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ABSTRACT

Despite various efforts being put in place to try to curb the problem of cheating in the secondary education examinations, still the vice is rampant in Kenya. This study sort to investigate the factors influencing cheating behavior in examinations among secondary school students in Kilifi District.

To achieve this, the research was focused on the influence of Social factors, Curricular factors, Peer pressure, and Teachers' practices. Descriptive survey method was chosen for this study. The target population was students and teachers in public secondary school level. Purposive sampling techniques was used to select five schools. The sample size was 240 respondents, 200 students and 40 teachers who were randomly sampled. Teachers and students instrument had a reliability coefficient of 0.9 and 0.7 respectively.

Data collected was organized, analyzed and interpreted using both descriptive and statistical analysis. SPSS statistical package and MS Excel for Windows was used for the analysis. From the research data it was established that social factors and teachers' practices had the greatest influence on the cheating behavior in the examinations. Curricular factors were third and peer pressure fourth in that order. Neutralizing attitudes which were the moderating factors had insignificant influence on the cheating behavior. Cheating behavior was prevalent in both gender and across the ages.

It was recommended that the school teachers can revitalize the classroom experience in such a way that students will see the relevance and importance of their learning and the self-defeating nature of cheating.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the study

Academic institutions would like to attract honest students as well as foster a culture of honesty and ethical conduct among their students. The prevalence and increasing severity of cheating should be distressing to educators because of their implications (King and Mayhew, 2002; Whitley and Keith Spiegel, 2002).

First; most schools in Kenya as it is in United States colleges and universities, have a mission that includes preparing for citizenship, character development, moral leadership, and/or service to society; each of these has a moral dimension. Prevalent cheating undermines efforts to accomplish such missions.

Second; acts of academic dishonesty undermines the validity of measures of student learning. This, in turn, interferes with school’s ability to correctly diagnose gaps in students learning for the purpose of both re-teaching current students and re-designing instructions for future students. Whitley and Keith-Spiegel (2002) make related claims that cheating undermines equity in grading and the mission to transfer knowledge.

Third; there are several costs to the entire educational enterprise that results from high levels of cheating. Students and teachers morale, the reputation of the institution, and public confidence in secondary education are all damaged by rampant cheating. Any interventions that effectively encourage student not to cheat during high school could increase the validity of measures of
student learning and also reduce damage to the morale, institutional reputations, and public confidence in high school education.

Fourth, research has shown that students who cheat in college are more likely to cheat in graduate and professional schooling (Baldwin, Daugherly, Rowley, and Schnartz, 1996), to engage in unethical workplace behavior (Harding, Carpenter, Finelli, and Passow, 2003, 2004; Hilbert, 1985; Nonis and Swift, 2001; Ogilby, 1995; Sims, 1993; Todd-Mancillas, 1987), to shop lift (Beck and Ajzen; 1991), to cheat on income taxes (Fass, 1990), and to abuse substances (Blankenship and Whitley, 2000; Karkvliet, 1994). Interventions that effectively encourage a student not to cheat during high school could reduce the frequency of his or her decisions to engage in other unethical behavior during school and beyond.

A survey by the Josephson Institute of Ethics found that 74% of the 12,000 high school students polled had cheated on a test at least once in the past year. The same survey also indicated that students are more likely than in the past to lie to parents and teachers and even to steal (Taylor, 2003). More than 35% of high and middle school students agreed with the statement “I would be willing to cheat on a test if it would help me get into college” (Gomez, 2001). Several studies conclude that cheating is less common at institutions with strong academic honor codes (Bowers, 1964; Brooks, Cunningham, Hinson, Brown, and Weaver, 1981; Canning, 1956; McCabe and Trevino, 1993, 2002). Studies also indicate that students who perceive that their peers cheat and are not penalized cheat more (Bowers, 1964; McCabe and Trevino, 1993, 1997).
Academic dishonesty is a comprehensive term that includes a collection of intentional but unacceptable behaviors that are against the rules and regulations of an academic institution (Kaufman, 2008). Students' academic dishonesty is not a new endeavor. From the historical perspective, Davis, Grover, Becker, and McGregor (1992) disclosed that academic dishonesty is steadily increasing in magnitude and sophistication since its first identification of evidence in the 1940s. Based on a decades of research on academic dishonesty, McCabe et al (2001) concluded that the magnitude of some forms of academic dishonesty is steadily increasing from time to time.

Kinyanjui (2007) notes that with an education system that rewards ‘examinocracy’, a culture of cramming and low application capacity in students has been perfected. That is, the system rewards those who developed good examination skills and score highly while it denies a chance to those who were not good at demonstrating their achievement through the medium of examinations. Complaints about the undue influence of secondary admission requirements and also that a new emphasis on testing has led to increased cramming and memory drills. Not to mention poor teaching and lack of adequate textbooks denies the students an opportunity for holistic learning. Little wonder students seem to perform best in subjects that require rote learning but dismally perform in subjects that require understanding of relationships, principles and application. When memorizing fails, students resort to examination malpractices including cheating.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

The demand for accountability has created a clamor for state testing of students. The pressures are enormous on both students and teachers resulting to an increase in attempted (and successful)
cheating not only in invigilated examinations but also in homework and assignments. Examinations cheats have refused to go away despite stringent mechanisms employed by the Kenya National Examination Council (KNEC) to curb the vice.

Cheating distorts competition, diminishes the student’s incentive to study, and leads to inaccurate evaluation of the student’s abilities. To assess quality of an education system, standards must be set to ensure that examinations are valid and reliable. The main reasons to why students continue to cheat both in the national examinations and the school-based examinations have not yet been fully established. More knowledge about the phenomenon of cheating behavior is needed with a view to rectifying the situation. It is therefore useful to be able to delineate which factors would influence cheating behavior in examinations among the secondary school students in Kilifi district.

1.3 Purpose of the study

The purpose of the study was to identify the factors influencing cheating behavior on examinations among students in public secondary schools in Kilifi District. The findings of this study are intended to bring a better understanding on what motivates students to cheat in examinations. It is also intended to provide suggestions on how to curb the vice which is endemic in all levels of education.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

This study had the following objectives:

  i) To establish if social factors influence cheating behavior in examinations among secondary school students in Kilifi district.
ii) To establish if curricular factors influence cheating behavior in examinations among secondary school students in Kilifi district.

iii) To establish if peer pressure influence cheating behavior in examinations among secondary school students in Kilifi district.

iv) To establish if teachers' practices influence cheating behavior among secondary school students in Kilifi district.

vi) To suggest ways in which the problem of cheating in examinations can be minimized.

1.5 Research Hypothesis

Hypothesis of the study were created to make assumptions or statements about a population parameter. These were presented by the test of null hypothesis. Incase the null hypothesis is rejected, the alternative was consequently accepted.

1.5.1 Hypothesis test for social factors

Null hypothesis:

\( H_0: \) Social factors do not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations

Alternative hypothesis:

\( H_1: \) Social factors do significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations.

1.5.2 Hypothesis test for curricular factors

Null hypothesis:

\( H_0: \) Curricular factors do not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations

Alternative hypothesis:

\( H_1: \) Curricular factors do significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations
1.5.3 Hypothesis test for peer pressure

Null hypothesis:

H₀: Peer pressure do not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations

Alternative hypothesis:

H₁: Peer pressure do significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations

1.5.4 Hypothesis test for teachers' practices

Null hypothesis:

H₀: Teachers' practices do not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations

Alternative hypothesis:

H₁: Teachers' practices do significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings and recommendations of this study are expected to help the policy makers, schools, teachers, students, parents and all stakeholders in education sector. The study is important in the following ways:

1) Literature in the area of cheating behavior in examinations will be enriched. This is significant because previous researches have tended to concentrate on the forms of examination irregularities.

2) It is believed that the findings of this study may help a great deal in alleviating the problem of cheating in examinations among students in Kilifi District and in general in Kenyan secondary schools.

3) The findings should also help change the attitude towards cheating in examinations and establish a culture of honesty. This will help to redeem the credibility of both the classroom and
public national examinations which has always been undermined by prevalent cheating.

4) Teachers may use the findings to improve on their classroom practices.

1.7 Delimitation

The study focused on public secondary schools in Kilifi district. The researcher selected the district for two main reasons. First, the KCSE performance for the district has been poor for many years, second, it was easily accessible to the researcher to gather adequate information and data thus making the study manageable.

The researcher investigated social factors, curricular factors, peer pressure factors, teachers’ practices as factors influencing cheating behavior in examinations at the secondary school level. It was not possible to explore all the factors in play due to constraints.

1.8 Limitations of the Study

The major limitations were as follows:

1. Although several factors may exist which influence cheating in examinations, only a few were chosen for investigation.

2. Examination cheating is a sensitive issue and as such getting honest data on cheating cases from students and their teachers was a challenge.

3. The data collected was mainly qualitative and therefore the results obtained were mainly descriptive and not empirical.

4. The data obtained from the sample district may not be well representative of Kenya.
1.9 Scope of the Study
The concept under study was factors influencing cheating behavior in examinations. Specifically under investigation was the social factors, curricular factors, peer pressure, and teachers' practices.
The study was carried out amongst students and teachers in public secondary schools in Kilifi district, Kenya. The literature of this study was mainly derived from theses, articles, and educational journals written about cheating behavior in examinations and related studies. The data gathered for this research was derived from the primary source which was the students and teachers questionnaires prepared by the researcher.

1.10 Assumptions of the Study
In the study, the following assumptions were made:

1. All respondents would cooperate and give valid and reliable answers to the questions put forth.
2. All teachers in the sample schools were well trained and would be professional when responding to the questionnaire.
3. Each school had the basic facilities required for effective learning.
4. The curriculum taught was the same in the sample schools.

1.11 Definition of Significant Terms
For the purposes of this study the following meanings were attached for the terms as below;
Cheating:

In an attempt to define Cheating otherwise referred to as Academic Dishonesty Kibler (1993a) noted; “One of the significant problems a review of the research on academic dishonesty reveals is the absence of a generally accepted definition” (p.253). One of the more widely cited definitions of academic dishonesty is that devised by Pavela (1978), who proposed a typology consisting of four components:

1. **Cheating** is “intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercises”. The term academic exercises include all forms of work submitted for credit or honors (p.78). Thus cheating includes such behaviors as using crib notes or copying during tests and unauthorized collaboration on out-of-class assignments.

2. **Fabrication** is “intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise” (p.78). Thus, fabrication includes behaviors such as making up sources for the bibliography or a paper or faking the results of a laboratory experiment.

3. **Plagiarism** is “deliberate adoption or reproduction of ideas or words or statements of another person as one’s own without acknowledgement” (p.78).

4. **Facilitating academic dishonesty** is “intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another engage in some form of academic dishonesty” (p.78).

Although Pavela’s (1978) typology encompasses a wide variety of behaviors, other could be added:
Misrepresentation consists of providing false information to an instructor concerning an academic exercise (Hollinger and Lanza-Kaduce, 1996).

Include behaviors such as giving a false excuse for missing a test or deadline or falsely claiming to have submitted a paper.

Failure to contribute to a collaborative project involves not doing one’s fair share.

Sabotage consists of actions that prevent others from completing their work (Stern and Havlicek, 1986).

Neutralizing Attitudes

First defined by Sykes and Matza (1957) in order to explain criminal behavior, neutralizing attitudes are “justifications for deviance that are seen as valid by the delinquent but not by the legal system or society at large.” Successful neutralization results in individuals avoiding “moral culpability for criminal actions.” Since individuals who cheat can experience feelings of guilt or shame because they recognize that certain behaviors violate their own ethical codes, they too must often justify or rationalize their actions to mitigate dissonance.

Cheating Culture

Although most of the students understand that cheating is against the rules, they often look to their peers for cues as to what behaviors and attitudes are normative at their institutions. Thus the belief that many other students are cheating, and that others believe cheating to be acceptable, can constitute “peer pressure” to cheat. Jordan (2001) found that estimates of the amount of cheating on a college campus were higher for students who had admitted cheating than their peers who had not cheated.
Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is ethical behavior mostly expressed by representing the value of words, thoughts, images and ideas; as well, it includes an understanding of the principles of ownership with respect to words, thoughts, and ideas. Sara Lawrence Lightfoot (1983) noted that although academic integrity is defined specifically as practices and ethics which pertain exclusively to respecting the words, images, ideas and thoughts of others, the notion of academic integrity can also be viewed in a wider context as a community ethic. From this perspective academic integrity becomes synonymous with honor. Within the context of a community, honor is a virtue which permeates all practices, interactions, assumptions, and interpersonal relationships in the School.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This section deals with the related literature review mainly concerning cheating in examinations in general and drawing examples from various places in the world. The historical background and the prevalence of cheating in examinations are discussed. The effects or consequences of cheating, reasons why cheating is wrong, what constitutes examination cheating are also discussed. Some of the factors believed to be influencing cheating behavior are outlined. Finally, solutions and recommendations for the research problem are briefly outlined.

Bushway and Nash (1977) notes that Academic dishonesty dates back to the first tests. Scholars note that cheating was prevalent on the Chinese Civil Service Examinations thousands of years ago, even when cheating carried the penalty of death for both examinee and examiner.

Academic dishonesty is endemic in all levels of education. Bushway and Nash further notes that in the United States, studies show that 20% of students started cheating in the first grade. Similarly, Dacoo (2002) notes that other studies reveal that currently in the U.S., 56% of middle school students and 70% of high school students have cheated. Jacob and Levitt (2003) states that Students are not the only ones to cheat in an academic setting. A study among North Carolina school teachers found that some 35 percent of respondents said they had witnessed their colleagues cheating in one form or another. The rise of high-stakes testing and the consequences of the results on the teacher are cited as a reason why a teacher might want to inflate the results.
of their students. Extensive studies have found that no personal characteristics correlate well with cheating, that is, there are no people "born to cheat" (McCabe and Trevino, 1999). Indeed, one experiment found that there was no relationship between how a student performed on a morality test and his likelihood of cheating -that is, students at a pre-conventional stage of morality are as likely to cheat as those at a post-conventional stage (West, Ravenscroft and Shrader 2004).

2.2 Reasons why cheating is wrong

In Educating For Character, Thomas Lickona (1991) defines five reasons why cheating is wrong:
1. It will ultimately lower your self-respect, because you can never be proud of anything you got by cheating.
2. Cheating is a lie, because it deceives other people into thinking you know more than you do.
3. Cheating violates the teacher's trust that you will do your own work. Furthermore, it undermines the whole trust relationship between the teacher and his or her class.
4. Cheating is unfair to all people who aren't cheating.
5. If you cheat in school now, you'll find it easier to cheat in other situations later in life - perhaps even in your closest personal relationships.

2.3 The Effects of Cheating in Examinations

Cheating in academia has a host of effects on students, on teachers, on individual schools, and on educational system itself. Smith, Davy, and Easterling (2004) posits that students who in neutralization to justify cheating, even once, are more likely to engage in cheating in the future, potentially putting them on a road to a life of dishonesty. Indeed, one study found out that students who are dishonest in class are more likely to engage in fraud and theft on the job when
they enter the workplace notes Nonis and Swift (2001). Students are also negatively affected by academic dishonesty after graduation. Due to academic dishonesty, not all graduates with the same grades actually did the same work or have the same skills. Thus, when faced with the fact that they do not know which graduates are skilled and which are the “lemons”, employers must pay all graduates based on the quality of the average graduate. Therefore, the more students who cheat, getting by without achieving the required skills or learning, the lower the quality of the average graduate of a school, and thus the less employers are willing to pay a new hire from that school. Because of this reason, all students, even those that do not cheat themselves, are negatively affected by academic misconduct.

Academic dishonesty also creates problems for teachers. In economic terms, cheating causes an underproduction of knowledge, where the teacher’s job is to produce knowledge (Bunn, Caudill and Gropper, 1992). Dealingy claiming that 77% of academics agreed with the statement “dealing with a cheating student is one of the most onerous aspects of the job,” (Whitley and Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Academic misconduct can also have an effect on a college’s reputation, one of the most important assets of any school. An institution plagued by cheating scandals may become less attractive to potential donors and students and especially prospective employers. Alternately, schools with low levels of academic dishonesty can use their reputation to attract students and employers.

Ultimately, academic dishonesty undermines the academic world. It interferes with the basic mission of education, the transfer of knowledge, by allowing students to get by without having to master the knowledge (Whitley and Keith-Spiegel, 2002). Furthermore, academic dishonesty creates an atmosphere that is not conducive to the learning process, which affects honest students as well (Bowers, 1964). When honest students see cheaters escape detection, it can discourage
student morale, as they see the rewards for their work cheapened. Cheating also undermines academia when students steal ideas. Ideas are a professional author's "capital and identity", and if a person's ideas are stolen it retards the pursuit of knowledge (Mallon, 2001).

2.4 Factors Influencing Cheating Behavior

Based on many studies done on this subject, various factors have been identified as having an influence on cheating behavior. These factors include: Social factors, curricular factors, peer pressure, teachers' practices. This study will focus on these variables. Nevertheless there are other factors influencing the cheating behavior including: Situational factors, cheating culture, motivational factors, Gender, Grade Point Average (GPA), Work ethics, Self-esteem, Honor code, Age, Race, School management styles, Technological advancement, severeness of punishment for the cheaters among many others.

2.4.1 Social Factors

In a recent article on academic pressure among New York City's private schools, Ralph Gardner (1996) observed that: "the grueling (academic) competition has left teenagers, at an age when their idealism and sense of opportunity should be sparkling, cynical and pessimistic about their future. Rather than rejoicing in the freedom and adventure that college promised even a decade or two ago, they're worried about what's going to happen to them after they graduate"

Academic achievement has become a high stakes competition. Jon S. Katzman, president of Princeton Review, an organization which prepares students to take standardized tests, believes that "ten years ago students were stressed because they wanted to be the winner. Now they are stressed because they don't want to be the loser."
Children of the wealthy bear burdens, as well. In a study on adolescents and alienation done by Raymond Calabrese and John Cochran (1990), it was observed that "affluent adolescents confront intense pressure to succeed, reflect the success image of their parents and maintain an affluent status." These privileged young people believe that they must choose occupations which befit their social status and they must earn an income which enables them to maintain a lifestyle equivalent to their parents'. At times, they doubt whether these expectations take into account their own interests and desires. These pressures make the affluent adolescent susceptible to feelings of alienation, a desire to withdraw from anxiety producing expectations.

The potential for alienation increases when the adolescent runs the risk of failure at an important undertaking. When this occurs, the child begins to consider alternative means by which to succeed. In studies done in each decade over the last thirty years, "fear of failure" and "parents demanding good grades" were consistently scored by students among the top five reasons for cheating. Cheating is an example of a type of "anti-social" behavior which affluent adolescents may pursue in an attempt to please their parents and maintain the "success image."

Interestingly, students often perceive the school to be an accomplice in the message that "success" is the preferred value. Situated as they are in the marketplace and vulnerable to the winds of consumerism, private schools market themselves to families who are willing to pay the high-priced tuition. Consequently, private schools feel the need to fulfill the expectations of their wealthy constituents.

Are schools unconsciously promulgating the notion that a student's worth is synonymous with achievement? Calabrese and Cochran (1990), the authors of the alienation study, believe that private schools unintentionally promote an ethic which might not be consistent with their stated
values. In their study, it is ironic that those students who were more prone to cheat attend a private religious school whose stated mission is to provide a value structure that clearly delineates right from wrong. It would appear that private religious schools need to come to grips with their mission.

2.4.2 Curricular Factors

Educators must consider whether the school curriculum contains characteristics which promote cheating behavior. Many teachers, for example, feel that it is necessary to "cover" all the important topics in their discipline. Often this results in a rapid-fire survey of dates, facts, people, and events. Too much material is covered in too short a time.

No doubt, the motives for covering everything of importance are worthy. Howard Gardner has said, "We would all like, as Renaissance men and women, to know everything, or at least believe in the potential of knowing everything, but that ideal is clearly not possible anymore."

Attempting to cover everything of importance has little lasting effect; the facts are quickly forgotten and the material often seems irrelevant.

On 29 June 1992 the Wall Street Journal published a troubling account of threats, accusations, strife and anger among students, parents, teachers and administrators at Taylor Alldmerica High School, one of the finest secondary schools in an affluent suburb of Pittsburgh. The account was a chronicle of a community's rage over student cheating and a school's unconscious promotion of cheating behavior.

Students at Taylor Allderdice High School spoke of the intensely competitive atmosphere. Some of this competition was the result of familial expectations. However, both the existence and absence of specific school policies fostered a climate which allowed the cheating to percolate.
An example of this was the bi-annual posting of class ranks and grade point averages which were carried out to the fourth decimal point. According to the teachers at Taylor Allderdice, "For many students, grades, class rank, and other totems became more sought after than learning."

Although American culture is by nature highly competitive and individualized, it is possible to alleviate excess competition among students in our schools. Some schools have done this by refocusing the educational process away from ranking and on to learning. Theodore Sizer, the former Head of Phillips Andover Academy, began a movement among secondary schools called the Coalition For Essential Schools.

The following are some of the common characteristics which define the Coalition For Essential Schools:

1. The Essential school should focus on helping adolescents learn to use their minds. The school curriculum should not attempt to be comprehensive.

2. The aphorism "less is more" should dominate. The school's goals should be simple: that each student masters a limited number of skills and areas of knowledge.

3. The school's goals should apply to all students, although the means to these goals will vary as those students themselves vary.

4. Teaching and learning should be personalized to the maximum feasible extent.

5. The governing practical metaphor of the school should be the student as worker, rather than the more familiar metaphor of teacher as deliverer of instructional services. The
prominent pedagogy will be coaching to provoke students to learn and thus teach themselves.

6. The diploma should be awarded upon successful demonstration of mastery for graduation - an "exhibition." This exhibition by the student will demonstrate his or her grasp of the central skills and knowledge of the school's program. The diploma is awarded when earned.

7. The tone of the school should stress values of unanxious expectation.

When asked about cheating behavior among students in Coalition Schools, Dr. Sizer answered, "It's impossible." Although he was referring primarily to the fact that students could not cheat because they are required to demonstrate their learning, other characteristics of the Coalition's curriculum are deterrents to cheating, as well. Built upon the characteristics of "unanxious expectation," "less is more," "personalized learning," and "the student as worker," the Coalition's approach also takes away the motive to cheat.

Today, there are alarming statistics regarding student willingness to engage in self-centered and unethical behavior. For the student, most cheating begins in high school, and continues or increases in college. Moreover, the cheating behavior continues into the graduate's professional career. For example, it was recently learned that most business executives are willing to commit fraud in order to advance their own careers. Schools must act to halt this downward ethical spiral. One way to do this is to consider adaptations in teaching methods which would make use of more student-centered learning, cooperative studies, alternative forms of assessment, and applications of knowledge. Complemented with the traditional approaches to teaching long
embraced by independent schools, these alterations will thwart cheating behavior and may even enhance the learning process.

2.4.3 Peer Pressure

In seeking to influence adolescents, the greatest challenge is the sub-culture which often binds teenagers in a code of secrecy; some have referred to this as “the student code”. In the Evans and Craig study, for example, most students indicated that they rarely complain to peers who cheat and they almost never report other students who they have witnessed cheating. Schab's thirty year study of cheating behavior revealed not only a small percentage of adolescents who expressed a willingness to report cheating, but also a declining willingness to report cheating.

One theory of social psychology which demonstrates the profound influence of peers in molding adolescent social behavior is social learning theory. Building on social learning theory, Ronald Akers (1985) has developed a theory of deviant behavior which illustrates that rather than being influenced by the "threat of formal punishment from conventional society," the deviant draws his/her support from a "primary group." In other words, when they cheat, students have no difficulty finding support for their behavior. It is easily rationalized as acceptable.

In fact, statistics indicate that cheating in schools is not deviant, it is normative. It is the non-cheater who is in the minority. Consequently, the greatest challenge posed to schools in attempting to deter cheating is inspiring student loyalty to the school community. The most effective means of inspiring loyalty is by giving students a stake in shaping the community. Writing in 1916, John Dewey said a democratic society "must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social change without introducing disorder."
Built upon Dewey's notions of school democracy, Lawrence Kohlberg (1995) has written extensively and applied these principles in his "Just Community" schools. Kohlberg's idea was to nurture shared ownership by involving students in the definition of and enforcement of community values. In such a school, the teacher serves as an "advocate for what (they) hope is the right answer" in addressing moral dilemmas. But, most importantly, everyone in the school seeks to put the good of the community ahead of personal interests.

Dr. Gary Pavela, the director of judicial programs at the University of Maryland and the past president of the National Center for Academic Integrity, fully supports the notion of student participation in formulating an Honor Code. Such balancing and sharing of authority is premised upon the assumption that control of academic dishonesty will not be accomplished by threat of punishment alone. Ultimately, the most effective deterrent will be a commitment to academic integrity within the student peer group. Only by giving students genuine responsibility in a collaborative effort with teachers can such a commitment be fostered and maintained. Trusting students to participate in the establishment, promotion and enforcement of community values is a difficult challenge.

Traditionally, schools have been hierarchical with students being at the bottom of the triangle. But educators are realizing that when trusted and when given an opportunity to participate in the vision of the school, students have a great deal to contribute. Moreover, this participation has had other positive consequences. Namely, the adolescent desire to belong has results in expressions of loyalty to the school, rather than the sub-group. The more of this type of loyalty which we can inspire, the less cheating behavior we will see.
2.4.4 Teachers' Practices

By their attitudes and actions, teachers will affect cheating behavior in their classrooms. This was the conclusion of the Evans and Craig (1990) study, which evaluated the attitudes and perceptions of students and teachers about cheating behavior. Teachers and students agreed that teachers who were vague in explaining the relevance and/or purpose of learning can unknowingly promote cheating behavior. When students have no idea why they are studying the things they are studying, or the topic is perceived as inapplicable to their lives, students will interpret the exercise as a waste of time. Consequently, they will look for shortcuts. In addition, students and teachers agreed that the number of grading opportunities offered in a course can affect cheating. When students were evaluated based on only one or two exams, there was a higher likelihood of cheating.

The study also revealed differences in student and teacher perception with regard to the importance of "teacher characteristics" in affecting cheating behavior among students. Students believed that teachers who were "unfriendly, boring or dull and have high expectations are more likely to encounter classroom cheating." Teachers, on the other hand, did not recognize such personality characteristics as having an impact on cheating behavior. Finally, students also expressed that teachers who require students to be accountable for their knowledge and apply their learning to real-life situations actually discouraged cheating.

As part of the study teachers and students were asked to identify classroom management techniques which would, in their opinion, reduce cheating behavior. The following is a list of the characteristics most often identified:

1. Course syllabi which define expectations and course objectives
2. Utilization of daily lesson plans with stated objectives

3. Some assessment by methods other than test and quiz

4. Elucidating the relevance of the lesson

5. Teacher communication with students in academic difficulty

6. Recreating tests each time the course is taught

7. Providing ample advance notice and exact coverage of exams

8. Seating assignments

9. Close teacher supervision during tests

10. Alternating test forms with scrambled number items

11. Use of different but equivalent make-up tests

Regarding the role of teachers in the detection of cheating, there is some evidence in the Evans and Craig study that teachers do not take the problem of cheating as seriously as students. One theory to explain this disparity is the possibility that students exaggerate the cheating problem. This is unlikely, however, because all studies indicate that more than half of secondary school students have cheated and numerous studies project that more than three-fourths of secondary school students have cheated. For example, in 1993 *Who's Who Among High School Students* conducted one of the largest polls of adolescent leaders and high achievers ever undertaken. Of the 5,000 students selected, 1,957 responded. All students surveyed had A or B averages and 98% planned to attend college. Paul Krouse, the director of *Who's Who Among High School Students*, reported, "Cheating is pervasive among the nation's top high school students. The results indicated that nearly 80% admitted to some form of dishonesty, such as copying someone else's homework or cheating on an exam." Of the private school students, nearly 60% indicated
that in their schools cheating is either "fairly common" or "everybody does it." Therefore, it would be difficult to conclude that student respondents are exaggerating the cheating problem.

Although it would be unfair to generalize about teachers' realizations of the seriousness of the cheating problem from one study, it must be pointed out that teacher vigilance is crucial in controlling cheating. If teachers do not realize the seriousness of the cheating problem, they will not be as attentive as they need to be in order to thwart cheating. In addition, they might not be as keen to adopt practices or policies which could effectively thwart cheating, such as the ones listed above.

Nevertheless, studies in deterrence theory indicate that as the risk of getting caught rises, the amount of cheating declines (Gibbs, 1975). A study entitled "Fear and the Student Cheater," conducted by Tittle and Rowe (1974), revealed that too much trust and familiarity in a classroom environment could lead to higher levels of cheating. The most salient factor in reducing cheating in this study was the fear of getting caught and punished.

One school which has revamped teaching and learning is Central Park East Secondary School (CPESS) in New York City. At CPESS the entire curriculum revolves around five essential questions: Whose viewpoint is being described? What evidence is there? How is this connected to other things? What are the alternatives? And, how is this relevant? The school's founder, Deborah Meier, speaks of developing habits of skepticism and empathy in the student.

Grant Wiggins (1989) has exposed some of the problems with traditional methods of student assessment. Wiggins challenges teachers to practice assessment, which is more closely aligned with the essential questions of the course. Heidi Hayes Jacobs' work on interdisciplinary curriculum challenges teachers to find the connections between the normally fragmented
disciplines. Interdisciplinary curriculum challenges us to utilize more diverse forms of assessing student knowledge, such as the production of a video, a photographic essay, a book of poetry, a published article or editorial, a speech or debate, a series of diagrams, the construction of a model, etc.

Another example of educational reform is the "Standards" developed by the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), which enable students to make the connections between content and real-world dilemmas. The school teachers can revitalize the classroom experience in such a way that students will see the relevance and importance of their learning and the self-defeating nature of cheating.

Teachers play a crucial role in the prevention, detection and punishment of cheating. Classroom management, teaching methodology, teacher vigilance, and enforcement are all crucial factors. Students speak of the moral impact which various teachers have had on their lives. To speak of the potential impact of teachers as only being in management and methodology is to do a disservice to the teaching profession. Adolescents are inspired by the integrity of their teachers and they intuitively know when a teacher has integrity.

2.5 The Kenyan case

A study conducted by Musau Kithuka (2004) on cheating in examinations in his report "Educational Measurement and Evaluation", he attributes examination cheating to collusion between students, impersonation, and carrying unauthorized materials into the examination room. These three forms constitute 90% of all examination irregularities. Studies on factors influencing cheating behavior in examinations in Kenya are very few and therefore there is need
for in-depth studies to be conducted to provide an understanding to why students continue to cheat both in public national and school based examinations.

KNEC classifies nature of cheating into six groups which are collusion, pre-prepared notes, impersonation, different handwriting, two script cases, and registration irregularities. Collusion and pre-prepared notes are the most common form of cheating. Table 2.1. below shows the cheating cases since 2003 in KCSE examinations while Table 2.2. shows the cheating cases in KCSE examinations in Kilifi district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of cases</td>
<td>1016</td>
<td>1771</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>666</td>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1419</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>2927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. cheating cases Nationwide in KCSE examinations for the year 2003-2011.

Source of data: KNEC Exam Analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of cases</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2. cheating cases in KCSE examinations in Kilifi district for year 2006-2011.

Source of data: Kilifi District KCSE Results Analysis (2012).

Examination irregularities often lead to the erosion of public confidence in the examining body and an increased public expenditure in the already overburdened national budgets through hiring more personnel to maintain security. They also undermine the credibility and reputation of examination authorities and countries they present (Nkumbi, 2002).
According to a KNEC circular (2011) to all heads of Primary and Secondary schools on Examination Ethics, schools are to make an impact by inculcating honesty and integrity of their pupils as a way of stamping out cheating in examinations by using every possible opportunity during the school life of the students through several ways including: Teaching of good values during school assemblies and programmes of pastoral instruction; Guidance and counseling; Strengthening of supervision and invigilation of school based tests and examinations.

2.6 Summary of Literature

From the various studies conducted on cheating in examinations, researchers agree that there are many factors that can be considered to influence the cheating behavior in examinations. This study was focused only on four of the factors namely: Social factors, curricular factors, peer pressure, and teachers' practices.

The greatest challenge to the schools in deterring cheating is inspiring student loyalty to the school community. The schools that do not, at the very least, engage their students in a meaningful dialogue about academic integrity are likely to experience the persistent levels of academic dishonesty identified in virtually all research on cheating in institutions. The students need to be sensitized on the reasons why cheating is wrong; the effects of cheating; the consequences of violating the principles of academic integrity and the need to engage in what they are learning for authentic reasons.

There is also the need to review academic policies which might aggravate competition. Embrace educational reforms that inspire a genuine student desire to learn. Practice the numerous classroom techniques which thwart cheating.
2.7 A Theoretical Model of Academic Dishonesty

Whitley (1998) organized the variables that he found to be related to academic dishonesty into a tentative causal model of academic dishonesty. The model holds that the intention to engage in academic dishonesty is based on three factors:

a) Attitudes towards academic dishonesty, including perceived norms concerning academic dishonesty and moral obligations not to engage in academic dishonesty (from the theory of planned behavior).

b) Benefits expected to accrue from academic dishonesty.

c) Perceived risk of being caught.

A positive risk-benefit analysis accompanied by a positive attitude toward academic dishonesty, perception of a normative structure that allows academic dishonesty, and lack of a felt moral obligation to avoid academic dishonesty lead to the formation of an intention to perform a dishonest behavior. The model does not address whether these factors combine additively to contribute to an intention to engage in academic dishonesty or whether the variables interact with one another because the existing research literature has not addressed that question.

The researcher used Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) as the theoretical framework for organizing the independent variables since most researchers have demonstrated its applicability to academic cheating. Ajzen's Theory of Planned Behavior postulates that human behavior is guided by rational decisions that are influenced by both the intention to perform the behavior and also a perception of control over the behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Intention is determined by three components:

i) Attitude towards a behavior (attitude)
ii) Perceived social pressures to engage in or not engage in the behavior (subjective norms).

iii) The perceived ease of performing the behavior (perceived behavior control).

Beliefs are the antecedents of attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavior control.

"Beliefs about the likely (positive and negative) consequences or other attributes of the behavior (behavior beliefs)" that produce the attitude toward the behavior. Belief about the normative expectations of other people (normative beliefs) leads to subjective norms, and beliefs about the presence of factors that may further or hinder performance of the behavior (control belief) result in perceived behavior control. Further, perceived behavior control is theorized to have a direct influence on both actual behavior and intention. The direct influence of perceived behavior control on actual behavior allows for the study of behaviors that are not under the complete violation control of the individual. The researcher included moral obligation as a modifying construct in the TPB for the purpose of organizing independent variables representation of the theory.
2.8 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework shows the interaction of various variables that influence cheating behavior in some secondary school students. The independent variables under study are social factors, curricular factors, peer pressure and teachers’ practices.

Independent variables are the variables that the researcher manipulate in order to determine their influence on the dependent variable. Variations in these variables would predict the amount of variations that would occur in the dependent one. The changes in the dependent variable therefore indicate the total influence arising from the total effect arising from the changes in the independent variables. Behavior to cheat in examinations therefore, varies as a function of the
independent variables; social factors, curricular factors, peer pressure and teachers’ practices. The conceptual framework also incorporates the moderating variable, the neutralizing attitudes operationalized as justifications for deviance that are seen as valid by the delinquent but not by the legal system or society at large. This is because in actual situations, simple one-on-one relationships between the independent and dependent variables are rare. Other variables play a part within the relationship. It is strongly believed that neutralizing attitudes has a significant, contributory or contingent effect on the original independent-dependent relationship. According to neutralizing theory (Sykes and Matza, 1957), neutralizing attitudes allow students to rationalize behavior that is contrary to their ethical codes. Neutralization under the traditional view does not directly cause cheating, but rather enables it.

The relationship of the independent, dependent and moderating variables are conceptualized below.
Figure 2.2. Conceptual Framework. Source: Researcher (2012)
CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter describes research techniques to be applied, instruments and methods to be used to validate the study objectives. It describes the area of study, the research design, target population and sample size, sampling procedure, methods of data collection, validity and reliability and method of data analysis.

3.1 Description of the Area of Study
The study will focus on schools in Kilifi district which is in Kilifi County situated in the North Coast of Kenya.

3.2 Research Design
Since this study was geared towards finding out what factors appear prominent in influencing the cheating behavior in examinations amongst students in secondary schools. The research design for this study was descriptive survey method. This method was chosen because it allows data collection from a large sample. This determines and reports the way things are such as public opinions or attitudes. Descriptive research studies are designed to obtain pertinent and precise information concerning the current status of phenomena and whenever possible to draw valid general conclusions from facts discovered (Lokesh, 1984). The methods are non-experimental for they deal with relationships among non-manipulated variables. Since the events or conditions have already occurred or exist the researcher merely select relevant variables for analysis of their relationships (Best & Kahn, 1998). This is a descriptive study of the current situation within secondary schools in Kilifi district as regards cheating behavior in examinations.
3.3 Target Population and Sample Size

Borg and Gall, (1996) defines a sample as a small proportion of a target population selected for analysis. According to Mugenda & Mugenda (2003), the sample must be representative as possible of the population from which it is drawn. The optimum sample size is directly related to the type of research you are undertaking. The sample must be large enough to represent the salient characteristics of the accessible population.

The target population was secondary school students and teachers in Kilifi district. There were 35 public secondary schools with a student population of 8462 (5194 boys and 3265 girls) and teachers population of 310. Table 3.1. below shows the students enrolment for 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of school</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>5194</td>
<td>3265</td>
<td>8462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1. Secondary schools enrolment in Kilifi District year 2011.

Source of data: Kilifi District Education Office (2011).

A purposive random sampling technique was used to select the schools on the basis of the type of school. The sample schools were selected using the criteria: Boys boarding, Girls boarding, Mixed boarding and day and mixed day.

The schools were Bahari Girls, Kilifi Township, Chumani Secondary, Katana Ngala secondary and Majaoni secondary. Majaoni secondary was used for piloting the instruments. Table 3.2. below shows the population of students and teachers in the sampled schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>No. of students</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>girls</th>
<th>No. of teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bahari</td>
<td>Girls boarding</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilifi Township</td>
<td>Boys boarding</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chumani</td>
<td>Mixed boarding</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katana Ngala</td>
<td>Mixed day</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majaoni</td>
<td>Mixed day</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2. Students enrolment and number of teachers in the sample schools for 2011.

Source of data: Kilifi District Education Office (2011)

Students and teachers samples were drawn from the selected schools. From each school a random sample of three classes were selected (one form two class, one form three class and one form four class). From each sampled class a random sample of thirteen (13) or fourteen (14) students was made to make a total of forty respondents per school. A random sample of eight (8) teachers was made from each sampled school. A total of two hundred and forty (240) respondents were used for this study.

3.4 Sampling Procedure

Sampling is a process of selecting a number of individuals or objects from a population such that the selected group contains elements representative of the characteristics found in the entire group (Orodho and Kombo 2002). From each sampled school three classes were randomly selected through lottery. Names of the classes in forms two, three and four were written on pieces of paper. For the form two classes the pieces of paper corresponding to the number of
streams were thoroughly mixed in a basket and one paper was picked at random and the class noted. The same procedure was used to pick the form three and form four classes from where the respondents were sampled from. All the students in the sampled class were given numbers and then pieces of paper with numbers equivalent to the number of students were written, folded, and mixed thoroughly in a basket. Then thirteen or fourteen students chosen at random picked each a piece of paper randomly from the basket to get the students participants. Purposive sampling was used to select eight teachers from the sample schools.

3.5 Methods of Data Collection
The research instruments used to collect data for this study were students’ and a teachers’ questionnaires. The research instruments had both structured and unstructured items that enhanced depth and reliability. The students’ questionnaire and the teachers’ questionnaire therefore were the source of primary data. The questionnaires had two main parts; section A was mainly concerned with students’ and teachers’ personal details and the other sections had the variables of measurement.

Secondary data was sourced from professional journals in various websites, theses, and articles posted in the internet. The data was used as the basis on which the research was carried out.

3.6 Validity and Reliability
The validity of the research was attained through having the instrument designed in such a way that the questions counterchecked each other. Answers in some questions were used to verify and clarify earlier given answers. Necessary phrasing of questions, logical sequencing and additional extra questions for in-depth inquiries was done. Finally the instrument was validated by the researcher’s seniors in the discipline of research and statistics.
Reliability of the measurements was also established. The research instrument was pre-tested to some selected subjects with the outcome being used to improve it. Split half method was used to determine the reliability of the research instrument. Nachmias and Nachmias (1996) points out that the split half method can be used in determining the internal consistency during the pre-test. The items were divided into halves and marked with even and odd numbers. Then the scores were tabulated. The results from one half were compared with the results of the other half. From the reliability of half the test, the half correlation of the whole test was estimated using the Spearman Brown Prophecy formula. The reliability co-efficient (r_e) for the full test was given by the formula;

\[ r_e = \frac{2r}{1+r} \]

where \( r_e \) is the reliability of the original test and \( r \) is the reliability of coefficient resulting from correlating the scores of the odd items with the scores of the even items. A correlation coefficient within the limit of \( r_e > 0.80 \) and \( <= 1 \) should be considered high enough to judge the instrument as reliable for the study (Mugenda and Mugenda, 1999).

3.7 Operational definition of variables

The table 3.3. below shows the operational definition for the variables in the study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Type of data analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To establish if social factors significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations</td>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Frequencies, $\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish if peer pressure significantly influences cheating behavior in examinations</td>
<td>Peer Pressure</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Frequencies, $\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish if curricular factors significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations</td>
<td>Curricular factors</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Frequencies, $\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To establish if teachers' practices significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations</td>
<td>Teachers' practices</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Frequencies, $\chi^2$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderating variable**

| Neutralizing attitudes | Ordinal | Frequencies, $\chi^2$ |

**Dependent variables**

| Cheating behavior | Ordinal | Frequencies, $\chi^2$ |

| In examinations |

Table 3.3. Operational definition of variables. Source: Researcher, (2012)

The factors under investigation were measured using the variables that would make the respondents to consider cheating in an important examination as follows:

**Social factors**: Improve student performance, improve class mean score, secure a university admission, avoid the consequences of failing examinations and impress parents with improved results.
Curricular factors: Learning not effective and relevant, examinations meant for ranking and rewarding, use of one test for end of term grading and ranking, too much work covered in too short a time, syllabus not well covered.

Peer pressure: Fear to fail the class, when everybody else in class is cheating, when a friend is ready to help with an answer, when a friend needs an answer and there is no danger of being caught, unwillingness by students to report those that cheat in examinations in their classes.

Teachers' practices: Pressure on students to perform well, teachers not supervising their examinations, willingness of teachers to help students cheat in examinations, testing areas never taught, time given to students to prepare for examinations.

Neutralizing attitudes: Parents willingness to help their children cheat in examinations, absence of harsh punishment to those who cheat in examinations, difficult examinations.

Cheating behavior in examinations: Number of cases of students who self-report having cheated in an examination, number of cases of students witnessed their classmates cheating, teachers confession of their students cheating in examinations, number of cases of cheating in homework or class exercises detected per week, number of cases of cheating in internal examinations, number of cheating cases in KCSE in sample schools.

3.8 Method of Data Analysis

Data collected was organized, analyzed and interpreted. Both descriptive and statistical analyses were used. SPSS statistical package and MS Excel for Windows were used. The analysis of the collected data began by editing and examination of the returned questionnaires responded to.
data was coded, appropriately categorized and processed using statistical package for social sciences (SPSS).

The SPSS software was used to generate frequency tables, percentages, bar charts, pie charts and measures of central tendency and dispersion for quantitative data. The chi-square test was used for the test of hypotheses since most of the data were in the ordinal level of measurement. Then inferences were drawn forming the basis of the research findings.
4.0 Introduction

In this chapter, the data collected during the study will be analyzed and reported. The research was executed to achieve the objectives outlined in chapter two. The first part of this chapter will report on the findings about the reliability of the measuring instrument. Secondly, this chapter will deal with the respondent identity. An analysis of the hypothesis testing in relation to the objectives of the study follows, then the general observations about the independent variables and the discussions of the findings.

4.1 Reliability of the measuring instruments

The researcher determined the reliability coefficient of the two measuring instruments using one of the internal consistency methods which is the split-half technique. The instruments were administered to a selected group of the subjects. Each test was divided into two groups, one half consisting of the odd numbered items and the other group the even numbered items. The researcher computed each subject’s total score from the two groups of items. The scores from the two groups of items for all the subjects were correlated. To obtain correlation coefficients for the whole test, the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula was used for each instrument. The correlation coefficient of reliability for the teachers’ instrument was 0.9029073 and 0.6910995 for the students’ instrument. This reflected a high reliability of the instruments since the rule of the thumb is that a good reliability should have a coefficient of at least 0.70 (Kasomo, 2006).
4.2 Response Rate

For a period of two weeks, data was being collected by the researcher personally so as to clarify any query by the respondent and get the appropriate responses. A total number of 240 respondents took part in the survey. However, 4 of the respondents did not return their questionnaires. The remaining 236 were considered as valid and analyzed. This represented a response rate of 98.33%.

4.3 Respondents characteristics for students

In part A of the questionnaire for the students, the participants were requested to give details of their identity on the following, their class, gender, ages, school name and type of school. This was done in order to establish the identity of the respondents who took part in the study.

4.3.1 Classes of respondents

Figure 4.1 below details the distribution of sample based on their classes.
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Figure 4.1. Classes of the respondents. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

The figure 4.1 indicate that 35% of the respondents (n= 70) were in form two class. Thirty four percent 34% (n= 68) were in form three class while 31% (n= 62) were in form four.
4.3.2 Gender of Respondents

Figure 4.2 below details the distribution of sample based on gender.
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Figure 4.2. Gender of respondents. Source: Researcher's survey data (2012)

As it is illustrated the male students form 54.0% (n=108) of the respondents while female students form 46.0% (n= 92) of the respondents. This is an indication that there are more boys in secondary schools in Kilifi district as compared to the number of girls.

4.3.3 Age of Respondents

Figure 4.3 below details the distribution of sample based on age.
As illustrated on the histogram the mean age of the respondents is 17.68 years with a standard deviation of 1.299. It can also be observed that the age distribution is normal.

4.3.4 Schools of respondents

Figure 4.4 below details the distribution of respondents with their schools.
The figure 4.4 above shows that 20% (n= 40) of the respondents were from Bahari girls. Twenty percent 20% (n= 40) were from Majaoni secondary. Twenty one point five percent 21.5% (n= 43) were from Kilifi Township secondary. Nineteen point five percent 19.5% (n= 39) were from Chumani Secondary while 19.0% (n= 38) were from Katana Ngala secondary. This data shows that the sample was drawn almost equally among the sample schools.

4.3.5 Type of school of the respondents

The figure 4.5 below details the distribution of the respondents based on type of school.

Figure 4.5. Respondents by type of school. Source: Researcher's survey data (2012)

Figure 4.5 above shows that 39.0% (n= 78) of the respondents were from mixed day schools. Twenty two point five percent 22.5% (n= 43) of the respondents were from boys boarding school. Nineteen percent 19.0% (n= 38) of the respondents were from girls school while 19.5% (n= 39) were from mixed boarding and day school.

4.4 Respondent Characteristics for Teachers

In part A of the teachers' questionnaire, the participants were requested to give details of their identity on the following: name of school, type of school, gender, teaching experience in years
and their academic qualifications. This was done in order to establish the identity of the respondents who took part in the study.

4.4.1 Name of school of respondents

Figure 4.6 below details the distribution of the sample based on the name of the school they teach.

![Pie chart of schools of respondents](image)

Figure 4.6. Schools of the respondents. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Figure 4.6 above shows that 19.44% (n= 7) of the respondents were from Majaoni, 13.89% (n= 5) were from Bahari girls. Thirteen point eight nine percent 13.89% (n= 5) of respondents were from Bahari girls. Twenty two point two two percent 22.22% (n= 8) of the respondents were from Kilifi Township, Chumani and Katana Ngala each. The variation in sample size in Majaoni and Bahari girls was due to respondents who did not return their questionnaires back to the researcher.

4.4.2 Type of school of respondents

Figure 4.7 below details the distribution of sample based on the type of school.
Figure 4.7. Type of school of respondents. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Figure 4.7 above shows that 22.22% (n=8) of the respondents were sampled from boarding boys’ school with the same percentage from mixed boarding and day school. Thirteen point eight nine percent (n=5) came from boarding girls school while 41.67% (n=15) were sampled from mixed day schools.

4.4.3 Gender of Respondents

Figure 4.8 below details the distribution of respondents based on gender.

Figure 4.8. Respondents by Gender. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)
Figure 4.8 above shows that the male teachers constituted 66.67% (n= 24) of the respondents with the female teachers constituting 33.33% (n= 12) of the respondents. There are more male teachers in the sampled schools.

### 4.4.4 Age of teacher respondents

The age of the respondents is detailed in Figure 4.9 below.

![Figure 4.9. Teachers' age. Source: Researcher's survey data (2012)](image)

Figure 4.9 above shows that the age of the teachers ranges from 24 to 55 years. The mean age is calculated to be 38.3 years with a standard deviation of 7.848.

### 4.4.5 Teaching experience of respondents

Participants were required to indicate their number of years of experience in teaching. The figure 4.10 below details the distribution of sample based on teaching experience in years.
The figure 4.10 above shows that the respondents had accumulated many years experience. The mean of teaching experience being 13.31 years with a standard deviation of 7.978.

4.4.6 Academic qualifications of the respondents

Figure 4.11 below details the distribution of sample based on the highest academic qualifications.

Figure 4.11. Academic qualification of respondents. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)
Figure 4.11 above indicate that 75% (n=27) of the respondents were degree holders. Five point five six percent 5.56% were masters holders while 19.44% were diploma holders. This shows that there is a highly qualified teaching staff in the district.

4.5 Descriptive Statistics on variables

In descriptive analysis, several methods that were used to do the analysis were mean, standard deviation, frequencies, percentages and crosstabulations.

Table 4.1 below details the descriptive statistics for the variables with quantitative data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On average how Many cases of cheating in homework or class exercises do you detect in a week?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>4.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average how many cheating cases during internal examinations are normally reported in a term?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many students in your school have been involved in exam cheating in KCSE for the last five years?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>2.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many tests are used to grade and rank your students at the end of the term?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>.676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much time (in days) do you give the students to prepare for important examination?</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you witnessed your classmates cheating in an exam?</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you ever reported a case of exam cheating in your class?</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.294</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1. Descriptive statistics. Source: Researcher's survey data (2012)
Table 4.1 above shows that the number of cases of cheating in homework and class exercises detected by the teachers per week had a mean of 4.39, standard deviation of 4.371 and a range of 0-20 cases. The number of cheating cases during internal examinations normally reported in a term had a mean of 6.0, standard deviation of 4.316 and a range of 0-20 cases. The number of cheating cases in the KCSE examinations for the last five years had a mean of 1.86, standard deviation of 2.193 and a range of 0-6 cases. The number of times the students had witnessed their classmates cheating in an examination had a mean of 3.91, standard deviation of 3.389 and a range of 0-20 times. Further, 94.4% (n=34) of the teacher respondents reported that there is cheating in examinations in their schools. Forty two percent 42% (n=84) of students sampled admitted that they had cheated in an examination. This is a clear evidence of the cheating in examinations that is taking place in schools.

The number of times the students reported a case of examination cheating in their class had a mean of 0.65, standard deviation of 1.294 and a range of 0-11. This shows that most of the students had reported one or nil case of cheating. Further, 66.7% (n=24) of the teacher respondents reported that students do not report cheating cases in their classes. Further, 91.7% (n=33) of the teachers agreed there were many unreported cases of cheating. This clearly indicates the unwillingness of the students to report their peers on cheating.

The number of tests used to grade and rank the students at the end of the term had a mean of 2.67 and standard deviation of 0.676 meaning there is adequate assessment of the students learning. The number of days given to the students to prepare for important examinations had a mean of 3.19, standard deviation of 2.068 and a range of 0-7 days.
The action taken by the teachers on examination cheaters is detailed on Table 4.2 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not ranked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspension from the rest of the exams</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not ranked, suspended, punished and guided</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results for the paper cancelled</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punished</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2. Action usually taken against the exam cheaters. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Table 4.2 above shows that the following actions; not ranked, suspended, punished and guided had a claim of 55.6% (n= 20), results for the paper cancelled had a claim of 27.8% (n= 10), punished had a claim of 8.3% (n= 3), suspension from the rest of the exam had a claim of 5.6% (n= 2) while not ranked had a claim of 2.8% (n= 1).

Table 4.3 below details the effectiveness of the actions taken towards deterring students from cheating.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very little</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>97.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very much</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3. Effectiveness of action taken. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Table 4.3 above shows that 52.8% (n= 19) of the respondents agreed with ‘much’ and ‘very much’ while 33.3% (n= 12) agreed to ‘little’ and ‘very little’. The remaining 13.9% (n= 5)
agreed on 'neutral'.

Seventy six point one nine percent 76.19% (n= 64) of the respondents who admitted as having cheated in an examination said they had never been caught. This queries the effectiveness of teachers’ supervision during examinations. Eighty percent 80% (n= 16) of those caught confessed that the punishment given to them deterred them from cheating again as shown on Table 4.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you ever cheated in an examination?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If yes, were you caught?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did the punishment deter you From cheating again?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4. Responses on cheating. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

4.6 Hypotheses Testing and Test Results

The hypotheses that were tested were the following,

1. Social factors do not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations.
2. Curricular factors do not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations.
3. Peer pressure does not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations.
4. Teachers’ practices do not significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations.

In Section B of the students’ questionnaire, the respondents were asked to tick against a list of twenty given reasons that would make them consider cheating in an important examination. The
respondents were to tick as many reasons as they would agree with. A table of frequencies and percentages was generated from the responses.

The table 4.5 below details the students responses on the reasons that would make them consider cheating in an important examination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>pct of Response</th>
<th>pct of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve my performance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the class mean score</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure a university admission</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impress my parents with improved results</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid the consequences of failing an exam</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If parents are willing to help me cheat</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If learning is not effective and relevant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an exam is meant for ranking and rewarding</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If only one test is used for grading and ranking</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure from teachers to perform well</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If too much work was covered in too short a time</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If syllabus is not well covered</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I am in danger of failing the class</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If everybody else in class is cheating</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend is ready to help me with an answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend is in need of an answer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a teacher does not supervise his/her exam</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is no harsh punishment to the cheaters</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a teacher is willing to assist me in an exam</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an area that was not taught is tested</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total responses                             |      | 1578  | 100.0          | 789.0        |

Table 4.5. Reasons for cheating in exams. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012).

Table 4.5 above shows that the major reasons why students cheat in examinations include; cheating in order to secure a university admission claiming 69% (n= 138) of the respondents.

Sixty seven point five percent 67.5% (n= 135) of the respondents would cheat if the syllabus is
not well covered. Sixty two percent 62% (n= 124) of the respondents would cheat if an area that was not taught is tested. Fifty seven percent 57% (n= 114) would cheat to improve their performance with 55% (n= 110) cheating to avoid the consequences of failing an important examination. Teacher’s willingness to assist students cheat in examinations claimed 43% (n= 86) of the respondents while pressure from the teachers for the students to perform well claimed 42% (n= 84) of the respondents. Forty one point five percent 41.5% (n= 83) of the respondents would cheat if examinations were meant for ranking and rewarding. The other reasons claimed less than 40% each with the lowest claiming 8% (n= 16) of the respondents.

The reasons in Table 4.5 above were further categorized into five groups. The groups were; Social factors, Curricular factors, Peer pressure and Teachers’ practices constituting the independent variables of the study and the fifth group Neutralizing attitudes as the moderating variable. Table 4.6 below details the responses with their percentages under the five categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cumulative counts</th>
<th>% of counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>27.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular factors</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>21.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>19.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ practices</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>26.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutralizing attitudes</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1578</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Responses for the test variables. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Table 4.6 above shows that the reasons that were categorized as social factors had a 27.88% (n= 440) claim of the total counts. Teachers’ practices had a 26.87% (n= 424) claim. Curricular factors had a 21.42% (n= 338) claim while peer pressure had a 19.20% (n= 303) claim of the counts. Neutralizing attitudes had the least claim of only 4.63% (n= 73) of the total counts.
For in-depth information the students were presented with an open-ended question and requested to respond to the same question why they would cheat in an examination even when they knew it was wrong to do so. The respondents were supposed to list down their three major reasons that would make them cheat. Table 4.7 below details the reasons provided by the respondents with their counts and percentages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>counts</th>
<th>Pct of responses</th>
<th>Pct of Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attain higher grades</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid shame of failing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impress my teachers and parents</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To earn bursary or sponsorship</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure university admission</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If areas not taught are tested</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an exam is too difficult</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I never understood the teacher</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the syllabus is not completed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If others are cheating</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If teachers don't supervise exams</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Am not well prepared for the exam</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If exam cheaters are not punished</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a teacher is ready to assist me cheat</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve class mean score</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If a friend is ready to help with an answer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If teachers are not teaching well</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If an exam is meant for ranking and rewarding</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If we are too crowded during an exam</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I can access exam materials or books</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total responses</td>
<td></td>
<td>479</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>248.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.7. Major reasons for cheating. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Table 4.7 above shows that the major reasons that the respondents sited as causing cheating in examinations include; cheating to attain higher grades with 43% (n= 86) claim of the total cases,
 cheating in order to secure a university admission with 24% (n= 48) claim, cheating to avoid 
shame of failing and cheating to impress teachers and parents had a 23.5% (n= 47) claim each, 
cheating if the syllabus is not completed had a 21.5% (n= 43) claim, cheating if areas not taught 
are tested had a 18% (n= 36) claim, cheating if the students did not understand their teacher had 
a 17.5% (n= 35) claim, cheating if the examination is meant for ranking and rewarding had a 
13.5% (n= 27) claim, cheating if the others are also cheating had a 12% (n= 24) claim. The rest 
had percentages less than ten each.

The reasons in Table 4.7 above were further categorized into five groups as social factors, 
curricular factors, peer pressure, teachers’ practices and neutralizing attitudes as shown in Table 
4.8 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Cumulative counts</th>
<th>% of counts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social factors</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>47.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular factors</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>16.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer pressure</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>9.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ practices</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>20.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutralizing attitudes</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.8. Responses for categorized test variables. Source : Researcher’s survey data (2012)

The Table 4.8 above shows that reasons that were categorized as social factors had a claim of 
47.08% (n= 234) of the counts. Teachers’ practices had a 20.92% (n= 104) claim, curricular 
factors with a 16.30% (n=81) claim. Peer pressure had a 9.46% (n=47) claim while neutralizing 
attitudes claiming 6.24% (n= 31) of the counts.

The teachers were also requested to state the major causes of cheating in examinations in their 
schools and their responses are detailed in Table 4.9 below.
Table 4.9. Teachers’ responses on causes of cheating. Source: researcher’s survey data (2012)

Table 4.9 above shows that the major reasons that make students cheat in examinations include; poor preparation by students with a claim 86.1% (n= 31) of total cases, pressure from parents and teachers with a claim 27.8% (n= 10), fear of failing examinations with a claim 25% (n= 9), poor supervision of examinations by teachers with a claim 19.4% (n= 7), peer pressure and cheating to get financial assistance claimed 13.9% (n= 5) each, culture of cheating having taken roots claimed 11.1% (n= 4) and the rest claiming less than 10% each.

The reasons for cheating in Table 4.9 were further categorized into five groups as shown in Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.10. Teachers’ responses on test variables. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Table 4.10 above shows that curricular factors claimed 45.12% (n= 37) of the responses, social
factors claimed 31.71% (n= 26), teachers’ practices with a claim of 12.2% (n= 10), peer pressure claiming 6.1% (n= 5) while neutralizing attitudes claimed the remaining 4.87% (n= 4) of the responses.

Chi-square Test

Chi-square test was used to test the hypothesis that the observed data are due to random variation and not by chance.

Table 4.11 below details the Chi-square test values for the students’ responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chi-square(a,b ,c,d,e,f,g,h,i)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>209.050</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177.508</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511.447</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>276.140</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.644</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What would make you cheat in an examination even when you know it is wrong to do so? Give the three main reasons.</th>
<th>Suggest ways that could help minimize cheating in examinations in your school.</th>
<th>Suggest ways that could help minimize cheating in examinations in your school.</th>
<th>Suggest ways that could help minimize cheating in examinations in your school.</th>
<th>Suggest ways that could help minimize cheating in examinations in your school.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63 447</td>
<td>281.950</td>
<td>132.170</td>
<td>96.972</td>
<td>12.389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11. Chi-square test statistics for students’ responses. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012)

Table 4.11 above shows that there is significant difference between the responses at 0.05 level of confidence and the responses are not due to chance.
Table 4.12 below details the Chi-square test values for the teachers’ responses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Asymp.sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On average how many cases of cheating in homework or class exercises do you detect in a week?</td>
<td>18.444</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do students report those who are cheating in exams?</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you feel there could be many other cases of cheating that are never reported?</td>
<td>25.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On average how many cheating cases during internal exams are normally reported in a term?</td>
<td>24.500</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What action is normally taken against the exam cheaters?</td>
<td>35.389</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do the actions taken in (12) above help to deter the students from cheating?</td>
<td>23.722</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many students in your school have been involved in exam cheating in KCSE in the last five years?</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many tests are used to grade and rank your students at the end of the term?</td>
<td>50.667</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much time in days do you give the students to prepare for important examinations?</td>
<td>21.667</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the major causes of cheating in examinations in your school?</td>
<td>136.198</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What strategies has your school put in place to curb the cheating behavior?</td>
<td>87.846</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 4.12 above shows that there is significant difference between the teachers’ responses at 0.05 level of confidence and the responses are not due to chance. However, it was noted that the number of cheating cases in KCSE among the sampled schools was less significant.

Hypotheses Test Results

From the above descriptive analysis results, the independent variable social factors was found to significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations. Hence we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that social factors significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations.

From the results, the independent variable curricular factors was also found to significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations. Hence we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that curricular factors significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations.
Similarly, the independent variable peer pressure was found to significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations. Hence we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that peer pressure significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations.

The independent variable teachers' practices was also found to significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations. Hence we reject the null hypothesis and conclude that teachers' practices significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations.

For the moderating variable neutralizing attitudes, the results were not significant. We do not have sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. We therefore conclude that neutralizing attitudes is not a significant moderator of cheating behavior in examinations.

4.7 Strategies for curbing cheating in examinations

When the students' and the teachers' respondents were asked to suggest ways in which cheating in examinations in their schools could be minimized they gave the following suggestions as detailed in Table 4.13 and Table 4.14 below.
Students’ suggestions on ways of minimizing cheating in examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category label</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Counts</th>
<th>Pct of responses</th>
<th>Pct of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Punish exam cheaters harshly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers to always supervise exams strictly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guide students on the vice of cheating</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to prepare well for exams</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide sufficient time for revision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure security of exam materials</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set quality tests</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure effective teaching and learning</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid ranking of students</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure early syllabus coverage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instill a culture of honesty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide clear rules on examinations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure no illegal materials get into Exam rooms</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure proper spacing of students during exams</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers to stop helping students cheat in exams</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and teachers avoid too much Demand on grades</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to avoid absenteeism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to have confidence on their work</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students to be frisked during exams</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total responses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>567</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>283.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0 missing cases; 200 valid cases

Table 4.13. Students’ suggestions on minimizing cheating. Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012).

Table 4.13 above shows that the most frequent strategies for minimizing cheating in examinations as suggested by the students were; teachers to always supervise examinations strictly with a claim of 55% (n=110) of the cases, punishing the examination cheaters harshly had a claim of 42.5% (n= 85), students preparing well for their examinations had a claim of 31% (n= 62), ensuring early syllabus coverage had a claim of 25% (n= 50), guiding students on the vice of cheating had a claim of 22.5% (n= 45), setting quality tests had a claim of 19.5% (n= 39), ensuring effective teaching and learning had a claim of 14% (n= 28) while providing sufficient time for revision to the students had a claim of 13% (n= 26).

Teachers’ suggested ways of minimizing cheating in examinations is detailed in Table 4.14 below
Table 4.14. Teachers’ suggestions on minimizing cheating in examinations.

Source: Researcher’s survey data (2012).

Table 4.14 above shows that the most frequent strategy for minimizing cheating is punishing the exam cheaters harshly with a claim of 55.6% (n= 20), ensuring strict supervision by teachers during examinations had a claim of 50.0% (n= 18), informing the students on the vices of cheating with a claim of 44.4% (n= 16). Ensuring no illegal materials get into the examination rooms had a claim of 19.4% (n= 7) while ensuring proper examination preparations and ensuring proper spacing of students during examinations had a claim of 11.1% (n= 4) each.

4.8 Other Findings from Crosstabulation results

When the variable ‘have you ever cheated in an examination’ was crosstabulated with ‘gender’ and Chi-square test calculated the Pearson chi-square value obtained was 2.145, with 2 (two)degrees of freedom and alpha at 0.05. This shows that there is no significant difference between female and male respondents. This means that no gender has preference to cheat.
Reporting cases of cheating in examinations among students versus gender had a Pearson chi-square value of 7.078 with six (6) degrees of freedom and alpha at 0.05. This shows that there is no significant difference between boys and girls in reporting cases of cheating in examinations.

Deterrent effect by the punishment given to exam cheaters was almost equal for both genders. The Pearson chi-square value was 1.985 with two (2) degrees of freedom and alpha at 0.05 showing no significant difference between the responses of the two genders.

It was further established that there was no significant difference between the responses across the ages. This means that cheating was independent of the age of the respondents. The Pearson chi-square value was 7.094 with 8 degrees of freedom and alpha at 0.05.

There was a significant difference between the responses of respondents from the different types of school. The Pearson chi-square value was 12.71 with 3 degrees of freedom and alpha at 0.05. The results showed that students in mixed day schools had a higher likelihood to cheat in an examination.

4.9 Summary of the chapter

The data instruments for students and teachers had a reliability coefficient of 0.70 and 0.9029073 respectively. The data collected was analyzed using descriptive analysis. It was established that social factors and teachers' practices had the greatest influence on the cheating behavior of students in examinations. Curricular factors had significant influence on the cheating behavior in
examinations. Peer pressure had a moderate influence on the cheating behavior in examinations. Neutralizing attitudes had the least influence on the cheating behavior and therefore not a significant moderator of the independent and dependent variables. The magnitude of the dependent variable which was measured by the cheating behavior in examinations was found to be moderately high for internal examinations, but low for the KCSE examinations.
5.0 Introduction

Based on the descriptive results presented in chapter four, this final chapter summarizes the findings of the study. It also has recommendations to policy makers, teachers, students, or any other concerned party. The final part of the chapter has suggestions for areas that need further study.

5.1 Summary of Research Findings

The purpose of the study was to identify the factors influencing cheating behavior on examinations among students in public secondary schools. Cheating in academia has a host of effects on the students, on teachers, on individual schools, and on educational system itself. Smith, Davy, and Easterling (2004) posits that students who in neutralization to justify cheating, even once, are more likely to engage in cheating in the future, potentially putting them on a road to a life of dishonesty. Attitude change towards cheating in examinations and establishment of a culture of honesty would be desirable as it would help to redeem the credibility of both the classroom and public national examinations which has always been undermined by prevalent cheating.

The specific objectives of the study were; firstly to establish whether social factors significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations among secondary students in Kilifi district. Secondly to establish whether curricular factors significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations. Thirdly to establish whether peer pressure significantly influence cheating
behavior in examinations. Fourthly to establish whether teachers’ practices significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations. Lastly to provide suggestions on ways of minimizing the problem of cheating in examinations.

Fifty four percent (54%) of the student sample were male while 46% were female. Sixty six point seven percent (66.7%) of the teachers’ sample were male and 33.3% female. Ninety three percent (93%) of students were teenagers and only 7% of them were 20 years and above. The mean age was 17.68 years. The mean age of the teachers sample was 38.31 years and a mean of 13.31 years of experience. Sample from mixed days made 39%, boys boarding 22.5%, mixed boarding and day 19.5%, while girls boarding made 19% of students respondents.

Forty two point five percent (42.5%) of the student respondents admitted that they had cheated in an examination. Of those who admitted having cheated only 23.5% of them said they were caught cheating and 76.5% were not caught. Eighty percent (80%) of those caught admitted that the punishment given deterred them from cheating again. Only 31% reported cheating cases in their classes with a mean of 0.65 numbers of times. Eighty two percent (82%) of the respondents had witnessed their classmates cheating in an examination. The mean number of times they witnessed classmate cheating was 3.91.

The dependent variable cheating behavior was operationalized as the number of cheating cases in examinations and in homework and class exercises. Ninety four point four percent (94.4%) of teachers’ sample said that students were cheating in examinations in their schools. The number of cheating cases detected per week in homework or class exercises was 4.39. In a term a mean of 6.0 cases of cheating are normally reported during internal examinations. Those who had
cheated in KCSE for the last five years had a mean of 1.86 cases. Sixty six point seven percent (66.7%) of teachers said that students do not report those cheating.

The independent variable social factors were established to be at 27.88%. It means that of the reasons given by the students on why they would cheat in an examination, 27.88% of them were social factors. Teachers' practices were established to be 26.87%. This means that of the reasons given for cheating 26.87% were related to teachers' practices. Curricular factors were established to be 21.42%. This means that of the reasons given for cheating 21.42% were related to the curriculum. Peer pressure was established to be 19.20% of the reasons given for cheating. Neutralizing attitudes were established to be 4.63% of all reasons given for cheating in examinations.

5.3 Discussion of the Findings

Fifty four percent (54%) of student respondents were male against 46% female. This was expected because more boys transit from primary school to secondary schools. Sixty six point seven percent (66.7%) of teachers' respondents were male against 33.3% female. Many female teachers were hesitant to participate in the filling of the questionnaire.

The mean age of the student respondents was 17.68 years with the majority (93%) being teenagers and therefore making a homogeneous group. The mean age of teachers was 38.31 years with a mean of 13.31 years of experience. This means that the schools had teachers with a great wealth of experience in the teaching profession.
Forty two point five percent (42.5%) of student respondents admitted having cheated in an examination. These results are consistent with the work of various studies done by other researchers. Dacoo (2002) notes that studies revealed that in the United States 56% of middle school students and 70% of high school students have cheated. On average the teachers detected 4 or 5 cases of cheating per week in homework or class exercises, 6 cases of cheating per term in internal examinations. The average number of cheating cases in KCSE for the last 5 years was 1.86 for the sample schools.

Of those who admitted having cheated 76.5% confessed were never caught. This means that the students have become so sophisticated in the art of cheating that they can beat all the systems set to prevent and detect the vice. It could also mean that the teachers are not effective in detecting and apprehending the cheaters. Eighty percent (80%) of the respondents agreed that the punishments given to the cheaters were effective in deterring them from cheating again. Eighty two percent (82%) had witnessed their classmates cheating, but only 31% of the respondents were ready to report their classmates who were cheating. Ninety four point four percent (94.4%) of teacher respondents confirmed that their students were cheating in examinations. The results indicates that the students were not willing to report their peers who were cheating.

5.2.1 Social factors

The most frequently cited reasons for cheating were social factors which made 27.88% of the student respondents with 31.71% of teacher respondents. Sixty nine percent (69%) of the respondents agreed that they would cheat in an examination if it helped them secure a university admission. These results were consistent with the studies done elsewhere. Gomez (2001) posits
that more than 35% of high and middle school students agreed with the statement “I would be willing to cheat on a test if it would help me get into college.” Fifty seven percent (57%) of student respondents agreed they would cheat if it helped to improve their performance, 55% would cheat to avoid the consequences of failing while 39% would cheat to impress their parents with improved results. Likewise this results were consistent with studies done in each decade over the last thirty years with “fear of failure”, and “parents demanding good grades” consistently being scored by students among the top reasons for cheating. A study done among junior and high school students in New York on what causes students to cheat revealed that the most prominent factors mentioned by students themselves in frank discussion are the pressure to succeed and peer pressure. Often without realizing it, parents and schools place enormous emphasis on “the bottom line” i.e. receiving high enough grades in order to go to the “right” high school or college. Social factors therefore significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations.

5.2.2 Teachers’ Practices

Teachers’ practices were found to significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations. They were the second most cited reasons for cheating with 26.87% of student respondents. For the teachers it was the third most cited reason for cheating with 12.2% of teachers’ respondents. Other studies shows that the rise of high-stakes testing and the consequences of the results on the teacher are cited as a reason why a teacher might want to inflate the results of their students.

Gibbs (1975) studies in deterrence theory indicate that as the risk of getting caught rises, the amount of cheating declines. The most salient factor in reducing cheating in Tittle and Rowe
(1974) study was the fear of getting caught and punished. This agrees with the results of this study with respondents suggesting that the cheaters should be punished harshly. The Kenya National Examination Council has recently introduced harsh penalty including a fine and a jail term for examination cheaters or those aiding the vice.

Evans and Craig (1990) in their study concluded that teachers’ attitudes and actions will affect cheating behavior in their classrooms. The study also stated that students believed that teachers who were unfriendly, boring or dull and have high expectations are more likely to encounter classroom cheating.

5.2.3 Curricular Factors

Curricular factors were found to significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations. These factors were ranked third by students with 21.42% of the respondents. Among the teachers they were ranked first with 45.12% of the respondents. Out of 200 student respondents, 67.5% said they would cheat if the syllabus was not well covered, 41.5% would cheat if examinations were meant for ranking and rewarding, 39.5% would cheat if too much work was covered in too short a time while 20.5% said would cheat if only one test was used for grading and ranking at the end of a term. These results are consistent with results of other studies. Jacqueline Grennon-Brooks (1993) saw a correlation between cheating and the type of curriculum. For many students, grades, class rank, and other rewards became more sought after than learning.

5.2.4 Peer Pressure

Peer pressure was also found to significantly influence cheating behavior in examinations. It was
ranked forth with 19.2% of the student respondents and 6.1% of teacher respondents. Thirty five percent (35%) admitted they would cheat if a friend was ready to help them with an answer. Thirty three percent (33%) would cheat if everybody else in class was cheating, 31.5% would cheat if a friend was in need of an answer and there was no danger of being caught. Twenty seven point five percent (27.5%) would cheat if they were in danger of failing the class while 24.5% would cheat if it helps to improve the mean score of their classes.

Akers (1985) developed a theory of deviant behavior which illustrated that rather than being influenced by the “threat of formal punishment from conventional society,” the deviant draws his/her support from a “primary group”. In other words, when they cheat, students have no difficulty finding support for their behavior.

5.2.5 Neutralizing attitudes

From the results of this study, the moderating variable which was neutralizing attitudes had little influence on the cheating behavior in examinations with only 4.63% of the student respondents. Twenty eight point five percent (28.5%) said they would cheat if there were no harsh punishment to those who cheat while 8.0% would cheat if their parents were willing to help them cheat. Philip Shon (2005) shows that many students justify cheating by framing the instructor as being unfair or difficult or the course as impossible to pass. In addition, “students ‘size up’ their teachers, testing their vigilance, and establishing the behavior parameters of permissible illicit action- how much they can get away with”.

5.2.6 Other Findings

The results of the study showed that there was no significant difference between boys and girls
on the cheating behavior in examinations. There was no significant difference across the students' age on the cheating behavior in examinations. This means that boys and girls across the ages had the same likelihood of cheating in an examination. There was no significant difference between boys and girls in reporting cases of cheating in examinations. The results showed that there was a significant difference between the type of school and the likelihood to cheat in an examination. Mixed day schools had a higher likelihood of cheating in an examination. For all the cases above, 95% level of confidence was used and maybe different results could be obtained when other levels of confidence are used. Further research could be carried on the relationship between cheating behavior in examinations with gender, age and the type of school.

5.3 Conclusions of the study

This research project was aimed at investigating the factors that influence the cheating behavior in examinations. Social factors, curricular factors, peer pressure and teachers' practices were the independent variables while neutralizing attitudes considered as the moderating variable. The point of interest was to establish which of the factors significantly influence the cheating behavior in examinations.

Firstly, the descriptive analysis showed that 54% of student respondents were male while 46% were female with a mean age of 17.68 years. For the teachers 66.7% were male and 33.3% were female with a mean age of 38.31 years and an average teaching experience of 13.31 years. On cheating behavior, 42.5% admitted they had cheated in an examination with 94.4% of the teachers reporting that their students were cheating. It was established that the students were not willing to report their classmates who were cheating in examinations. It was also established that many students were believed to be cheating undetected. Of those caught cheating, 75% admitted
that the punishment given deterred them from cheating again.

It was established from the students that social factors had the greatest influence in cheating behavior in examinations with 27.88% of the respondents. Teachers’ practices had the second greatest influence in cheating behavior with 26.87% of the respondents. Curricular factors were third in influencing the cheating behavior with 21.42% of the respondents. Peer pressure had the least influence among the four independent variables with 19.2% of the respondents. Neutralizing attitudes which was the moderating variable had only 4.6% of the respondents and therefore having little influence in cheating behavior which was a departure from the results of other researches.

In conclusion, the researcher is of the view that there are several other factors that influence the cheating behavior in examinations and which could also have great influence on cheating behavior.

5.4 Recommendations of the study

Alleviate excess competition among students in our schools by refocusing the educational process away from ranking and on to learning.

Adapting teaching methods which would make use of more student-centered learning, cooperative studies, alternative forms of assessment, and applications of knowledge.

Dewey, John (1916) said that a democratic society must have a type of education which gives individuals a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social change without introducing disorder.

Gary Pavela supports the notion of student participation in formulating an honor code. Such
balancing and sharing of authority is premised upon the assumption that control of academic
dishonesty will not be accomplished by threat of punishment alone. Ultimately, the most
effective deterrent will be a commitment to academic integrity within the student peer group.

Teachers play a crucial role in the prevention, detection and punishment of cheating. Classroom
management, teaching methodology, teacher vigilance, and enforcement are all crucial factors.

Students speak of the moral impact which various teachers have had on their lives. Adolescents
are inspired by the integrity of their teachers and they intuitively know when a teacher has
integrity.

5.5 Recommendations for Further Research

Future studies could be done to establish the strength of the factors influencing the cheating
behavior in examinations.

The study was limited to investigate only four factors influencing cheating behavior in
examinations keeping other factors constant. For future studies, it would be useful to include
other variables such as situational factors, cheating culture, motivational factors, gender, age
race, school management styles and so on.
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Appendix I: Letter of Introduction

Dear respondent,

My name is James M. Kariuki and I am an M.Ed student at the University of Nairobi. I am currently working on my thesis on Factors influencing cheating behavior in examinations among secondary school students in Kenya and in particular in Kilifi district under the supervision of Dr Levi. Your responses will be very helpful to me in compiling data for writing my thesis.

Please answer the questionnaires as accurately as you can. Be very honest. All the information given will be treated with the highest confidentiality and only used for the purpose of the study. In no way will any individual member be identified.

I pledge to share the results of the study with you if you so request. You can contact me at 0722566115 or my supervisor at 0722660576 if you have questions about the study or the questionnaire now or in future.

Best regards,

James M. Kariuki

Reg No. E58/74783/2009

University of Nairobi.
Dear Respondent

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. This questionnaire is intended to collect information on factors influencing the cheating behavior in examinations among secondary school students in Kilifi District. The information gathered will be used for research purposes only. Please assist by writing or by ticking in the appropriate line or code, respectively.

SECTION A: PERSONAL DETAILS

1. Student code number

2. What Form are you? __________________________


4. What is your age to the nearest year? _____________

5. Name of your school ________________________________________


SECTION B:

Among the many reasons that would make one to cheat in an examination, which of the listed reasons would make you to consider cheating in an important examination? Tick (✓) the ones that apply to you.
7. If it helps to improve my performance
8. If it helps to improve the mean score of my class
9. If it helps me to secure a university admission
10. If it helps me to impress my parents with improved results
11. If it helps me to avoid the consequences of failing an important exam.
12. If my parents are willing to help me cheat
13. If learning is not effective and relevant to me
14. If an examination is meant for ranking and rewarding
15. If only one test is used for the end of term grading and ranking
16. If there is some pressure from the teachers to perform well
17. If too much work was covered in too short a time
18. If the syllabus is not well covered
19. If I am in danger of failing the class
20. If everybody else in class is cheating
21. If a friend is ready to help me with an answer
22. If a friend is in need of an answer from me and I’m not in danger of being caught
23. If a teacher does not supervise his/her examination
24. If there is no harsh punishment to those who cheat
25. If a teacher is willing to assist in an important examination
26. If an area that was never taught is tested [ ]

27. Have you ever cheated in an examination? [1] Yes [0] No

28. If yes in (27), were you caught? [1] Yes [0] No

29. What punishment was given to you? ________________________________

30. Did the punishment deter you from cheating again?

31. How many times have you witnessed your classmates cheating in an examination? _____

32. How many times have you ever reported a case of exam cheating in your class? _____

33. What would make you cheat in an examination even when you know it is wrong to do so? Give the three main reasons.

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________
34. Suggest ways that could help minimize cheating in examinations in your school

Thank you
QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Respondent

Thank you for agreeing to take part in this study. This questionnaire is intended to collect information on factors influencing the cheating behavior in examinations among secondary school students in Kilifi District. The information gathered will be used for research purposes only. Please assist by writing or by ticking in the appropriate line or code, respectively.

SECTION A: Personal Data

1. Name of your school __________________________________________________________


4. What is your age? _________________

5. What is your teaching experience in years?_____________________


SECTION B:

7. Are there students who cheat in examinations in your school? [1] Yes  [0] No

8. On average how many cases of cheating in homework or class exercises do you detect in a week? ________________________________

9. Do students report those who are cheating in examinations?  [1] Yes  [0] No

10. Do you feel that there could be many other cases of cheating that are never reported?  
    [1] Yes  [0] No
11. On average how many cheating cases during internal examinations are normally reported in a term? ________________________________

12. What action is usually taken against the exam cheaters?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

13. To what extent do the actions taken in (12) above help to deter the students from cheating?


14. How many students in your school have been involved in examination cheating in KCSE for the last five years? ________________________________

15. How many tests are used to grade and rank your students at the end of the term in your school? ________________

16. How much time (in days) do you give the students to prepare for important examinations?

________________________________________________________________________

17. What are the major causes of examination cheating in your school?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
18. What strategies has your school put in place to curb the cheating behavior?


THANK YOU
18. What strategies has your school put in place to curb the cheating behavior?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU