



**PERCIEVED PARENTING STYLES AND DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS ON ANTI-SOCIAL AND AGGRESSIVE BEHAVIOUR AMONG ADOLESCENTS**

**OjoAdeshina Akinwumi (PhD), Leads City University, Ibadan, Nigeria**

**Pivotwvs1@gmail.com**

**Jane Roli Adebusuyi (PhD) Associate Professor Dept of Sociology, Psychology and Criminology, leads City University, Ibadan. University of Ibadan. Oyinlola O. Adedoyin Chris land University, Abeokuta, Ogun State.**

**ABSTRACT**

Adolescents' antisocial behaviour and aggression are threats to the socio-economic development of any country. This study therefore examines the influence of parenting styles and demographic factors on anti-social and aggressive behaviour among adolescents in selected secondary schools in Abeokuta, Nigeria using social learning theory and behavioural theory, with the use of ex-post facto research design. The study uses random sampling technique to select 484 adolescent secondary school students as its participants. Using a questionnaire comprising the Aggressive behaviour scale developed by the researcher and the 15-item Parenting Style Inventory Scale (PSI) developed by Darling and Toyokawa (2001), the study shows a significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and antisocial behaviour ( $r = .19, p < .01$ ) and there was significant inverse relationship between authoritarian parenting style ( $r = -.22, p < .01$ ); among other findings. The study posits that good parenting style is effective in reducing antisocial and aggressive behaviour.

**Keywords:** Parenting Styles, Demographic Factors, Antisocial and Aggressive behavior, Adolescents.

**Word count:** 146.

**Background to the study**

Antisocial behavior is a major problem in childhood and beyond. Moreover, persistent forms affect 5%-10% of children in developed western countries (Rutter, et al., 2008) and are linked to future adult crime, drug and alcohol misuse, unemployment, poor physical health and mental disorders (Cohen, 1998; Moffitt et al., 2002; Odgers, et al., 2007). It is estimated that every youth is

at risk of antisocial behavior which could cost the public & 1.7 – 2.3 million over their lifetime (Cohen, 1998).

Parenting style that an individual is exposed to has been found to be a major risk factor in involvement of antisocial behaviour. Erratic and inconsistent parenting has been associated with child behavioural problem in research. Other factors that could lead to this directly or indirectly include domestic violence, parental drug abuse, maternal depression, family poverty, parents with low education, stressed families and single parent status (Webster-stratton&Reid, 2008; Bloomquist& Schnell, 2005). Studies have suggested that there are some parenting style that can improve or worsen children's behaviour problems. Also a report by Garber, Robinson &Valentiner, 1997 shows a significant relationship between high levels of parental warmth and lower levels of externalizing behaviour problems in children.

Parents of children with antisocial behaviour are likely to be less positive, more permissive and inconsistent; they tend to use more violent and critical discipline as corrective measures. Meanwhile most of these parents lack of involvement in their children's success, they don't monitor or supervise their children's activities, which in turn strongly predicts antisocial behavior (Reid, Webster-Stratton & Baydar 2004). In an influential review Rutter, Giller & Hagell (1998) concluded that antisocial behaviour is associated with hostile, critical, punitive and coercive parenting.

Aggression is often classified based on the motive, these include reactive (angry) aggression (Zillman, 1979) which results from a process of escalating, anger and perceived) loss of control (the short fuse syndrome). Loeber and Hay, (1997) noted that aggression is generally not used alone but it encompasses a variety of behavior, these behaviors are classified based on the mode of expression and these include verbal aggression, bullying, physical fighting, robbery and homicide. The nature and pattern of aggression among the Nigerian adolescents have

changed within time, becoming more dramatic. In Nigeria, the frequency of aggressive and anxiety has reached unprecedented heights under mining every facet of social life(Ishola, 2011).Factors responsible for increasing level of aggressive behavior among adolescent include drug use, availability of drugs, gender, poor neighborhood, poverty and deprivation (Erickson and Megiverin, 2006).

Based on these dimensions, Baumrind suggested that the majority of parents display one of three different parenting styles. (Maccoby& Martin, 1983).

1. Authoritarian parenting style:in this style of parenting, children are expected to follow the strict rules established by the parents. Failure to follow such rules usually results in punishment. Authoritarian parents fail to explain the reasoning behind these rules. If asked to explain, the parents might simply reply, "Because I said so." These parents have high demands, but are not responsive to their children. According to Baumrind, these parents "are obedience- and status-oriented, and expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation" (1991).

2. Authoritative parenting style Like authoritarian parents, those with an authoritative parenting style establish rules and guidelines that their children are expected to follow. However, this parenting style is much more democratic. Authoritative parents are responsive to their children and willing to listen the questions. When children fail to meet the expectations, these parents is more nurturing and forgiving rather than punishing. Baumrind suggests that these parents "monitor and impart clear standards for their children's conduct. They are assertive, but not intrusive and restrictive. Their disciplinary methods are supportive, rather than punitive. These parents want their children to be assertive, socially responsible, cooperative and self-regulated " (1991).

3. Permissive parenting style Permissive parents, sometimes referred to as indulgent parents, have very few demands to make of their children. These parents rarely discipline their children

because they have relatively low expectations of maturity and self-control. According to Baumrind, permissive parents "are more responsive than they are demanding. They are nontraditional and lenient, do not require mature behavior, allow considerable self-regulation, and avoid confrontation" (1991). Permissive parents are generally nurturing and communicative with their children, often taking on the status of a friend more than that of a parent.

Social learning theory regards gender identity and role as a set of behaviours that are learned from the environment. The child is more likely to attend to and imitate those people it perceives as similar to itself. Consequently, it is more likely to imitate behaviour modeled by people the same sex as it is. The child will also have observed the consequences of other people's behaviour and will be motivated to imitate the behaviour it has seen reinforced and avoid imitating the behaviour it has seen punished (vicarious reinforcement and punishment).

Parents who are inconsistent in their approach towards their child can unintentionally promote negative child behaviour, which can lead to a mutual escalation into negative behaviour from both (Rutter et al., 2008). Social – Economic Status (SES) is an economic and sociological combined total measure of an individual or family's economic and social position in relation to others, based on income, education and occupation Social – Economic Status is typically broken into three categories, high SES, middle SES, and low SES. Belonging to a social class is not merely a personal attribute, but also a contextual variable that characterizes a group of people. The shared culture of a particular class influences, and is influenced by, peoples' attitudes and lifestyle (Krieger et al., 1997).

It appears that adolescent aggressive behaviour stems from different factors which can be traced to adolescent family backgrounds community, and school and the value systems. If the adolescent is unstable due to the above factor he/she may suddenly display deviant behaviour, tends to be emotionally disturbed and exhibits destructive tendencies. Theories of aggression

suggest that aggression is acquired through a process of trial and error, instructing and observation of models.

### **Statement of problem**

Antisocial behavior and aggression among adolescent is a matter of concern as it constitute a threat to the security, life, property and the social economics development of the country. Lack of support and pressure from friends and parents can also result to conflict, like when a parent pressures a child toward a particular career path or withdrew financial and emotional support for a career path not of the parent's choice. Despite these challenges, researchers have uncovered convincing links between perceived parenting styles and the effects these styles have on children.

The importance of gender, parenting styles and social economic status among Nigerians adolescent on anti-social and aggressive behaviour is not only open to serious questioning but also to a greater evaluation. Violent behaviour has led to serious global issue and requires meaningful intervention to be able to bridge the aforementioned gap. The study therefore seeks to provide answers to the following research questions.

1. Will there be positive significant relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta?
2. Will there be positive significant relationship between parenting styles and aggressive behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta?
3. Will male respondents exhibit higher level of aggressive and antisocial behavior than female among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta?
4. What is the contribution of socio-demographic variables on antisocial and aggressive behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta?

### **Purpose of the study**

The main purpose of this study is to examine the influence of parenting styles and demographic factors on anti-social and aggressive behavior among adolescents. The following are the specific objectives.

1. To examine the significant relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta
2. To investigate the significant relationship between parenting styles and aggressive behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta
3. To determine gender differences on aggressive and antisocial behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta
4. To know the contribution of socio-demographic variables on antisocial and aggressive behaviour among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta

### **Significance of the study**

Findings from this study are significant to a number of stakeholder institutions and individuals such as policy makers, teachers, career shapers, students, parents, community, industry and organizations at the national and international level.

The findings of this study will serve as a tool for the parents on how to better prepare and support their children on ways to control or reduce aggression. The study provides insights to the knowledge and awareness of the influence of alcohol use, anxiety and gender on aggression as an essential ingredient for effective conduct of good behavior and mental health functioning among adolescents.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research Design**

The design of this study is the ex-post facto research design. This design was used by the researcher because there was no manipulation of the variables during the course of this study rather they were measured through the collection of data based on the subject's responses on the questionnaire. The independent variables for this study are Parenting Styles and demographic variables while the dependent variables are Anti-social and Aggressive Behaviour.

### **Participants**

The participants of this research were four hundred and eighty four (484) students from both (242)public and (242)private secondary schools respectively. The Secondary school were selected using convenient sampling method from Abeokuta South Local Government in Ogun State. Three each from public and private secondary schools from Abeokuta South Local Government. Class rooms were randomly selected using the even class and participants were randomly selected using the 4<sup>th</sup> student.

### **Sampling Technique**

The researcher selected 484 students from 3 Private secondary school and 3 Public secondary school from Abeokuta South Local Government. The students were selected using the nth term random sampling of "the second class". The 484 students were used as a representative sample of the total population of the students in Abeokuta.

### **Research Instruments**

Three instruments were used to collect data for this study. The first will be a self-report questionnaire which are in four sections.

**Section A: Demographic data:** This section consists of four items, which include age, sex, social economic status, and parental marital status.

## **Section B: Antisocial behaviour**

This study assesses the influence of parental support on antisocial behavior and the scale was developed by the researcher. The dependent variable which is antisocial behaviour, is operationalized as the behavioral pattern characterized by aggressive behavior and drug use during the year prior to the survey. The students answered a ten-item scale describing their experience with aggression, drug use, and alcohol consumption in the past twelve months. Subsequently, a scale was built by summing the answers to each item and creating an index from 0 to 10, where 10 indicates high levels of antisocial behavior ( $\text{Alpha}=0.79$ ). Furthermore, the factor analysis revealed the existence of three components, aggressive behavior, drug use, and alcohol use. However, when the factor analysis was set to produce a single solution, the results suggested that this group of items is measuring the same unidimensional latent construct (Antisocial Behavior).

## **Section C: Aggressive behaviour**

Aggressive behaviour was measured using the Aggression Scale developed by Opines and Frankowski, (2001). The Aggression Scale comprise of 11 items and responses ranges from “0 times” to “6 or more times.” Thus, the Aggression Scale can range between 0 and 66 points. Each point represents one aggressive behavior adolescents engaged in during the week prior to the survey. The scale measures behaviors that might result in psychological or physical injury to other adolescents. Although the instructions do not specify the setting and, therefore, the behaviors can occur in or out of school, most questions refer to aggressive behaviors against other adolescents. The scale is not intended to measure other forms of aggression such as family violence, aggression against teachers, or destruction of property.

The scale requests information regarding the frequency of the most common overt aggressive behaviors, including verbal aggression (teasing, name-calling, threatening to hurt or hit) and physical aggression (pushing, slapping, kicking, hitting), as well as information about



anger (getting angry easily, being angry most of the day). These components were summated into a single scale. For the internal consistency, the authors reported Cronbach's alpha for the scores of African American street children was .88 and for Caucasian street children was .89. In this sample, the internal consistency of the scores, measured by Cronbach's alpha, was .86 for the total sample (girls = .88, boys = .83, African American = .84, Caucasian = .88) .90 as the overall cronbach alpha which did not vary by gender. The alpha for this study is  $\alpha = 0.831$ . The scale also reported a split half reliability of .879, spearman brown prophecy co-efficient and correlation between form of 0.53.

#### **Section D: Parenting Style Inventory Scale (PSI)**

This is a 15-item scale developed by Nancy Darling and Toyokawa (2001). The scale is divided into three sections, representing the three different parenting styles. The three styles identified by Darling and toyokawa (2001) are Responsiveness, Autonomy granting and Demandingness. The participants were made to express their degree of acceptance on 5 point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree (5) to strongly disagree(1). The author reported a reliability coefficient alpha of 0.51. In this present study, 0.42 was obtained for the reliability coefficient alpha on the 15 items.

#### **Procedure**

The approval of the school counselors and vice principal was sought, even though verbally, and upon granting the request, the questionnaires were distributed randomly to the students using the 4<sup>th</sup> term. The researcher explained the purpose of the research to the respondents that it was only an academic exercise. The questionnaires were gathered and analyzed to test the stated hypotheses.

## Statistical Analysis

The data collected with the questionnaire were analyzed with both descriptive and inferential statistics. The descriptive statistics used to find the mean and standard deviation of the data while inferential statistics was used to test the hypotheses set for the study.

## RESULTS

This chapter deals with data analysis and interpretation of the findings. Specifically, the study provided answers to four research hypotheses. The statistical tests used include Pearson product moment correlation, t-test for independent samples and multiple regression analysis for testing composite relationship of the independent variables.

The first hypothesis stated that there will be significant positive relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. This hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

**Table 4.1: Zero-order correlation showing the relationship between, parenting style and antisocial behaviour**

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Antisocial behaviour	11.53	7.04	-				
Authoritative	10.09	3.71	.19**	-			
Authoritarian	9.68	3.29	-.22**	.12*	-		
Permissive	9.87	3.40	-.20**	.14**	-.26**	-	

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

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.1 reveal that there was significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and antisocial behaviour ( $r = .19, p < .01$ ). Indicating that parent with high authoritative parenting style significantly relate to increase in antisocial behaviour. There was significant inverse relationship between authoritarian parenting style ( $r = -.22, p < .01$ ), the result

implies that parent who are high on authoritarian parenting style significantly relate to decrease in student antisocial behaviour. Also, permissive parenting style have significant negativelationship with antisocial behaviour ( $r = -.20, p < .01$ ). The result indicates that increase in permissive parenting style significantly relates to decrease antisocial behaviour.

The second hypothesis stated that there will be significant positive relationship between parenting styles and aggressive behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. This hypothesis was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation.

**Table 4.2: Zero-order correlation showing the relationship between, parenting style and aggressive behaviour**

Variables	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
Aggressive behaviour	11.53	7.04	-				
Authoritative	10.09	3.71	.23**	-			
Authoritarian	9.68	3.29	.27**	.15*	-		
Permissive	9.87	3.40	-.31**	.11**	.21**	-	

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

\*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 4.2 reveal that there was significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and aggressive behaviour ( $r = .23, p < .01$ ).The result shows that parent with high authoritative parenting style significantly relate to increase in aggressive behaviour. There was significant positive relationship between authoritarian parenting style ( $r = .27, p < .01$ ), the result implies that parent who are high on authoritarian parenting style significantly relate to increase in student aggressive behaviour. Also, permissive parenting style have significant inverse relationship with aggressive behaviour ( $r = -.31, p < .01$ ). the result indicates that increase in permissive parenting style significantly relates to decrease in aggressive behaviour.

The three hypothesis states that male respondents will exhibit higher aggressive and antisocial behavior than female among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. This hypothesis was tested using the t-test for independence and the result presented in Table 4.5.

**Table 4.5: t--test summary table showing difference between male and female respondents on antisocial and aggressive behaviour.**

	Sex	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	df	T	P
<b>Antisocial behavior</b>	Male	228	14.61	6.20	482	7.52	<0.05
	Female	256	8.07	6.28			
<b>Aggressive behavior</b>	Male	228	16.61	7.22	482	8.22	<0.05
	Female	256	11.12	6.11			

The result from table 4.5 shows that male respondents (M=14.61, S.D =6.20) significantly reported higher scores on antisocial behaviour compare to female respondents(M=8.07, S.D= 6.28). Male respondents significantly reported higher antisocial behaviour (t (482) = 7.52, p<.05) than male respondents. This implies that gender significantly influences antisocial behaviour.

It was revealed that male respondents (M=16.61, S.D= 7.22) significantly reported higher scores on aggressive behaviour compare to female respondents (M=11.12, S.D =6.11). male respondents significantly reported higher aggressive behaviour (t (482) = 8.22, p<.05) than male respondents. This implies that gender significantly influences aggressive behaviour. The hypothesis is thus accepted.

The fourth hypothesis states that socio-demographic variables will have significant joint and independent influence on antisocial and aggressive behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. This was tested using multiple regression analysis. The results are presented in Table 4.4.

**Table 4.4: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis Showing the Influence of socio-demographic variables on Career aspiration.**

Predictors		B	t	P	R	R <sup>2</sup>	F	P
Antisocial behaviour	Age	.16	3.73	<.05	.38	.14	20.08	<.05
	Parental marital status	-.17	-3.84	<.05				
	Socio-economic status	-.23	-5.37	<.05				
Aggressive behaviour	Age	.19	2.33	<.05	.42	.32	31.10	<.05
	Parental marital status	-.21	-4.32	<.05				
	Socio-economic status	-.33	-7.24	<.05				

The result revealed that age, parental marital status and socio economics status have joint influence on antisocial behaviour ( $R^2 = 0.14$ ,  $F(4,479) = 20.08$ ,  $p < .05$ ). When combined age, parental marital status and socio economics status for accounted for 14% of the change observed in the self-report antisocial behaviour. This revealed that the collective presence of socio-demographic variables has significant influence on antisocial behaviour. The result further revealed that age ( $\beta = .16$ ,  $t = 3.73$ ;  $p < .05$ ), parental marital status ( $\beta = -.17$ ,  $t = -3.84$ ;  $p < .05$ ) and socio-economic status ( $\beta = -.23$ ,  $t = -5.37$ ;  $p < .05$ ) have significant independent influence on antisocial behaviour. While gender ( $\beta = .10$ ,  $t = 1.66$ ;  $p > .05$ ) have no significant independent influence on antisocial behavior. The result further revealed that demographic variables have joint influence on aggressive behaviour ( $R^2 = 0.32$ ,  $F(4,479) = 31.10$ ,  $p < .05$ ). When combined

age, gender, parental marital status, socio-economic status for accounted for 32% of the change observed in the self-report aggressive behaviour.

This revealed that the collective presence of gender, parental marital status, socio-economic status has significant influence on aggressive behaviour. The result further revealed that age ( $\beta = .19$ ,  $t=2.33$ ;  $p<.05$ ), parental marital status ( $\beta = -.21$ ,  $t=-4.32$ ;  $p<.05$ ), socio-economic status ( $\beta = -.33$ ,  $t=-7.24$ ;  $p<.05$ ) have significant independent influence on aggressive behaviour. The hypothesis is thus accepted.

## **DISCUSSION, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **DISCUSSION**

The first hypothesis stated that there will be significant positive relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. The result revealed that there was significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and antisocial behaviour. There was significant inverse relationship between authoritarian parenting style. Also, permissive parenting style have significant negative relationship with antisocial behavior. The result support the study by Finkenauer et al. (2005) investigated whether parenting behaviors are directly or indirectly (through building self-control) associated with emotional (depression, stress, low self-esteem) and behavioral (delinquency, aggression) problems among adolescents. Both types of problems were directly, negatively related to adaptive parenting behavior (high parental acceptance, strict control and monitoring and little use of manipulative psychological control). And self-control partially mediated the link between parenting behavior and adolescent problems.

There was no sign that high self-control was associated with drawbacks or increased risk of psychosocial problems. Also, Yizhen et al. (2006) identified the family factors relevant to aggression. The results showed that maternal education, paternal occupation, family type,

parental child rearing attitude and patterns, student's interpersonal relationship were significantly associated with children's and adolescent's aggression. The risk factors of aggression were parental child-rearing patterns, peer relationship, teacher-student relationship and family conflict.

The second hypothesis stated that there will be significant positive relationship between parenting styles and aggressive behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. The result revealed that there was significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and aggressive behaviour. There was significant positive relationship between authoritarian parenting styles. Permissive parenting style has significant inverse relationship with aggressive behavior. The result support the study by Ooi et al. (2006) examined the impact of quality of parent-child attachment on aggression, social stress and self-esteem in a clinical sample of 91 boys with disruptive behavior disorders ranging from 8 to 12 years of age. Those boys were included in the study, which were found to exhibit various aggressive and antisocial behaviors such as getting into fights, telling lies and teasing others. Multiple regression analyses found that the quality of parent-child attachment significantly predicted parent-rated aggression, social stress and self-esteem.

Higher quality of parent-child attachment was associated with lower levels of parent-rated aggression, lower level of social stress and higher levels of self-esteem. DeHart et al. (2006) examined the link between parenting style and implicit self-esteem. Children who reported their parents to be nurturing had higher implicit self-esteem and those who reported their parent to be overprotective had lower implicit self-esteem. Mother's independent reports of their early interactions with their children were also related to children's level of implicit self-esteem. Also, Malete (2007) examined the relationship between family factors and secondary school student's aggressive and antisocial behavior. Participants were 1,478 juniors and senior secondary school students from four major urban centers in Botswana, aged 12-20. High scores on antisocial and

aggressive behavior were significantly related to poor parent-child relations and low parental monitoring.

The third hypothesis stated that male respondents will exhibit higher aggressive and antisocial behavior than female among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. The result showed that male respondents significantly reported higher scores on antisocial behaviour compared to female respondents. Also, male respondents significantly reported higher scores on aggressive behaviour compared to female respondents. This implies that gender significantly influences aggressive behaviour. The result is in line with the study by Cullerton et al. (2008) that examined associations between maltreatment and aggression using a gender-informed approach. Peer ratings, peer nominations, and a counselor report of aggression were collected on 211 maltreated and 199 nonmaltreated inner-city youth during a summer camp. Maltreatment was associated with aggressive conduct; however, these effects were qualified by gender, maltreatment subtype, and the form of aggression under investigation.

Findings revealed that maltreatment was associated with physical aggression for boys and relational aggression for girls. Physical abuse was associated with physically aggressive behavior but sexual abuse predicted relational aggression for girls only. Findings suggest that investigating the interaction between familial risk and gender is important in understanding aggressive behaviors of boys and girls.

The fourth hypothesis stated that socio-demographic variables will have significant joint and independent influence on antisocial and aggressive behavior among adolescent in some selected secondary schools in Abeokuta. The result revealed that age, gender, parental marital status and socio economics status have joint influence on antisocial behaviour. The result further revealed that age, parental marital status and socio-economic status have significant independent influence on antisocial behavior, while gender have no significant independent influence on



antisocial behavior. More so, demographic variables have joint influence on aggressive behaviour. The result further revealed that age, parental marital status, socio-economic status have significant independent influence on aggressive behaviour. The result support the study by Larsen and Dehle (2007) examined the association between parent emotional support and rural adolescent aggression and whether adolescent psychopathology and substance abuse mediated this association.

Results indicated that emotional support has an indirect influence on adolescent aggression. Adolescent substance abuse was completely mediated by adolescent grade-point average, indicating no direct significant association with aggression. Adolescent psychopathology significantly mediated the relationship between parental emotional support and adolescent aggression.

Ochoa et al. (2007) analyzed the role of different but inter related variables relative to family and school contexts in relation to problems of violent behavior at school in adolescent period. Result showed a direct association between quality of communication with father and teacher's expectation about the student, with the adolescent's involvement in violent behavior at school. Moreover, findings showed indirect paths, where adolescent's self-concept (family and school), accepted by peers, and attitude towards authority, seemed to be influenced by quality of interaction with parents and teachers, and also be closely associated with violent behavior at school.

## **CONCLUSION**

The study investigated the influence of parenting style and demographic variables on antisocial and aggressive behavior among secondary school students in Abeokuta. The study therefore concluded that there was significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and antisocial behaviour. There was significant inverse relationship between authoritarian

parenting style and aggressive behaviour. Also, perceived permissive parenting style has significant negative relationship with antisocial behavior. The result revealed that there was significant positive relationship between authoritative parenting style and aggressive behaviour. There was significant positive relationship between authoritarian parenting style. Guerrere Michele (2018) explained that there is no right or wrong parenting style that should be adopted. This study reveals that, permissive parenting is the perceived parenting style that is working for students.

A study in Spain also supports that Permissive parenting style was associated with strong academic performance and they did better than those with authoritative parenting style.(Garcia and Gracia, 2009).But this does not mean that it is a better parenting style. It is a call on awareness for parents to know that their children want a permissive style meaning they want to be in control. Meanwhile, parents may adopt the authoritative parenting style that gives both parent and the children opportunity to be in control.

Also, Male respondents significantly reported higher antisocial behavior and aggressive behaviour than male respondents. Finally, age, gender, parental marital status and socio economics status have joint influence on antisocial behaviour. Age, parental marital status and socio-economic status have significant independent influence on antisocial behaviour.

## **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Good parenting style should effective in reducing antisocial and aggressive behaviour. During the preschool year, psychosocial interventions with parents regarding their parenting practices can have immediate effects both on antisocial and aggressive behaviour among adolescents. Several different models of effective parenting programs have been found for the parents of children in this age group, including parent training workshops, group meetings and coaching during interactions with children. The latter part of parent-child program may be more

appropriate in clinical settings or interventions targeting high-risk families than in large- scale prevention services. Programs like home-visitation interventions needs to be emphasized by the state social welfare units.

### **Limitations and Suggestion for Future Study**

The study was limited to secondary school students in Abeokuta and not the entire Abeokuta city. This was due to time and financial constraints. The small sample size prohibits the generalization of results to all students in Ogun state. Future research should include a larger sample size with participants randomly drawn from different schools in different states, thereby providing a more representative sample of the population and greater generalizability of the study findings. Second, the cross-sectional design provided an opportunity to examine the variables at only one point in time, which means different research design could be, used in future research.

### **References**

- Abraham, C. O. (2006). Socio-economic differences in children's health how and why do these relationship change with age? *Psychological bulletin*, 128, 285-329.
- Ang, R. P & Goh, D. H. (2006). Authoritarian parenting style in Asian society, A cluster-analytic investigation contemporary family Therapy: *An International Journal Psychologists*, 28(1), 67 – 89.
- Baumrind, (1991). The influence of parenting style on early adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of adolescents*, 11, 56-59.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations*, 45, 405-414. Baumrind, D. (2005). Patterns of parental authority and adolescent autonomy. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*, 108, 61-69.
- Baumrind, D., & Black, A.E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38, 291-327.
- Bee, K. (2005). Alternative explanations for the relationship between material and verbal interaction style and language. *International Journal of Educational Psychologists* (16)141-161.
- Berger, K. S. (2001). *The developing person throughout the life span*. 5th. Ed. 1 New York.

- Bossaert, G, Doumen, S, Buyse, E, &Verschueren, K. (201 1).Predicting student’s academic achievement after the transition to first grade: A two year longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 32, 47-57.
- Bowers, J.H., Bowen, K.N., Huck, J.L., Lee, D.R., &Spraitz, J.D. (2011, March).College binge drinking. Paper presented at the 48th Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Toronto.
- Brooks-Gunn, J., Britto, P.R., & Brady, C. (1999). Struggling to make ends meet: Poverty and child development. In M.E. Lamb (Ed.), *Parenting and child development in nontraditional families* (pp. 279-304).Mahweh, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Buri, J.R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 57, 110-119.
- Buri, J.R., Misukanis, T.M., & Mueller, R.A. (1988). Nothing I ever do seems to please my parents: Female and male self-esteem as a function of mother’s and father’s nurturance. St. Paul, MN: University of St. Thomas.
- Carmines, E.G., & Zeller, R.A. (1979).Reliability and validity assessment. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Chen, G, &Weikert, L. A. (2008). Students background, school climate, school disorder, Students achievement. An Empirical Study of New York City Middle Schools *Journal of School Violence* 7 (4) 3-20.
- Cherry, K. (2005).About .com Guide. <http://Psychology.about.com/od/developmentalp/>
- Chiew, L. Y. (2011). Relationship of parenting style and self esteem.Unpublished B. Sc project, Faculty of Arts and Social Science.University of Tunku Abdul Rahman.
- Chime, P. A. (2004). Influence of deviant behavior on academic achievement of in school adolescent in Udi L. G. A. Unpublished M. ED Thesis. University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
- Clinard, M. B. & Meier, R. F. (2007).Sociology of deviant behavior. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing.
- Erickson, E. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: Norton
- Eysenck, H. I. (1947). *Dimensions of Personality*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Eysenck H. J. (1996). Personality and Crime: Where do we stand? *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, 2, 143 – 152.
- Farrington, D.P. (2004). Conduct disorder, aggression, and delinquency. In R. Learner & L. Steinberg (Eds.), *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology* (2nd Ed.). New York: Wiley.
- Fearon, R. P., Bakermans- Kranenburg, M. J., Van Ijzendoorn, M. H., Lapsley, A., &Roisman, G.I. (2010). The Significance of insecure attachment and disorganization in the development of children’s externalizing behaviour: A meta-analytic study. *Child Development*, 81, 435 – 456.
- Fergusson, D., Campbell-Swain, N., &Horwood, J. (2004). How does childhoodeconomic disadvantage lead to crime?.*Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45, 956- 966.
- Gerard, J. M., & Buehler, C. (1999).Multiple risk factors in the family environment and youth problem behaviours.*Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(2), 343 – 375.

- Goldson, B., & Munice, J. (2006). *Youth crime and justice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Griffin, K. W., Botvin, G.J., Scheier, L.M., Diaz, T., & Miller, N.L. (2000). Parenting practices as predictors of substance use, delinquency, and aggression among urban minority youth: Moderating effects of family structure and gender. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviours*, 14, (2), 174 – 184.
- Haapasalo, J. (2001). How do young offenders describe their parents? *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 6, 103- 120.
- Harrison, E.O. (2005). *The development of antisocial behaviour patterns in adolescence*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc..
- Hawkins, J. D., Howell, J., Krisberg, B., & Wilson, J. J. (1995). *Serious violent and chronic juvenile offenders*. California: Sage Publications.
- Henggler, S. (1989) *Delinquency in adolescence*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Freisthler, B., Byrnes, H. F., & Gruenewald, P. J. (2009). Alcohol outlet density, parental monitoring, and adolescent deviance: A multilevel analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31(3), 325-330.
- International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM), 483-490. New York, NY: ACM Press.
- Lansu, T. M, & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2012). Peer status in emerging adulthood: Associations of popularity and preference with social roles and behavior. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 27(1), 132-150.
- Liao, C.-T.(2002). A research into the family communication patterns and political attitude of Taiwan elementary students (in Chinese). *Journal of Social Sciences of National Taipei University of Education*, 1, 29-41.
- Lin, C.-F.(1991). *Deviant behavior counseling and case studies* (in Chinese). Taipei, Taiwan: Psychological Publishing Co. Ltd.
- Mandara, J. (2006). The impact of family functioning on African American males' academic achievement: A review and clarification of the empirical literature. *Teacher College Record*, 10, 205-222.
- Miki, M. C. (2008). Parenting relationships and involvement: Effect of students' school engagement and performance. *Rmle on/me* 31, 10, 1-11.
- Mille, A. (2009). *Anti social behavior*. McGraw Hill Open University Press England.
- Mullins, A. (2005). *Parenting for character*. Equipping your child for life.
- Paternoster, R., & Mazerolle, P. (1994). General strain theory and delinquency: A
- Patrick, C. J. (1994). Emotion and psychopathy. *Psychophysiology*, 31, 319-330.
- Patrick, C. J., Bradley, M. M., & Lang, P. J. (1993). Emotion in the criminal psychopath: Startle reflex modulation. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102, 82-92.

- Patrick, C. J., Edens, J. F., Poythress, N., Lilienfeld, S. O., & Benning, S. D. (manuscript in preparation). Further Evidence for Two Distinct Facets of Self-Reported Psychopathy: Differential Relations with Criterion Variables in Offender Samples. Manuscript in preparation for publication.
- Patterson, G. R. (1995). Coercion as a basis for early age of onset for arrest. In J. McCord (Ed.), *Coercion and Punishment in Long-Term Perspectives* (pp. 81-105). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Patterson, G. R., & Chamberlain, P. (1994). A functional analysis of resistance during parent training therapy. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 1, 53-70.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial Boys*. Eugene, OR: Castalia Publishing Co.
- Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., Jones, R. Q., & Conger, R. E. (1975). *A Social Learning Approach to Family Intervention*. Vol. 1. Eugene, OR: Castalia Publishing Co.
- Patterson, M. C., & Newman, J. P. (1993). Reflectivity and learning from aversive events: Toward a psychological mechanism for the syndromes of disinhibition. *Psychological Review*, 100, 716-736.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, Design, and Analysis: An Integrated Approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Quinlan, J. R. (1993). C4.5: Program for Machine Learning. San Mateo, CA: Morgan Kaufmann Publishers. replication and extension. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 31(3), 235-263.
- Salton, G., & Buckley, C. (1988). Term-weighting approaches in automatic text retrieval. *Information Processing & Management*, 24(5), 513-523.
- Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., Smits, I., Lowet, K., & Goossens, L. (2007). The role of intrusive parenting in the relationship between peer management strategies and peer affiliation. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 28(3), 239-249.
- Srikant, R., & Agrawal, R. (1995). Mining sequential patterns. In P. S. Yu & A. L. P. Chen (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 11<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Data Engineering* (pp. 3-14). Los Alamitos, CA: IEEE Computer Society Press.

### KEY

<b>SECTIONS</b>	<b>VARIABLES</b>	<b>NO OF ITEMS</b>
<b>Section A</b>	<b>Demographic data</b>	1-4
<b>Section B</b>	<b>Antisocial behavior</b>	1-10
<b>Section C</b>	<b>Aggressive behavior</b>	1-11
<b>Section D</b>	<b>Parenting Style Inventory Scale (PSI).</b>	1-15

© GSJ