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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study was to investigate the influence of parental educational background on students’ deviant behaviours in Federal universities in the south-south geopolitical zone of Nigeria. The design adopted for this study was the descriptive survey design. The main instrument used for data collection was the “Parental Educational Background on Deviant Behaviour Questionnaire (PEBDEBEQ)”. Multi-staged sampling technique was used in selecting the representative sample size of 1,524 students drawn from the population. Data were analyzed using One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The hypothesis was tested at 5% level of significance. The findings revealed that parents who are relatively higher in level of education tend to transmit discipline culture and values to their children and also they make the home environment favourable to their children by meeting their needs. Conclusion was that parental education influences the discipline behaviour of students. Based on the findings, it was recommended among others that both governmental and non-governmental organizations should be involved in non-formal education programmes that will enhance the educational level of parents.
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Introduction
Education is a crucial factor in the social, economic, political and technological development of a nation. The greatest asset of any society is her citizenry (who are members of the family institution). The quality of the citizens is considered to be proportional to some extent to the quality of their education. No nation can rise above the quality of its educated citizenry. The educational status of parents seems to have a way of influencing the behaviour of students. This is due to the crucial role parents play in the life of their wards. It is very difficult for illiterate parents to monitor the activities of their children on the social media. With the advent of the internet and latest development in information technology even educated parents are not finding it easy to operate the computer and the internet. Hence, the need for parents to be brought up to speed with the latest development in education and modern world.

A number of studies examined the influence of parental education on the behaviour of students. [1]Ekpo and Ajake (2013) carried out a study to investigate the influence of socio-economic status and educational level of parents on
delinquency among senior secondary school students in Calabar south, Cross River State, Nigeria. In the survey, the population was 2,640 senior secondary school students, using simple random sampling technique 600 students were drawn for the study; an independent t-test was employed for testing the hypothesis at .05 levels of significance for family socio-economic status and educational level of parents. ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses. The results showed that family socio-economic status and the educational level of parents significantly influenced students delinquency.

In another related study, [2] Machebe and Ifelunni (2014) conducted a study to investigate the Influence of parental socio-economic status on academic achievement of students in selected schools in Nigeria, a case study of Enugu State. A sample of 180 students was randomly selected from three secondary schools. Four factors examined and statistically analyzed were; parental socio-economic background, parental educational background, parental educational qualification and students’ health status. Results showed that parental socio-economic status and parental educational background did not have significant effect on the academic performance of the students.

Accordingly, [4] Ozurumba, Briggs, Ebuara and Emanche (2007) had critically examined the influence of parental education and students’ performance in educational statistics at Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja, Nigeria; the sample involved was 250 students randomly selected; a 47 item-questionnaire was used as instrument for data collection. Oral interview and practical observation were made as complementary tools. One null hypothesis was formulated and tested using independent t-test analysis. The result showed that, though parents’ level of education affects children’s academic performance, other variables such as school environment, facilities are also implicated.

In another study, [5] Igbo, Okafor, Rita and Eze (2014), investigated the influence of socio-economic background on self-concept and academic achievement of in-school adolescents in Anambra State, Nigeria; two research questions and two null hypotheses tested at .05 levels of significance guided the study; Ex-post facto design was used for the study. A sample of 300 senior secondary II students was randomly selected from 10 co-educational secondary schools. Instrument for the study was a questionnaire. Data generated from the respondents were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and ANOVA statistics. Result showed that, socio-economic background significantly influences self-concept and academic achievement of students. Self concept should in turn exert an influence on deviant behaviours.

[6] Desalegn and Berhan (2014) conducted a study to determine the prevalence of cheating and identify factors that influence cheating among students of Hawassa University College of Medicine and Health Science. A cross sectional study was conducted from May through June, 2013. The study included 1,366 full-time undergraduate students from a total of 1,732 undergraduate and postgraduate students; a pre-test self-administered, structured questionnaire was used to collect self-reported data regarding cheating. Bivariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses were used to assess associations. The results indicated that, there is no significant association between cheating and personal variables such as gender and parental education level. This results may have been due to the area of the study. The prevalence of cheating in those climes is thought to be lower than in Nigeria which in 2012 ranked second in examination malpractice in the world.

Ragai in [7] Okon (2008) studied certain factors in the home which could influence deviant behaviours among adolescents. He obtained his data by interviewing 408 mothers and 439 adolescents; ages between 14-15 years living in low income farming areas of Kentucky. By means of socio-economic scale, the 408 families were divided into 3 social status groups of equal numbers. The results revealed that mothers’ educational levels were related to adolescents’ disciplined behaviour.
In another study conducted by Kahikan (2009) in a low literacy district Kashmore of upper Singh, in Pakistan. 650 students were selected from 10 government founded schools. It was a survey study therefore questionnaire was considered appropriate research tool. Data were gathered on the influence of family variable such as socio-economic status, parental education level and family size on learners’ school outcomes which includes academic achievement and disciplined behaviour, findings indicates that parental level of education particularly mothers educational status is an important predictor of a child’s educational and behavioural outcome. The literature also suggests that parental educational status influences parents knowledge, beliefs, values, goals about child rearing, etc. so that a variety of parental behaviours are indirectly related to children’s school performance and behavioural dispositions.

From the literature reviewed some studies have shown a significant influence of parental educational status on students deviant behaviour while some have not. Some studies have shown that the mothers’ educational status may exert a greater influence on deviant behaviours than fathers’ educational status. It is important to investigate this phenomenon in our climes in other to be able to take measures to ensure that there is a decline in deviant behavior among our students.

Generally, the study seeks to assess the influence of parents’ educational background on deviant behaviours of Federal universities students in south- south Nigeria. The research question asked to guide the study is;

“‘To what extent does parental education status influence students’ deviant behaviours?”

Based on the specific objective and research question used, the null hypotheses put forth to guide the study was:

1. There is no significant influence of father educational status on students’ deviant behaviours.
2. There is no significant influence of mothers’ educational level on students’ deviant behaviours.

This study adopted a survey research design. The study area is South-South geo-political zone of Nigeria which comprises of six (6) states namely, Akwa Ibom, Bayelsa, Cross-River, Delta, Edo, and Rivers. The population of this study was 69,152 students (33,281 males and 35,871 females), 20,289, 17,139, 16,014 and 15,710 from the Universities of Benin, Calabar, Port Harcourt and Uyo respectively. A multi-stage sampling (made up of purposive, simple random, stratified and accidental processes) was adopted in selecting the sample of 1524 students.

The main instrument used for data collection in this study was a questionnaire titled ‘Parental Educational Background and Students’ Deviant Behaviour Questionnaire (PEBSDEBEQ). The 32 items instrument was constructed using four point Likert type scale to guide response. The content and face validity was ascertain by experts. To determine the reliability of the research instrument, a trial test was conducted using the Cronbach Coefficient Alpha procedure. The reliability estimates was 0.68. The instrument of data collection was administered with the help of some research assistants. At the end of the exercise, out of 1,524 copies of the questionnaire administered, only 1,491 were successfully completed and usable. The statistical analysis technique deployed to test the hypothesis was One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

The variables of the study and the variables about the respondents are in two categories; the ones as categorical variables, and the ones as continuous variables. The categorical variables are described with frequencies and percentages in Table 2. Analysis of results in Table 2 indicated that 48% of the respondents were males, and the remaining 52% were females. Majority of them (96%) were single, while 4% of them were married. On age, 52% were aged 17 – 22years, while 48% of them were aged 23 years and above. Concerning school attended, 29% of them were drawn from University of Benin, 27% from University of Calabar, 22% from University of Port Harcourt, and 22% from University of Uyo.

**Father educational status**

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant influence of father educational status on students’ deviant behaviours.

The independent variable in this hypothesis was fathers’ education level, which had four levels in this study, namely No formal education, First School Leaving Certificate/SSCE/TC II, Diploma/Nursing/B.sc, and Post-Graduate. The dependent variable in this hypothesis was students’ deviant behaviour, which had five dimensions in this study, namely sexually related deviant behaviour, assault/bullying, examination malpractice and truancy. The statistical analysis technique deployed to this hypothesis was One–way analysis of variance (ANOVA); the results of the analysis are presented in Tables 1 and 2. While the group sizes, mean values, and standard deviations were presented in Table 1, the actual results of ANOVA were presented in Table 2.
Table 1: Group sizes, means and standard deviations of respondents’ deviant behaviours based on their fathers’ educational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexually related deviant behaviour</td>
<td>1 (No formal educational)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.65</td>
<td>2.308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (FSLC, SSC, TC II)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>2.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>2.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Post Graduated)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.81</td>
<td>2.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>2.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault /bullying</td>
<td>1 (No formal educational)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.88</td>
<td>2.053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (FSLC, SSC, TC II)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>2.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>2.161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Post Graduated)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>2.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>1 (No formal educational)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>2.270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (FSLC, SSC, TC II)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>2.148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>9.53</td>
<td>2.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Post Graduated)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.54</td>
<td>2.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>2.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination malpractice</td>
<td>1 (No formal educational)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td>2.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (FSLC, SSC, TC II)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>1.991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>2.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Post Graduated)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>2.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>2.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>1 (No formal educational)</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>9.32</td>
<td>1.714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 (FSLC, SSC, TC II)</td>
<td>743</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 (Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>1.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 (Post Graduated)</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>2.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>1.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Analysis of variance of influence of father’s level of education on students’ deviant behaviour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Sig level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexually related deviant behaviour</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>15.883</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.294</td>
<td>1.102</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7144.412</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>4.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7160.295</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault/bullying</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>20.973</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.991</td>
<td>1.463</td>
<td>0.223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7106.988</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>4.779</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7127.961</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug abuse</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>7.944</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.648</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7039.614</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>4.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7047.559</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination malpractice</td>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>32.810</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.937</td>
<td>2.688</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>6049.594</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>4.068</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6082.404</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sizes, means and standard deviations of the four groups of respondents based on their fathers’ educational level are shown in Table 1. The comparison of the four group mean values on each of the sub-variables of deviant behaviours using ANOVA yielded F-value of 1.102, 1.463, 0.559, 2.688 and 3.172 respectively for sexually-related deviant behaviour, assault/bullying, drug abuse, examination malpractice and truancy as shown in Table 2. Of these five F-values, only the ones for examination malpractice (2.688) and truancy (3.172) are significant at .05 level (i.e. are higher than the critical F-value of 2.61). With these results, the null hypothesis was rejected in these two instances, but not rejected in the other three instances of sexually-related deviant behaviour, assault/bullying and drug abuse. This implies that fathers’ educational level had a significant influence on students’ deviant behaviours only in the aspects of examination malpractice and truancy; but it does not have significant influence on the aspects of sexually related deviant behaviour, assaults/bullying and drug abuse.

To further explore the pattern of significant influence of fathers’ educational level on the two aspects of students’ deviant behaviours, Fisher’s LSD post hoc multiple comparison tests was carried out, and the results of the analysis was presented in Table 3.

### Table 3: Fisher’s least significant difference (LSD), analysis of the significant influence of fathers’ educational level on students’ deviant behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Father’s educational level</th>
<th>No formal education (N=179)</th>
<th>FSLC/SSE (N=743)</th>
<th>Diploma/Degree (N=342)</th>
<th>Post-Graduate (N=227)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination Mal practice</td>
<td>No formed education</td>
<td>9.48*</td>
<td>-0.43b</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSLC/SSE</td>
<td>-2.56*</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma/degree</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post-graduate</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>9.32*</td>
<td>0.43b</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSLC/SSE</td>
<td>2.82*</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>diploma/degree</td>
<td>2.66*</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>8.87</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>9.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MSW= 4.068 | MSW= 3.359 |

a “– Group means are presented along the diagonal
b – Mean differences are presented above the diagonal
c – Fishers t- values are measured below the diagonal
* - t - value is sig. at .05 level (Critical t=1.96)”

Analysis results in Table 3 indicated that only the pair-wise comparison of students with fathers’ education level of no formal education and students with fathers’ education level of FSLC/SSE in their deviant behaviour of examination malpractice was significant. The level of examination malpractice exhibited by students’ fathers with FSLC/SSE (with mean= 9.91) was significantly higher than the examination malpractice exhibited by students’ whose fathers had no formal education (with mean= 9.48) (t= - 2.56, p< .05). All other pair-wise comparisons were not significant.
On truancy, only two pair-wise comparisons were significant. A significant t-value of 2.82 indicated that the level of truancy of students of fathers with no formal education was significantly higher than that of students of fathers with FSCC/SSE. Also, a significant t-value of 2.66 indicated that the level of truancy of students of fathers with no formal education was significantly higher than that of students of fathers with diploma or Bachelor’s degree. All other pair-wise comparisons were not significant.

Generally, the testing of the Hypothesis 1 revealed that fathers’ educational level had no significant influence on students’ deviant behaviour of sexually-related deviant behaviour, assault/bullying and drug abuse, but it had a significant influence on students’ deviant behaviours of examination malpractice and truancy, where students of fathers with no formal education were significantly different from students of fathers with FSLC/SSE. This constituted the answer to Research Question.

**Mother educational status**

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant influence of mothers’ educational level on students’ deviant behaviours.

The independent variable in this hypothesis was mothers’ education level, which had four levels in this study, namely No formal education, First School Leaving Certificate/SSCE/TC II, Diploma/Nursing/B.Sc, and Post-Graduate. The dependable variable in this hypothesis was students’ deviant behaviours, which had five dimensions in this study, namely sexually related deviant behaviour, assaults/bullying, examination malpractice and truancy. The statistical analysis technique deployed to this hypothesis was One–way analysis of variance (ANOVA); the results of the analysis are presented in Tables 4 and 5. While the group sizes, mean values, and standard deviations were presented in Table 4, the actual results of ANOVA were presented in Table 5.

**Table 4: Group sizes, means and standard deviations of respondents deviant behaviours based on their mothers’ education level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexually–related deviant</td>
<td>1(No formal education)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>2.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(FSLC/SSE, TCII)</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>9.83</td>
<td>2.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>9.95</td>
<td>2.249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(Post–Graduate)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>10.11</td>
<td>2.336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.89</td>
<td>2.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault/Bullying</td>
<td>1(No formal education)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>2.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(FSLC/SSE, TCII)</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>2.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>2.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(Post–Graduate)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9.59</td>
<td>2.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.82</td>
<td>2.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Abuse</td>
<td>1(No formal education)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.66</td>
<td>2.637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(FSLC/SSE, TCII)</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>9.57</td>
<td>2.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>9.63</td>
<td>2.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(Post–Graduate)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td>2.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.60</td>
<td>2.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination malpractice</td>
<td>1(No formal education)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>2.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(FSLC/SSE, TCII)</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>2.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>1.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(Post–Graduate)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>1.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>9.78</td>
<td>2.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>1(No formal education)</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>1.607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2(FSLC/SSE, TCII)</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>1.887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3(Diploma, NCE, B.Sc)</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>1.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4(Post–Graduate)</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>8.71</td>
<td>1.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>8.97</td>
<td>1.837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5: Analysis of variance of influence of mothers’ education level on students’ deviant behaviours**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F-Ratio</th>
<th>Sig. Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexually–related deviant</td>
<td>Between Group</td>
<td>12.949</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.316</td>
<td>.898</td>
<td>.442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Group</td>
<td>7147.346</td>
<td>1487</td>
<td>4.807</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sizes, means and standard deviations of the four groups of respondents based on their mothers’ educational level and shown in Table 19; the comparison of the four group mean values on each of the sub-variables of deviant behaviours using ANOVA yielded F-values of 0.0898, 1.674, 0.220, 0.5232 and 5.947 respectively for sexually-related deviant behaviour, assault/bullying, drug abuse, examination malpractice and truancy, as shown in Table 20. Of these five F-values, only the ones for examination malpractice (5.232) and truancy (5.947) were significant at .05 level (i.e. were higher than the critical F-value of 2.61). With these results, the null hypothesis was rejected in these two instances, but not rejected in the other three instances of sexually-related deviant behaviours, assault/bullying and drug abuse. This implies that mothers’ educational level had a significant influence on students’ deviant behaviours only in the aspect of examination malpractice and truancy; but it does not have significant influence in the aspects of sexually related deviant behaviours, assaults and drug abuse. To further explore the pattern of significant influence of mothers’ educational level on the two aspects of students’ deviant behaviour, “Fisher’s LSD post hoc multiple companion test was carried out, and the results of the analysis were presented in Table 21.”

Table 6: Fisher’s least significant difference (LSD), analysis of the significant influence of mothers’ educational level on student deviant behaviours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Father’s educational level</th>
<th>No formal Education (N=179)</th>
<th>FSLC/SSE (N=743)</th>
<th>Diploma/Degree (N=342)</th>
<th>Post-Graduate (N=227)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examination Malpractice</td>
<td>No formed education</td>
<td>9.58*</td>
<td>-0.14b</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSLC/SSE</td>
<td>-0.63c</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma/Degree</td>
<td>-2.69*</td>
<td>-3.66*</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post-graduate</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>3.26*</td>
<td>9.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSW= 4.048</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truancy</td>
<td>No formal education</td>
<td>8.61*</td>
<td>-0.50*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FSLC/SSE</td>
<td>-2.47*</td>
<td>9.10</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>- 0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diploma/Degree</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>3.08*</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>- 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>2.64*</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>8.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MSW=3.340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. – group mean are presented along the diagonal
b. – mean differences are presented above the diagonal
c. – fishers t- values are measured below the diagonal
The pair-wise comparison results in Table 21 indicated that on examination malpractice, students’ of mothers with Diploma/Degree (mean=10.27) were significantly more deviant in terms of examination malpractice than students of mothers with no formal education (t=-2.69, p<.05), than those of mothers with FSLC/SSE (t=3.66, p<.05), and than those of mothers’ with Diploma/Degree (t=3.26; p<.05). On truancy, Table 21 showed that students mothers with FSLC/SSE (with mean =9.10) are significantly more truant than:

a. Students of mothers with no formal education (t=2.47; p<.05),
b. Students of mothers with Diploma/Degree, and
c. Students of mothers with Post–Graduate qualifications.

Generally, the testing of Hypothesis 2 had shown that mothers’ education level had no significant influence on students’ deviant behaviours in the aspects of sexually-related deviant behaviour, assault/bullying and drug abuse, but it had a significant influence on students’ deviant behaviours of examination malpractice and truancy where students of mothers with diploma/degree and students of mothers with FSLC/SSC were significantly different from other students in the aspects of examination malpractice and truancy, respectively.

The findings from hypothesis 1 showed that fathers educational status had no significant influence on students deviant behavior on sexually related deviant behavior, assault or bullying and drug abuse; but it had a significant influence on students’ deviant behavior of examination malpractice and truancy where students of father with no formal education were significantly different from students of father with FSLC/SSE. The level of examination malpractice exhibited by students whose fathers have FSLC/SSE was significantly higher than the examination malpractice exhibited by students whose fathers have no formal education other pair-wise comparisons were not significant.

On truancy, only two pair–wise comparisons were significant. Results indicated that the level of truancy of students of fathers with no formal education was significantly higher than that of students of fathers with FSCC/SSE. Also, the level of truancy of students of fathers with no formal education was significantly higher than that of students of fathers with diploma or Bachelor’s degree. All other pair-wise comparisons were not significant.

Again the testing of hypothesis 2 showed that mothers educational level had no significant influence on students’ deviant behavior in the aspects of sexually–related deviant behavior assault and bullying and drug abuse but it had a significant influence on students’ deviant behavior of examination malpractice and truancy where student of mothers with diploma/ degree, and students of mothers with FSLC/SSE were significantly different from other student in the aspects of examination and truancy respectively. On examination malpractice, students’ of mothers with Diploma/Degree were significantly more deviant in terms of examination malpractice than students of mothers with no formal education, than those of mothers with FSLC/SSE, and than those of mothers’ with Diploma/Degree. On truancy, Table 21 showed that students mothers with FSLC/SSE are significantly more truant than other students in examination malpractice and truancy, respectively.

This implied that for both mothers’ and fathers’ educational levels influence on students’ deviant behavior are the same, as such the null hypothesis was upheld in the instance of sexually related deviant behavior, assault or bullying and drug abuse but it was rejected in two cases of examination malpractice and truancy. Thus, parental background had no influence on students deviant behavior as it concern sexually related deviant behavior assault or bullying but do influence deviant behavior in terms of examination malpractice and truancy respectively.

Specifically, the independent variable; fathers’ educational level was dichotomised into four levels: No formal education, First School Living Certificate (FSLC)/Teachers’ college (TCII), NCE/Diploma/Nursing/B.Sc and Post Graduate certificates. While the dependent variable deviant behaviour was categorised into five dimensions in this study, namely; sexually related deviant behaviour, assault/bullying, examination malpractice, drug abuse and truancy.

The finding in this study was in accordance with a number of studies which examined the influence of parental education on the behavior of students. For instance, [1]Ekpo and Ajake (2013) carried out a study to investigate the influence of socio-economic status and educational level of parents on delinquency. The results showed that family socio-economic status and the educational level of parents significantly influenced students’ delinquency. Similarly, Machebe and Ifelunni (2014) conducted a study to investigate the “Influence of parental educational and socio-economic status on students’ academic achievement. Results showed that parental socio-economic status and

* t - Value is sig at.05 level (critical t=1.96)
parental educational background did not have a significant effect on the academic performance of the students. In agreement, [6]Desalegn and Berhan (2014) conducted a study to determine the prevalence of cheating and identify factors that influence cheating. The results indicated that, the study didn’t show a significant association between cheating and personal variables (gender and parental education level).

In consonance, [3]Akinsanya, Ajayi and Salomi (2011) examined the relative effect of parents’ occupation, qualification and academic motivation of wards on students’ academics. The results suggested that parents’ education had the highest significant influence on the academic achievement of students in mathematics.

Accordingly, [4]Ozurumba, Briggs, Ebuara and Emanghe (2007) had critically examined the influence of parental education and students’ academic performance. The result showed that, though parents’ level of education affects children’s academic performance, other variables such as school environment, facilities are also implicated. In another related study, [5]Igbo, Okafor, Rita and Eze (2014) investigated the influence of socio-economic background on self-concept and academic achievement of in-school adolescents in Anambra State, Nigeria. Result showed that socio-economic background significantly influences self-concept and academic achievement of students. Similarly Ragai in [7]Okon (2008) studied certain factors in the home which could influence deviant behaviors among adolescents. The results revealed that mothers’ educational levels were related to adolescents’ disciplined behavior.

Other related studies averred there was no significant influence of parental educational background on students’ deviant behavior. In this aspect, [9]Dubow, Boxer and Huesmann (2009) examined the effects of students’ family background on students’ deviant behaviour among students from high and low socio-economic status and literate parents, his findings averred that there was a significant difference between the rates of deviant behaviour between children from high and low economic background and literate or illiterate parents. This finding suggested that students whose one or both parents were literates and consequently from higher economic status were more disciplined compared with those from low economic background.

Kahikan (2009) findings indicates that parental level of education particularly mothers educational status was an important predictor of a child’s educational and behavioural outcome. This was a confirmation of the findings of this study which speculated that parental educational level influence students’ deviant behavior in two cases of examination malpractice and truancy. The reason could be that parental educational status is an embodiment of parents’ knowledge, beliefs, values, desires, abilities and goals about child rearing which are both directly and indirectly related to students’ behavioral dispositions.

The literature also suggested that parental educational status influences parents’ knowledge, beliefs, values and goals about child rearing practices which is associated with a variety of parental behaviours and are indirectly related to students’ behavioural disposition. Furthermore, the findings of this study were also in line with the views of [5]Igbo et al. (2014), [3]Akinsanya et al. (2011) and [4]Ozurumba et al. (2007) who assert that the level of parents’ education where related to the disciplined behaviour of students. So also, [9]Dubow et al. (2009) and [8]Kahikan (2009) who having examined the effect of students’ background on student’s deviant behaviour and the findings in their separate studies are averred that students whose one or both parents are literate were more disciplined compared to children whose parents were illiterate.

The current literature reports that most researchers are of the opinion, that parents who are relatively higher in levels of education tends to transmit disciplined culture and values to their children and the make the home environment favourable for their children by meeting their needs. (Eteng, 2015). Conclusion was drawn that parental education influences the discipline behaviour of students. Based on this findings the following were made:

1. Both government and non-governmental organizations should be involve in non-formal education of parents; that will enhance the ability of parents to step up and update themselves with means of controlling their children behaviour with the invent of information technology in today’s world.
2. Non-formal education should be made free to encourage illiterate parent who cannot avoid the cost for formal education.
3. Educational institution should organize seminars, lectures and symposia from time to time for adult members of the community where the school are located, this will help the illiterate inhabitants to upgrade their knowledge in Information Technology and vital knowledge on deviant control mechanism.
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