychological feeling within every parent whose child takes part in any test or exam process which brings panic. Just as the students panic when preparing and taking exams, so are the parents (Mayhew, Hubbard, Finelli, Harding and Carpenter, 2009). They too panic whenever their children undergo exam process. Most of the parents or guardians would want or prefer "a one touch attack on examination. This is when the student sits for exams and don't have a retake or a repeat of the same due to failure. Kusnoor et.al, (2013) revealed that: it becomes quite attractive or acceptable for many guardians or parents at home to welcome any idea that would make their children pass with minimal effort or force. The study states that when talking about the force or effort it includes: monetary obligation, time spent, and energy used in order for one to do examination.

The responses are better indicators of the way cheating has determinants at home among the peers. The peers are perceived to be having better handling prowess on their fellows especially those in schools; it's ideally acceptable that the peer influence is very much evident from those who have had some experience in the act of cheating. The manipulated students feel that they can't do without their peers.

My friends at home usually come with exams and there is no way I can stop using them because they are my friends. (Student.1).

I have seen my brother and his friends coming to our house to discuss the papers which they claim to be exams. My brother told me never to tell anybody about it (Student.2).

The expressions by Student 1 and Student 2 are an indication that peer influence at home is so real. The respondents have expressed that they have had some experience with examination cheating among the peers. The first expression shows that the respondent had been a part in cheating while the second respondent (student 2) is a witness of a cheating among the peers, at home. This indicates that peer influence is even strong in determining examination cheating at home. Peer is an environment that young people can't avoid and it can have far reaching consequences such as cheating and even influencing cheating; and is always inculcated by the home environment, (Brown, Sautter & Littvay, 2010). The assertions by the respondents are in compliance with a study carried out in USA by Wehman (2009) who confirmed that examination cheating at home takes those with experience in examination cheating. These people with experience are mainly the peers, classmates and predecessors in the game of academic malpractice. A similar study carried out in India by Mahenshwari (2011) also confirmed that peer influence is a great factor in examination cheating besides other factors such as political or social. This was given support by Khan and Khan (2011) who also affirmed that one of the main social factors affecting exam malpractice among secondary school students is peer influence. This was also given credence by Okorodudu (2013), who revealed that peer pressure significantly predicts student's attitude towards examination cheating tendencies. This pressure is exerted on self and always screws the students' attitude in examination cheating.

IV. CONCLUSION & RECOMMENDATION

The Personal determinants of examination cheating tendencies were observed as self efficacy, External locus of control, Low Self esteem and gender factor among students. It emerged prominently that most of the students cheat due to low self efficacy and External locus of control according to the data collected from the respondents. The study finally concluded that examination cheating is more prominent in less efficacious students than in more efficacious ones and that self- efficacy is a factor that can't be avoided as determinant of examination cheating tendencies among secondary school students. External locus of control was revealed as the external influences that lead to examination cheating. It was also established that there was significant relationship between self esteem, self confidence and examination cheating. This was more attributed to those with low self esteem and low self confidence than those with high self esteem and self confidence. The Ministry of Education to establish or initiate an aspect of Moral and Ethical behaviour Development in schools to enhance teacher and student commitment to examination ethics since the study revealed that there is significant relationship between teachers and examination cheating.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adelusi, B. (2008) Examination malpractice and the Nigerian Society: *Journal of Education*, Jos: 4(1), 110-116.
- [2]. Afokasade, A. & Suleiman (2014) Determinants of Nigerian students. Disposition to cheating. The perpetrators perspective. *The international journal of learning in higher education*, Vol 20 issue 4, November 2014, PP31 – 37.
- [3]. Akaranga, S.I & Ong'ong'a, J. J. (2013) The Phenomenon of examination Malpractice: An example of Nairobi and Kenyatta Universities. *Journal of Education and practice* ISSN 2222-1735 Vol. 4.19: pp 1 – 40.
- [4]. Angrist, J. Rettinger, E & Kramer M. (2006). "Long-Term Educational Consequences of Secondary School Vouchers: Evidence from Administrative Records in Colombia." *American Economic Review journal*, 96(3): 847-62.
- [5]. Ashworth, P., Bernnister. P & Thome. P. (2006), University Students Perception of Cheating and Plagiarism in Academic assessment. *Journal of studies-Higher Education*. 22(2): 187-203.
- [6]. Azuka, N.G. Alutu (2006). Secondary Schools Students' Perception of and Examination Ethics, in *Journal of Humanities and Ecology*, 20(4), pp. 295-3.
- [7]. Bloodgood, Turnley and Mudrack (2012). The power of morals in a world that can't stop talking: *Journal of Education and practice*. PP 3 and 280 (note 11).
- [8]. Cizek, G.I (2003), *Detecting and preventing classroom cheating: Promoting integrity in assessment*. California: Corwin.
- [9]. Cizek, G. I. (1999) *Cheating on tests: How to do it, detect it and prevent it*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- [10]. Chaudhury, Nazmul, Jeffrey Hammer, Michael Kremer, KarthikMuralidharan, and F. Halsey Rogers. (2006). "Missing in Action: Teacher and Health WorkerAbsence in Developing Countries."Journal of Economic Perspectives. 20(1): 91-116.
- [11]. Chinamasa, E. Mavaru, L, Maphosa, C & Tarambawamwe, P. (2011) Examination cheating. Exploring strategies and contributing factors in five universities in Zimbabwe, P.P 86-101)Journal of innovative research in Education 1 (1) April 2011.
- [12]. Cohen, Vigoda&Samorly (2001) Analysis of the mediating effect of personal psychological variables on the relationship between socioeconomic status and political participation. Psychology Journal 22 (4): 727 – 757.
- [13]. Cohen, L, Manion. L, Morrison. K, (2007) Research Methods in Education: London: Rout Ledge Falmer.
- [14]. Cornelius, Ukpeph & Ndifon, R A. (2012) Factors that influence examination malpractice and academic performance in primary science among primary six pupils in Gross river state, Nigeria Journal of Education and practice. ISSN 2222 – 1735. Vol 3, No. 9, 2012.
- [15]. Cresswell, J.W, (2014) Research Design:Qualitative; Quantitative and Mixed method approaches Thousand Oaks, C.A Sage.
- [16]. Gideon, P. & Bruin (2007) Examining the cheats: The role of consciousness and excitement seeking in academic dishonesty. Department of Human Resource Management, University of Johannesburg; Auckland Park. South Africa.
- [17]. Ibia, E. &Ibia (2006). Sociological Foundations of Nigerian Education.Oyo: Abaam Publishing Company.
- [18]. Idaka, I.E Idika, D.O & Egbona, A.E (2011) An analytic model of psychosocial variables as determinants of cheating tendency among secondary school . African Journal of education, volume 1 Number 2 (2011), pp 68-75.
- [19]. Kagendo, E Njue G.M, Muthaa, &Muriungi, P.K (2014). Effectiveness of Examination handling and distribution procedure and malpractice in secondary schools in Eastern province, Kenya.University of Nairobi Press. Nairobi, Kenya.
- [20]. Kayode, G. (2010). Major causes of examination malpractice in Nigeria.A journal presented at the educational conference A.A University. Ekpama.
- [21]. Lathrop, A., & Foss, K. (2005).Guiding students from cheating and plagiarism to honesty and integrity: strategies for change. USA: Libraries unlimited.
- [22]. Mahenswari, J.A. (2011). "Monitoring Works: getting Teachers toCome to School:." Bureau for Research and Economic Analysis of Development (BREAD) Working Paper103.
- [23]. Matamande; Mandimika. W, Tenderera. E & Nyikahadzoi, 2 (2010) Exploring management strategies to reduce cheating in written exams.A case study of Midland State University, Zimbabwe.
- [24]. McCabe.D.L, Trevino. L.K. & Butterfield, K.D (2012) Cheating in college: why students do it and what educators can do about it.John Hopkins University Press.The United States of America.
- [25]. McCabe, D.L (2006), Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspectiveInternational Journal for Education Integrity. Vol 1 No. 1 (2006).
- [26]. Mwandikwa,O. & Charo, O (2008). Locus of control in academic, determinants and unethical behaviour: Silesia university press, 53, 40-126, Katowixe.
- [27]. Nida. B, Aykut. O,& Mustafa. B (2013). Research on the students of the faculty of Education for identifying tendency of cheating in exams.Dumpinar University (NPU) sample. Kutaya, Turkey.
- [28]. Nora &Zhang.R.C (2010) Motives of cheating among secondary school students: Nwankwo, P (2011). A Survey of Examination Malpractice among Secondary School Students- Causes, effects and Solutions. GRIN Verlag.
- [29]. Offorma, G.C (2006). Curriculum issues in 21st Century. Key note paper, presented on Second Annual Conference, curriculum organization of Nigeria. RUTECH – Calabar.
- [30]. Ojo, O.D &Olumuyiwa, F.A (2011) parental influence on wards in escalation of examination misconduct in Nigeria. European Journal of social sciences Volume 19, number 2 (2011).
- [31]. Olaleye, P.O. (2006) Academic performance and cheating intermediate; Journal of research in education, Vol. 5, No. 1.
- [32]. Olorufemi, O. &Abola.F. ; (2014) Psychosocial factors as determinant of examination malpractice among secondary school students in Ondo state. International Journal of innovation and applied studies. ISSN 2028 – 9324 Vol. 8 No. 3 PP. 1258-1264.
- [33]. Ossai, M.C (2011) Study habit predicts examination behaviour. Proceedings ofinternational conference on teaching, learning and change (C) (IATEL) 1/STE – <http://wwwsite.org/journal>.
- [34]. Paul, W. Grimes &. Rezele ,P. (2006) The determinants of cheating by High school students: A comparative study of Academic Dishonesty in the Transitional Economies. International review of economic of education, Vol 4 issue 2 (2005) P.P 23-45.

- [35]. Raburu, P.A (2015). Motivation of women academics and balancing family and Career. *Journal of Educational and Research* Vol.5. NO.1:359-370.
- [36]. Republic of Kenya (2010), Education statistics and indicators fact sheet. Nairobi; Ministry of Education
- [37]. Republic of Kenya (2008). The 2008 KCSE Results Analysis, Nyanza Province, Kisumu: Unpublished Result Analysis.
- [38]. Ruto, K.D, Kipkoech. C.L & Rambei, D.K (2011). Problems of school management in the 21st century. 2.173-181-23, June 2013 from <http://www.scientoassociatist.it/pmc/files-vol 2.pdf>.
- [39]. Grijalva, Nowel & Kerkvict (2006). Teachers blame parents for kids' moral decline.
- [40]. Retrieved September 22, 2007 from:
http://edu.singtao.com/engs/digest_details.asp?article_id=90&catid=1.
- [41]. Sonja & Panu (2012). Academic Misconduct in higher education: Durham University Press. Durham E Thesis. online. <http://ethesis.dur.ac.uk/2546/>.
- [42]. Strom, P., & R. Strom 2005. Cyber bullying by adolescents: A preliminary Assessment. *The Educational Forum* 70(1): 21-36.
- [43]. Strom, P., & R. Strom. (2006). Polling adolescents to improve learning. Paper Presented at the Conference of the American Association of Behaviour and Social Sciences, February 17, Las Vegas, NV.
- [44]. Thonoghdeh, N. & Vongdeuan O. (2014) student factors influencing cheating in examinations. A case study of Loas in Dongkok.china.
- [45]. Uti, A (2012), Relationship between parenting styles and students academic achievement in secondary schools in Ethiopia. *Journal of education and research* vol.4 pp 243-271.
- [46]. Wehman and Howell, (2009) Contextualizing cheating Research: A modest proposal: *Journal of AERA* proposal – S.G 10 volume 1(14) – pp (1051 – 1079).

John Timon Odhiambo Owenga. "Relationship between selected Home determinants and examination cheating among secondary school students." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(7), 2020, pp. 54-62.