

THE IMPACT OF HOME ENVIRONMENT FACTORS ON ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE OF SENIOR SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN GARKI AREA DISTRICT, ABUJA –NIGERIA

Linus Terry DZEVER

University of Ibadan, NIGERIA

Abstract. The study examined the impact of home environment factors on the academic performance of public secondary school students in Garki Area District, Abuja, Nigeria. The stratified sampling technique was used to select 300 students from six public schools, while the simple random sampling technique was used to administer the questionnaire. The study utilized a descriptive survey research design for the study. Also, data on student's academic performance was obtained from student's scores in four selected school subjects. Data obtained was analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistical techniques; Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Multiple regression analysis (ANOVA). The results result revealed a positive and significant relationship between permissive parenting style with academic performance ($p < 0.05$). However, no relationship exists between authoritarian parenting and demanding parenting with academic performance of students ($p > 0.05$). Also, the result from the study identified income, educational background and occu-

pational level as well as permissive parenting style as the main predictive variables influencing students' academic performance.

Keywords: academic performance, home environment factors, parenting styles, parents' socio-economic background

Introduction

Education, in its broadest sense, is a process designed to inculcate knowledge, skills and attitudes necessary to enable individuals to cope effectively with their environment. Its primary purpose is to foster and promote the fullest individual self-realization for all people. It is indispensable to normal living, without education the individual would be unqualified for group life.¹⁾According to Aremu (2000), education is the process of developing the capacities and potentials of the individuals as to prepare that individual to be successful in a specific society or culture. Notably, it is often said to be the powerful tool for developing intellectual abilities, shaping cultural attributes, acquiring knowledge and skills as well as a favourable tool to move a nation towards developing its scientific and technological culture. Achieving this goal requires understanding of commitment to the proposition that education is a primary instrument for social and economic advancement of human welfare (Verma, 1997). From this perspective, education is serving primarily as an individual development function.

Academic performance refers to the level of performance in school, accomplishment or success in school". However, academic performance is the core of educational growth (Aremu & Oluwole, 2001). Jansen (2004) defined academic performance as the process of developing the capacities and potentials of the individual student so as to prepare that individual to be successful in a specific society or culture. From this perspective, education is serving primarily as an individual development functions. It is important to keep in mind that academic performance may largely be a function of the context in

which it takes place, and therefore the necessary abilities may also vary according to the context. In this regard it may be concluded that the concept, meaning and criteria of academic success may also vary according to the context in which it is found.

The educational system is vital for every country in the world and Nigeria is no exception; a strong and effective education system can help boost the development of any country, as academic performance in Nigeria most especially at the secondary school level has been largely associated with many factors in literature. These include; school environment, lack of learning resources as well as home environment factors (Adeagbe, 2004; Aremu & Oluwole, 2001). Padilla & Gonzalez (2001) and Aremu & Sokan (2003) also reported tremendous academic failures among students and some have tried to find the reasons behind the alarming rate of failures. Thus, the problem of under-achievement of students' at school has a long history in educational psychological research. Consequently, improving student academic achievement had long been an extremely complicated and vexing problem for school systems and education policy makers. Among the many efforts aimed to improve student's achievement are two quite different approaches, each with deep historical roots.

The prevalence of poor academic performance seems to have increased over the last two decades been estimated at close to 11.3% in a general school population (Burtless, 1996). In Nigeria, the estimation of the intensity of under-performance is clear as many inhibitory factors may be involved, as it is observed that the level of academic under-achievement is influenced by the presence of other academic inhibitory factors. This is because being successful in academics could be consequent on being regular and doing assignments on time. For instance, the latest results of the West African Examination Council²⁾ showed that only 62, 295 of the 310, 077 candidates (20.04 percent) passed with credit in five subjects including Eng-

lish/mathematics.³⁾ There is further revealed that, a total of 529,425 candidates, representing 31.28 percent, obtained credits in five subjects and above, including English Language and Mathematics. It is noted that when compared to the 2011, 2012 and 2013 May/June WASSCE results, there was marginal decline in the performance of candidates as 30.70 percent was recorded in 2011, 38.81 percent in 2012 and 36.57 percent in 2013. According to him, out of 1,692,435 candidates that sat for the examination, 791,227 candidates, representing 46.75 percent, obtained six credits and above, just as a total of 982,472 candidates representing 58.05 percent, obtained five credits and above. In addition, he stated that 1,148,262 candidates, representing 67.84 percent, obtained credits and above in four subjects, while 1,293,389 candidates, representing 76.42 percent, obtained credits and above in three subjects.³⁾

Literature review

The home environment is considered a powerful influence on the child. A home environment is viewed as consequential for child developmental outcomes such as cognitive ability, school readiness, academic achievement and emotional adjustment (Fantuzzo et al., 2000). Historically, examinations of the influence of home environments on developmental outcomes have focused on distal variables as the primary measures of home experience, such as the family income, parents educational level, parents occupational status, parental involvement and parenting styles of (authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting styles). For researchers, Ekanem (2004), Collins (2007), framing their investigations of the influence of children's home environments from an ecological perspective, however, the primary focus on static, contextual settings and variables omits the possibility of examining the dynamic influence of process variables that are found in the child's context of the home setting.

The academic performance of any child cannot be separated from the home environment in which the child grows up (Fantuzzo et al., 2000). Numerous studies revealed that various factors are responsible for scholastic failure of students, such as low socio-economic background, student's cognitive abilities, school related factors, environment of the home, or the support given by the parents and other family members (Khan & Malik, 1999; Fan, 2001; Gonzalez-Pienda et al., 2002). Parental socioeconomic characteristics to a greater extent determine student's performance in school and their adjustment to life (Aikens et al., 2008). Family financial resources, which are associated with parents' occupation and educational attainment, often imply increased learning opportunities both at home and in school. Indeed, family background is the foundation for children's development, as such family background in terms of family type, size, socio-economic status and educational background play important role in children's educational attainment and social integration (Ushie et al., 2012). The home has a great influence on the child's psychological, emotional, social and economic state. In the view of Ajila & Olutola (2000), the home affects the individual since the parents are the first socializing agents in an individual's life.

Socio-economic background may affect learning outcomes in numerous ways. For example, parents with higher socio-economic status are able to provide their children with the (often necessary) financial support and home resources for individual learning (Asikhia, 2010). They are also more likely to provide a more stimulating environment to promote cognitive development. At the level of educational providers, students from high-SES families are also more likely to attend better schools, in particular in countries with differentiated (or "tracked") educational systems, strong segregation in the school system according to neighbourhood factors and/or clear advantages of private over public schooling (Schulz, 2005). Asikhia (2010) further opines that par-

ents' socio-status could be defined more objectively by using such indices as occupation, income and education.

Chen (2009) also studied the effects of family background, students' abilities and achievement in rural China. He found that parental education is key determinants of students' academic achievement, but the roles of father's education and mother's education differ across child gender and levels of ability. For example, father's education has significantly positive effect on academic achievements for both boys and girls, while mother's education only matters for girls. The effect of father's education matters for lower ability children, while mother's education matters for higher ability children (Chen, 2009). UNESCO⁴⁾ alleged that family characteristics are a major source of disparity in students' educational outcomes. More family financial resources, which are associated with parents' occupation and educational attainment, often imply increased learning opportunities both at home and in school. Better-educated parents can contribute to their children's learning through their day-to-day interactions with their children and involving themselves in their children's school work. Parents with higher occupational status and educational attainment may also have higher aspirations and expectations for their children's occupation and education, which in turn can influence their commitment to learning.

According to Caro (2009), socio-economic status (SES) of parents is an important explanatory factor that influences students overall performance in school, as students who have low SES earn lower test scores and are more likely to drop out of school. Low SES negatively affects academic performance because it prevents access to vital resources and creates additional stress at home. Similarly, parent's level of education has a proven influence on students' academic achievement (Maicibi, 2005). Educated parents are more likely to use complex language and a wider vocabulary with their young children (Penny, 2001). Parents with lower levels of education are less likely to

have high expectations for the children's academic careers. Parents with more education are more likely to get involved in the school. Better-educated parents are familiar with how schools work and are likely comfortable with school structure (Penny, 2001). Kundu & Tutoo (2000) also asserts that parents' level of education influences students' motivation and performance in the sense that educated parents value education and they tend to encourage their children to value and actively engage in receiving education. Higher occupational level of parents indicates better economic condition and this results in material support for the education of their children (Vickers, 1994). Hobson (1990) in the course of his investigation found that parents of higher academic achievers practice more professional, administrative and clerical occupations, while the parents of the under-achievers pursued occupations such as trades; production work and semi-skilled and unskilled occupations. Escarce (2003) maintains that most under-achievers come from the lower- socio-economic levels of the home-environment and that the psychosocial encouragement here contributes very little towards improving the intellect.

Parenting has been recognized as a major agent in socializing adolescents (Utti, 2006). Okpako (2004) defined parenting as the act of parenthood, the child upbringing, training, rearing as well as education. Parenting styles according to Baumrind (1991) is a stable complex of attitudes and beliefs. Parenting styles and academic performance have been studied primarily in children and adolescents. Demanding parenting requires adolescents to be responsive to parental rules and requests while also assuming the parental responsibility of responsiveness to adolescent's needs and points of view (Maccoby, 2000). Studies by Baumrind (1991; 2005) reported positive associations between demanding parenting style and academic performance. For example, Baumrind (1991) found that children (ages 10-15 years old) of parents who were characterized as demanding were the most motivated, the most competent, and the most achievement oriented. In addition, Baumrind & Black

(1967) found that demanding parenting was positively associated with academic performance; and authoritarian and permissive parenting were negatively associated with grades.

The success of demanding parenting is most notable in the various behavioural indicators exhibited by their children. According to Miller (1995), children raised by demanding or authoritative parents are often focused on achievement for personal, internal reasons, not to please their parents. Students of demanding parents have shown such values as a “stronger work orientation, greater engagement in classroom activities, higher educational aspirations, more positive feelings about school, greater time spent on homework, more positive academic self-conceptions, and lower levels of school misconduct, such as cheating or copying” (Steinberg et al., 1992). Therefore, the supportiveness and encouragement employed within the demanding parenting style eventually “provides their children with a sense of initiative and confidence in relation to learning” (Rogers et al., 2009), paving the way for academic success.

Regarding the associations between parenting style and academic performance, parents who are often described as “controlling” or “authoritarian,” have typically been found to predict poor academic achievement (Chao, 2001). Empirical studies showed that children with authoritarian parents tended to exhibit anxious and withdrawn behaviours, lack self-reliance, rely on authority figures to make decisions, diminishing their sense of personal value and responsibility. Additionally, the high level of parental pressure incorporated within the authoritarian style can often reduce children’s intrinsic motivation, causing them to be reliant on extrinsic sources, thus undermining the process of learning (Grolnick, 2003). These types of behaviours often trigger poor communication skills (Verenikina et al., 2011), an essential component predictor of future success. In fact, Brown & Iyengar (2008) have found that this overemphasis may, in fact, alienate children. Placing excessive pres-

sure on children and interfering with their studies may lead to children having lower academic competence and, consequently, lower academic achievement.

Permissive parenting on the other end of the spectrum is characterised by little control over children, aiming for high levels of warmth but undemanding. They are indulgent and passive in their parenting and believe that the way to demonstrate their love is to give their children wishes. Unlike authoritarian parents, punishment is very rarely used in permissive homes and children are commonly given greater opportunity to make their own decisions in life (Kang & Moore, 2011). Being more responsive than demanding, parents of this style have relatively low expectations for their children, setting very few, if any, rules. They often take a very casual and easy-going approach (Verenikina et al., 2011) toward their children, opening up conversations and subsequently developing warmer relationships between them. Despite the high provision of warmth, children raised by permissive parents are less likely to be intrinsically motivated, thus lacking persistence in approaching learning tasks (Kang & Moore, 2011).

Research questions

(1) What is the significant relationship between authoritarian parenting style, demanding parenting style and permissive parenting style with academic performance of college students; (2) Is there any joint influence of parenting styles on academic outcomes of college students; (3) Would there be any influence of authoritarian parenting style, demanding parenting style and permissive parenting style on academic performance of college students.

Hypotheses

H₀₁: Parents income does not have significant effect on the academic performance of students.

H₀₂: Parental educational background has no significant effect on students' academic performance

H03: Parental occupation has no significant effect on the academic performance of students

Materials and methods

This research is a descriptive survey research design using an ex-post facto type. A survey study usually deals with the description and analysis of status of an area. It attempts to describe what exists now and explain why certain situations exist as well as focuses on the characteristics of the population by studying representative sample.

Participants

The participants for this study were all registered secondary school students in Garki Area District, Federal Capital Territory - Abuja, Nigeria. The study was delimited to only 300 secondary school students in Garki area district. In order to represent adequate sample, 50 students were selected using a simple random sampling technique, a representative of six (6) secondary schools.

Measuring instruments

Socio-economic status scale (SESS)

The parents socio-economic status of adolescents' was measured by socioeconomic status (SES) developed by Salami (2000). It was developed to measure the educational, occupational and social status of the adolescents'. The items in the scale requested for data of the participants also. These items included parents' occupational (10 marks), parents level of education (12 marks), parents residence (5 marks), parents possession of necessary and luxury items (29 marks) giving the total of fifty marks maximum score of 56. All these were summarized to indicate the participants' family socio-economic background as being high, or low. The highest score obtainable is 56 while the least is 6. The test-retest reliability of the scale was .73 with an interval of

three weeks. The instrument was validated by correlating the socio-economic status scale by Ipaye (1977). The correlation obtained between their scores on the two instruments was 0.64. This is an indication of a fairly high construct validity of the present instrument.

Parenting styles inventory (PSI-II)

Parenting style: To assess parenting style, the Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II), was administered (Darling & Toyokawa, 1997). The 15-items Parenting Style Inventory consists of three subscales: Demandingness (degree to which parents have expectations and standards they expect their child to fulfill), Responsiveness (degree of emotional sensitivity and responsiveness), Autonomy granting or permissiveness (degree to which parents allow and encourage their children to develop their own ideas, beliefs, and point of view). Participants responded to each item following the prompt ‘How much do you agree or disagree with this sentence?’ using a 5-point likert – type scale (1 = ‘strongly disagree’ to 5 = ‘strongly agree’). The coefficient alpha of responsiveness ($\alpha = .82$), autonomy granting or permissiveness ($\alpha = .75$) and demandingness ($\alpha = .72$), respectively.

Academic performance

Academic performance is measured through Academic performance scores. It is usually defined in two ways - the grades earned in school and score achieved on standardized tests of academic performance and achievement. For this study, academic performance of student was obtained from their scores in four selected subjects of English, Mathematics, Economics and Biology examinations of first term for the 2013/2014 academic session. The scores in four subjects were then converted to Z-scores to ensure their reliability and validity since they were obtained from different secondary schools, the Cronbach’s alpha was 0.94.

Data collection and procedure

The researcher personally administered the instruments following the approval by relevant authorities. The researcher explains how each section of the questionnaire should be filled. Questionnaires were preferred because of number of respondents, cost and the nature of the topic which had both quantitative and qualitative data (Kothari, 2004) self-administered were also preferred because they were easy to fill by the participants. They kept the respondents on the subject, they were respectively objective and were fairly easy to make frequent counts and it was the easiest means of reaching respondents and obtaining desired information in the limited time available. The participants' were adequately informed of confidentiality and the need to be precise and truthful in filing the questionnaire. The questionnaires were then filled and returned by the participants for data analysis.

Analysis

The major statistical too in this study were the Pearson product moment correlation (PPMC) and multiple regression analysis (ANOVA) to ascertain the patterns of relationship and the contribution of the independent variables on Students' Academic performance. In each case, the level of significance set is 0.05.

Results

Question 1: Is there any significant relationship between parenting styles (authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting style) and the academic performance of students?

The Table 1 showed Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient (r) that there is significant relationship between parenting styles with academic performance of secondary school students in Ibadan Metropolis. The level

of relationship is as follows; Authoritarian parenting styles ($r=0.241^{**}$, $P<0.05$), demanding parenting style ($r=0.410^{**}$, $P<0.05$), Permissive parenting style ($r=0.161^{**}$, $P<0.05$), P was lesser than 0.05 level of significance. That is, there is a significant relationship between the three dimensions of parenting styles and academic performance of secondary school students.

Table 1. Correlation between parenting styles and academic performance

Variables	\bar{X}	S.D	1	2	3	4	P	Remark
Academic performance	50.11	13.339	-					
Authoritarian	17.03	3.102	.241**	-			.005	Sig
Demanding	18.79	3.198	.410**	.120*	-		.005	Sig
Permissive parenting style	15.89	3.010	.161**	.297**	.323**	-	.005	Sig

Sig. at * $P<0.01$; ** $P<0.05$ level

Question 2: What is the composite effect of parenting styles (authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting style) on the academic performance of students?

Table 2. Summary of regression analysis of the combined prediction of each of the independent variables on the dependent variable

.R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
0.196	0.039	0.029	13.145

SUMMARY REGRESSION ANOVA

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	P	Remark
Regression	2052.435	3	684.145	3.959	0.009	Sig.
Residual	51146.152	296	172.791			
Total	53198.587	299				

Table 2 showed that the prediction of the three independent variables (authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting style) on the students' academic performance. That is, students' academic performance corre-

lated positively with the three predictor variables (authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting style). The table also shows a coefficient of multiple correlations (R) of 0.196 and a multiple R square of 0.039. This means that 2.9% (Adj. $R^2=0.029$) of the variance in the student's academic performance of the respondents is accounted for by the three predictor variables, when taken together. The significance of the composite contribution was tested at $p<0.05$ using the F- ratio at the degree of freedom ($df = 3/296$). The table also shows that the analysis of variance for the regression yielded a F-ratio of 3.959 (significant at 0.05 level). This implies that the joint contribution of the independent variables to the dependent variable was significant and that other variables not included in this model may have accounted for the remaining variance.

Question 3: What is the relative contribution of each of the independent variables of parenting styles (authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting style) on the academic performance of students?

Table 3. Relative contribution of the independent variables to the dependent variables (Test of significance of the regression coefficients)

Variable	Unstandardized Coefficients (B)		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Remark
	(B)	Std. Error	Beta			
Constant(Academic performance)	52.731	6.091	-	8.657	0.000	
Authoritarian	.414	.257	.096	1.611	0.108	Not sig
Demanding	.276	.251	.066	1.099	0.273	Not Sig.
Permissive	-.935	.278	-.211	-3.368	0.001	Sig

Table 3 reveals the relative contribution of the three independent variables to the dependent variable, expressed as beta weights. The correlation coefficients of permissive parental style have relationship with the student's academic performance. The effects of permissive parental style was actually

determined the reinforcement of these three variables; using the standardized regression coefficient to determine the relative contributions of the independent variables on academic performance of students'. Permissive parental style ($\beta = -0.211$, $t = -3.368$, $p < 0.05$) is the most potent contributor of poor academic performance of students followed by Authoritarian parenting at ($\beta = 0.096$, $t = 1.611$, $p > 0.05$), and demanding parenting style at ($\beta = 0.066$, $t = 1.099$, $p > 0.05$), in that order.

Hypotheses

H₀₁: Parents Income does not have significant effect on the academic performance of students

Table 4. (ANOVA): showing the difference between the parent's income and student's academic performance

Parents Income	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-cal	P	Remark
10,000-20,000	95	45.20	19.63	5433.138	5	1086.628	3.704	<0.05	Sig.
20,001-40,000	82	47.78	14.93	86248.099	294	293.361			
40,001-80,000	50	49.22	16.12	91681.237	299				
80,001-100,000	26	51.08	19.06						
101,000-150,000	38	57.24	14.28						
Above 150,001	9	60.78	17.85						
Total	300								

F=3.704, df = 5/299, P< .05

Above Table 4 presents the ANOVA analysis showed that parents income have significant effect on the academic performance. The result revealed six differences means values. Parents income range of above N150,000 has value means of 60.78, follows by parents income range of N101,000 to 150,000 has value means of 57.24, and Parents income range of N80,001

to 100,000 has value means of 51.08, while Parents income range of N40,001 to 80,000 has value means of 49.22, while Parents income range of N20,001 to 40,000 has value means of 47.78, and Parents income range of N10,001 to 20,000 has value means of 45.20. Therefore, it can be concluded that there was a significant effect between parents Income and Students Academic performance at ($F_{(5/294)} = 3.704, P < 0.05$). The result does not give support to the hypothesis. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and accepts alternative hypothesis. That is, parents' income has significant effect on the academic performance of students.

Ho2: Parent's educational background has no significant effect on the students' academic performance.

Table 5. (ANOVA) showing the difference between the parent's educational background and student's academic performance

Education Background	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-cal	P	Remark
No schooling	22	56.00	20.274	6545.272	7	935.039	3.207	<0.05	Sig.
Elementary School	98	45.96	15.660	85135.965	292	291.562			
Professional training	49	49.90	18.399	91681.237	299				
Diploma/OND	16	49.13	6.712						
NCE	26	54.88	10.727						
HND/Degree	44	45.07	21.835						
Master Degree	41	49.80	17.515						
Doctorate Degree	4	76.00	6.928						
Total	300								

$F=3.207, df = 75/299, P < .05$

Above Table 5 presents the ANOVA analysis showed that parents educational background have significant effect on the academic performance. The result revealed seven differences means values. Doctorate degree has value means of 76.00, follows by No schooling has value means of 56.00, and NCE has value means of 54.88, Professional training has mean value of 49.90, while Master degree has value means of 49.80, and Diploma/OND has value

means of 49.13, and Elementary school has value means of 45.96 and HND/First degree has value means of 45.07 and. Therefore, it can be concluded that there was a significant effect between parents educational background and Students Academic performance at ($F_{(7/292)} = 3.207, P < 0.05$). The result does not give support to the hypothesis. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and accepts alternative hypothesis. That is, parent's educational background has significant effect on the students' academic performance.

Ho3: Parent's occupation has no significant effect on the students' academic performance

Table 6. (ANOVA) showing the difference between the parent's occupation and student's academic performance

Parent Occupation	N	Mean	SD	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F-cal	P	Remark
Banker	14	50.21	9.065	2316.961	9	257.440	4.105	<0.05	Sig.
Engineer	43	47.56	27.271	89364.275	290	308.153			
Doctor	9	61.44	10.549	91681.237	299				
Lawyer	8	52.63	9.180						
Lecturer	8	51.00	15.892						
Teacher	9	56.67	7.194						
Army Officer	18	48.11	6.885						
Clergy/Imam	27	48.56	19.929						
Business	104	47.90	15.375						
Private Own	60	48.73	17.426						
Total	300								

F= .835, df = 9/290, P> .05

Above Table 6 presents the ANOVA analysis showed that parents occupation have significant effect on the academic performance. The result revealed seven differences means values. Doctorate has value means of 61.44, follows by Teachers has value means of 56.67, and Lawyer has value means of 52.63, Banker has mean value of 50.21, while Business has value means of 48.56, and Private own has value means of 48.73, and Army officer has value means of 48.11 and Clergy/Imam has value means of 47.90 and Engineer has mean value of 47.56. Therefore, it can be concluded that parents occupation

have no significant effect on the academic performance at ($F_{(9/290)}=.4.105, P<0.05$). The result does not give support to the hypothesis. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected and accepts alternative hypothesis. This implies that parent's occupation has significant effect on the students' academic performance.

Discussion

The present study examined to what extent parenting styles and parental socio-economic status affect academic performance of senior secondary school students. The study shows a significant relationship (positive) between parenting styles with academic performance of secondary school students. However, parenting has been recognized as a major agent in socializing adolescents (Utti, 2006). Parenting interactions provide resources across the generational groups and function in regard to domains of survival, reproduction, nurturance, and socialization. This finding is also supported by Kang & Moore (2011) who viewed permissive parents as relatively low expectations for their children, setting very few, if any, rules. They often take a very casual and easy-going approach toward their children, opening up conversations and subsequently developing warmer relationships between them. Despite the high provision of warmth, children raised by permissive parents are less likely to be intrinsically motivated, thus lacking persistence in approaching learning tasks. Ultimately, their lack of self-control often causes difficulties when engaging in social interaction and they may even go so far as to being the school bullies or, ironically, victims of bullying from other children.

Also, the Pearson correlation demonstrates a positive significant relationship between authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting with academic performance. These results can be confirmed by previous findings on the predictive effect of parenting styles on academic performance of students (Baumrind, 1991; Ingoldby et al., 2003), they found that the more autonomy, demand and support parents provided, the more students were confident and

persistent academically. In other words, authoritative parenting was found to continue having an influence on students' academic performance. Authoritarian parenting is believed to have adverse effects on children's psychological development. Authoritarian parents exhibit anxious and withdrawn behaviours, lack self-reliance, rely on authority figures to make decisions" (Kang & Moore, 2011), diminishing their sense of personal value and responsibility. The statistical fact that the authoritarian style of parenting is the best for academic purposes, which is can be due to its ability to put pressure on children to perform well in school. However, the constant demands and directions of parents can lead children to overly rely on parents for guidance, which can hurt creative endeavors or academic performance in classes that require high amounts of creative energy, such as the arts. Unlike authoritarian parents, punishment is very rarely used in permissive homes and children are commonly given greater opportunity to make their own decisions in life (Steinberg et al., 1992).

In the course of this study, the researcher sought to find out if students' academic performance is significantly influenced by the three dimensions of parenting styles utilized in this study. In order to achieve this, the multiple regression analysis was employed. Results obtained shows there is a high association between parenting styles (authoritarian, demanding and permissive parenting) and students' academic performance. The ANOVA result further reveals that students' academic performance is significantly influenced by the styles of parenting adopted by parents ($p < 0.05$). This shows that parenting styles exerts substantial effect on the changes in students' performance. This result also implies that at least one of the socioeconomic variables (SES) significantly predicts high sibling's performance. Furthermore, in Table 3, the significance of parenting styles in influencing students' academic performance indicates that among the three dimensions of parenting, only permissive parenting style was significant ($p < 0.05$), this means that permissive parenting

style directly influences students' poor academic performance in school, as permissive parenting is characterised by little control over children, aiming for high levels of warmth, punishment is very rarely used in permissive homes and children are commonly given greater opportunity to make their own decisions in life.

The results of the hypotheses obtained in Tables 4 – 6 indicate that students' academic performance is significantly influenced by the socioeconomic background of their parents. This indeed is true as the socioeconomic status of parents in terms of income, nature of occupation and education determine the type of attention and involvement they have with their children. However, family financial resources, which are associated with parents' income, occupation and educational attainment, often imply increased learning opportunities both at home and in school. These findings collaborate with Razza et al. (2010), who found that parents' socioeconomic characteristic to a greater extent determines student's performance in school and their adjustment to life. Children from higher-SES households tend to have higher initial reading scores and show faster rates of growth compared with children from lower-SES households.

Similar result was reported by Chen (2009) that parental education is a key determinant of student achievement, but the roles of father's education and mother's education differ across child gender and levels of ability. Chen observed father's education to have a significant positive effect on academic achievements for both boys and girls, while mother's education only matters for girls. Maicibi (2005) submits that the amount of education parents have has a proven influence on students' academic achievement. Better-educated parents are more likely to use complex language and a wider vocabulary with their young children. Therefore, parents with lower levels of education are less likely to have high expectations for the children's academic careers. Similar results have been reported by earlier studies, for instance, Sentamu (2003),

observed that parent's occupation is another important variable which determines the academic performance of students'. Higher occupational level of the parents indicates better economic condition and these results in material support for the education of their children. Students whose parents have better jobs and higher levels of educational attainment and who are exposed to more educational and cultural resources at home tend to have higher levels of literacy performance.

Conclusion and recommendations

The study indicates that students/children academic performance is influenced by the parenting styles and socioeconomic background of their parents; as parents that earn high income can take absolute responsibilities of their children's education compared to parents that earn meager salaries. The financial and moral support a child receives from his/her parents' affects his psychology, which is reflected in his performance in school. However, there has been considerable research in support of the correlation between parenting styles, children's behaviour and, ultimately, academic performance. "The voluminous literature on parenting style, parents' socio-economic status and academic success indicates that both parental socio-economic status and parenting style influence children's school achievement", however, this relationship has only been closely explored with the secondary school students in Abuja, Nigeria. Increased studies will likely bring forth a greater understanding of each parenting style and parents socio-economic background, which is crucial for developing appropriate support measures for each child.

NOTES

1. http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/droppub_2001
2. <http://www.waecnigeria.org/>
3. <http://www.vanguardngr.com/2014/08/mass-failure-as-waec-releases-mayjune-exam-results/>

4.<http://www.oecd.org/edu/school/programmeforinternationalstudentassessments/pisa/33690591.pdf>

REFERENCES

- Adeagbe, T.T (2004). *Effective communication language teaching method, parent supportiveness and gender in learning outcomes and attitude in Yoruba reading comprehension: PhD thesis*. Ibadan: University of Ibadan.
- Aikens, N.L. & Barbarin, O. (2008). Socioeconomic differences in reading trajectories: the contribution of family, neighborhood, and school contexts. *J. Educ. Psychology, 100*, 235-251.
- Ajila, C. & Olutola, A. (2000). Impact of parents' socio-economic status on university students' academic performance. *Ife J. Educ. Studies, 7*, 31-39.
- Aremu, O.A. (2000). Impact of home, school and government on primary school pupils academic performance. *Exceptional Child, 5*(1), 106 – 110.
- Aremu O.A. & Oluwole, D.A (2001). Gender and birth order as predictors of normal pupils anxiety pattern in examination. *Ibadan J. Educ. Studies, 1*(1) 1-7.
- Aremu, A.O. & Sokan, B.O. (2003). A Multi-causal evaluation of academic performance of Nigerian learner, issues and implications for national development (pp. 365-375). In: Ayodele Bamisaiye, O., Nwazuo, J.A. & Oladiran, A. (Eds). *Education this millennium*. Ibadan: Macmillan Nig. Ltd.
- Asikhia O.A. (2010). Students and teachers' perception of the causes of poor academic performance in Ogun state secondary schools [Nigeria]: implications for counselling for national development. *European J. Social Sci., 13*, 229 – 249.

- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development (pp. 746-758). In: Brooks-Gunn, J., Lerner, R.&Peterson, A.C. (Eds.).*The encyclopedia of adolescence*.New York: Garland.
- Baumrind, D. (2005). Patterns of parental authority and adolescent autonomy (pp. 61-69). In: Smetana, J. (Ed.). *New directions for child development: changes in parental authority during adolescence*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Baumrind, D. & Black, A.E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38, 291-327.
- Brown, L. & Iyengar, S. (2008). Parenting styles: the impact on student achievement. *Marriage & Family Rev.*, 43, 14–38.
- Burtless, G. (1996). *Does money matter: the effect of school resources on student achievement and adult success*. Washington: Brookings Institution Press.
- Caro, D.H. (2009). Socio-economic status and academic achievement trajectories from childhood to adolescence. *Canadian J. Educ.*, 32, 558-590.
- Chao, R.K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, 72, 1832-1843.
- Chen, J.J.L. (2009). Relation of parental, teacher and peer support to academic engagement and achievement among Hong Kong students. *School Psychology Intern.*, 29,183-198.
- Cheadle, J.E. (2008). Educational investment, family context, and children's math and reading growth from kindergarten through the third grade. *Sociology Education*, 81, 1-31.
- Collins, A.I. (2007). *Social studies for schools*. Ibadan: University Press.
- Darling, N. &Toyokawa, T. (1997). Construction and validation of the parenting styles inventory II (PSI-II). *Unpublished manuscript*.

- Ekanem, T.F. (2004). The school as a substitute home (pp. 120 – 136). In: Obinaju, Q.I. (Ed.). *Theory and practice in early childhood education*. Calabar: BON.
- Escarce, J.J. (2003). Socio-economic status and the fates of adolescents. *Health Serv. Res.*, 38, 1229-1234.
- Fan, X. (2001). Parental involvement and students' academic achievement: a growth modeling analysis. *J. Experim. Educ.*, 70, 27-61.
- Fantuzzo, J. Tighe, E. & Childs, S. (2000). Family involvement questionnaire: a multivariate assessment of family participation in early childhood education. *J. Educ. Psychology*, 92, 367-376.
- Gonzalez-Pienda, J.A, Nunez, J.C., Gonzalez-Pumariiega, S., Alvarez, L., Rocces, C. & Garcia, M. (2002). A structural equation model of parental involvement, motivational and aptitudinal characteristics, and academic achievement. *J. Experim. Educ.*, 70, 257-287.
- Hobson, P. (1990). Some reflections on parents' rights in the upbringing of their children. *J. Philosophy Educ.*, 5, 63-74.
- Grolnick, W.S. (2003). *The psychology of parental control: how well-meant parenting backfires*. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Ingoldby, B., Schvaneveldt, B., Supple, A. & Bush, K. (2003). The relationship between parenting and behaviors and adolescent achievement and self-efficacy in Chile and Ecuador. *Marriage & Family Rev.*, 35, 139-159.
- Ipaye, J.B. (1977). Influence of socio-economic status on pupils acquiring of vicarious reinforcement. *Lagos Educ. Rev.*, 1(1), 9-15.
- Jansen, J.V. (2004). *Taalvaardigheid as moderator in die voorspelling van akademieseprestasie: master's thesis*. Bloemfontein: University of the Free State.
- Kang, Y. & Moore, J. (2011). Parenting style and adolescents' school performance in mainland China. *US-China Educ. Rev. B*, 1, 133–138.

- Khan, R.M. & Malik, K. (1999). Effectiveness of parents' involvement in reading, child's overt behavior at home, mothers' educational level on children's reading comprehension. *J. Elementary Educ.*, 21, 68-91.
- Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research and methodology: methods and techniques*. New Delhi: Mew Age International.
- Kundu, C.L. & Tutoo, D.N. (2000). *Educational psychology*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers.
- Maccoby, E. E. (2000). Parenting and its effects on children: on reading and misreading behavior genetics. *Ann. Rev. Psychology*, 51, 1-27.
- Maicibi, N.A. (2005). *Pertinent issues in management: human resource and educational management*. Kampala: Net Media Publishers.
- Muller, C. (1995). Maternal employment, parent involvement, and mathematics achievement among adolescents. *J. Marriage & Family*, 57, 85-100.
- Okpako, J.E.F. (2004). Parenting the Nigerian adolescents towards smooth transition to adulthood (pp. 275-288). In: Nwazuoke, I.A., Bamgbose, O. & Morokola, O.A. (Eds.). *Contemporary issue and research in adolescents*. Ibadan: Omoade Printing Press.
- Padilla, A.M. & Gonzalez, R. (2001). Academic performance of immigrant and U.S.-born Mexican heritage students: effects of schooling in Mexico and bilingual/English language instruction. *Amer. Educ. Res. J.*, 38, 727-742.
- Penny, M. (2001). *Understanding children's challenging behaviour, why try to influence or change behaviour for a variety of purposes*. Richmond: Nelson.
- Razza, R.A., Martin, A. & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2010). Associations among family environment, sustained attention, and school readiness for low-income children. *Developmental Psychology*, 46, 1528-1542.

- Rogers, M.A., Theule, J., Ryan, B.A., Adams, G.R. & Keating, L. (2009). Parental involvement and children's school achievement: evidence for mediating processes. *Canadian J. School Psychology, 24*, 34–57.
- Salami, S.O. (2000). Relationship between work-role salience and career maturity among high school students in Nigeria. *Ife J. Behavioural Res.*, 2, 98-107.
- Schulz, W. (2005). Measuring the socio-economic background of students and its effect on achievement in PISA 2000 and PISA 2003. *Annual Meetings of the American Educational Research Association in San Francisco, 7-11 April 2005*.
- Sentamu, N.P. (2003). School's influence of learning: a case of upper primary schools in Kampala & Wakiso Districts. *Uganda Educ. J.*, 4, 25-41.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S.D., Dornbusch, S.M. & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: authoritative parenting, school involvement an encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*, 1266-1281.
- Ushie, M.A., Onongha, G.I., Owolabi, E.O. & Emeka, J.O. (2012). Influence of family structure on students' academic performance in Agegelo-calgovernment area, Lagos State, Nigeria. *European J. Educ. Studies, 4*, 177-187.
- Utti, A. (2006). *Relationship between parenting styles and students' academic achievement in secondary schools in Ethiope East L.G.A of Delta State: MEd thesis*. Abraka: Delta State University.
- Verenikina, I., Vialle, W. & Lysaght, P. (2011). *Understanding learning and development*. Macksville: David Barlow Publishing.
- Verma, G.K. (1997). Inequality and intercultural education (pp.55-64). In: Woodrow, D., Verma, G.K., Rocha-Trindale, M.B., Campani, G. & Bagley, C. (Eds). *Intercultural education: theories, policies and practice*. Vermont: Ashgate.

Vickers, H. (1994). Young children at risk, differences in family functioning.
J. Educ. Res., 87, 262-270.

✉ Linus Terry Dzever
Department of Guidance and Counselling,
University of Ibadan, Nigeria
E-Mail: terrypaina@yahoo.com

