

**RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTING STYLES AND STUDENTS' DISRUPTIVE
BEHAVIOUR AMONG SECONDARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN UYO METROPOLIS
OF AKWA-IBOM STATE, NIGERIA**

BY

**Menyene-Abasi Andem UDO
B.Sc Ed (Political Science, University of Uyo, 2015)
P16EDPC8001**

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF POSTGRADUATE STUDIES,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY, ZARIA, NIGERIA, IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE AWARD OF MASTER DEGREE IN
EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY**

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY AND COUNSELLING,
FACULTY OF EDUCATION,
AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,
ZARIA, NIGERIA**

OCTOBER, 2019

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this dissertation entitled Relationship between Parenting Styles and Students' Disruptive Behaviour among Secondary School Students in Uyo Metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria has been performed by me in the Department of Educational Psychology and counselling. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this dissertation was previously presented for another degree at this or any other Institution.

Menyene-Abasi Andem UDO
P16EDPC8001

Date

CERTIFICATION

This Dissertation entitled Relationship between Parenting Styles and Students' Disruptive Behaviour among Secondary School Students in Uyo Metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria by Udo, Menyene-abasi Andem (P16EDPC8001) meets the regulations governing the award of Master's Degree (Educational Psychology) in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counselling of Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria and is approved for its' contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Professor E. F. Adeniyi
Chairman, Supervisory Committee

Date

Professor M. Balarabe
Member, Supervisory Committee

Date

Professor A. I. Mohammed
**H.O.D. Educational Psychology and
Counselling**

Date

Professor Sani Abdullahi
Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies

Date

DEDICATION

This research work is dedicated to my parent Mr. and Mrs. Andem Andem Udo who sponsored and guided me right from primary school up-to Undergraduate programme, to date am indeed grateful, and to my uncle Kingsley Bassey and my grandmother Mrs. Augusta Bassey, to my siblings Timfon Andem Udo and Ima-Abasi Andem Udo.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The researcher is grateful to Almighty God for his protection, love and the enablement to complete this research work successfully. Researcher's appreciation goes to his role model supervisor Professor E.F. Adeniyi for her patience, keen interest, and skillful guidance and general support from beginning to the end of this work. The researcher also acknowledged the contribution, constructive criticism, support and advice of my second supervisor Professor M. Balarabe.

The researcher's sincere appreciation and gratitude go to his internal examiners; Prof. J.A. Gwani and Dr. A. Sambo for the time they spent in making critical observation and contributions towards the completion of the work, and all the lecturers in the Department of Educational Psychology and Counselling for sharing their knowledge and experience with the researcher; Prof. A.I. Mohammed, Prof. M.I. Mustapha, Prof. R.M. Bello, Prof. D. A. Oliagba, Prof. S. Sambo, Prof. K. Mahmoud, Dr. H.A. Tukur, Dr. L. K. Maude, Dr. U. Yunusa, Prof. J.M. Ademokoya, Dr. G.L. Likko, Mal. H. Umar, Mal. H. Muhammad, Malama S.J. Shika, Malama N.Y. Ahmad Mal. B. Mahmoud and Mal. M.H. Rogo. The researcher's appreciation goes to the administrative staff in the Department especially Mr. Markus, Mal. Bashir and Mal. Abubakar for their support. The researcher also wishes to express appreciation to Mr U. Ojo of Iya Abubakar Computer center who analyzed the data.

The researcher's profound gratitude goes to his friends Mr. S. O. Sam, Mr. E. J. Effiong, Mr. C. B. Lawal, Mrs M. Peter, Miss. E. Obot, Miss. M. Dyeris, and all P16EDPC Psychology students you guys make my staying in ABU to be fun. The researcher recognize the cooperation of the principals and staff of all the school being used to carry out this research

Finally the researcher profound acknowledgements goes to his family members Mrs. N. Bassey, Mr. and Mrs. L. Ntah, Mr. G. Etim, Mrs E. Paulinus and others too numerous to mention and to my best mummy in the world Mrs. B. A. Udo from the depth of my heart I love you mum, for their support and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	i
Declaration	ii
Certification	iii
Dedication	iv
Acknowledgements	v
Table of Contents	vi
List of tables	ix
List of abbreviation	x
Operational Definition of Terms	xi
Abstract	xii

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	3
1.3 Objectives of the Study	5
1.4 Research Questions	5
1.5 Research Hypotheses	6
1.6 Basic Assumptions	6
1.7 Significance of the Study	
1.8 Scope and Delimitations of the Study	8

CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction	9
------------------	---

2.2	Concept of Parenting	10
2.3	Parenting Styles	12
2.3.1	Authoritative Parenting Style	15
2.3.2	Autocratic Parenting Style	18
2.3.3	Laissez-Faire Parenting Style	21
2.3.4	Democratic Parenting Style	24
2.3.5	Uninvolved Parenting Style	26
2.4	Disruptive Behaviour	28
2.4.1	Relationship between Parenting Style and Disruptive Behaviour	31
2.5	Theoretical Framework	32
2.5.1	Baumrind Theory of Parenting	32
2.5.2	Erick Erickson's Psychosocial Theory	34
2.5.3	Bandura's Social Learning Theory	39
2.5.4	DolarsandMiller'sBehaviourist/LearningTheoryofReinforcement	39
2.5.5	Durkheim Sociological Theory	42
2.6	Review of Empirical Studies	43
2.7	Summary	59
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY		
3.1	Introduction	61
3.2	Research Design	61
3.3	Population of the Study	61
3.4	Sample and Sampling Techniques	62
3.5	Instrumentation	64

3.5.1	Parenting Style Questionnaire	64
3.5.2	Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire	64
3.6	Validity of the Instrument	65
3.6.1	Pilot Testing	65
3.6.2	Reliability of the Instrument	66
3.7	Procedure for Data Collection	66
3.8	Procedure for Data Analysis	67
CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION		
4.1	Introduction	68
4.2	Demographic Characteristics of Respondent	68
4.2	Hypotheses testing	69
4.3	Summary of the findings	73
4.4	Discussion	73
CHAPTER FIVE: SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS		
5.1	Introduction	79
5.2	Summary	79
5.3	Conclusion	81
5.4	Contribution to Knowledge	82
5.5	Recommendations	82
5.6	Suggestions for Further Studies	83
	REFERENCES	85
	APPENDIX	96

List of Tables

Table 1: Baumrind's styles of Parenting and their Characteristics Parenting Styles	34
Table 2: Gender distribution of SS1 Students in the public secondary school who are found with disruptive behavior according to their school and percentage	62
Table 3: Distribution of Population and Sample Size of SS1 Students from the selected Schools who were Found to Exhibits Disruptive Behaviour	63
Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by Sex	68
Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by Age	68
Table 6: Distribution of Respondents by School System	69
Table 7: Summary of Pearson products Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour	69
Table 8: Pearson products Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior	70
Table 9: Pearson products Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior	71
Table 10: Pearson products Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior	71
Table 11: Pearson products Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior	72

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ADAQ	-	Adolescent Drug Addiction Questionnaire
ADHD	-	Attention-Deficit/Hyperactive Disorder
ANOVA	-	Analysis of Variance
CBCL	-	Children Behavior Checklist
EFDA/DH		Expended Function Dental Auxiliaries/ Dental Hygienist
ITPSDB	-	Influence of Teachers Parenting Styles on Students Disruptive Behaviour
PAQ	-	Parent Authority Questionnaire
PPMC(r)	-	Pearson Product Moment Correlation
PSASDBQ	-	Parenting Style and Students Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire
PSDQ	-	Parenting Style and Dimensions Questionnaire
PSI-II	-	Parenting Style Inventory
PSQ	-	Parenting Style Questionnaire
PSS	-	Parenting Styles Scale
SBI	-	Social Behaviour Inventory
SDBC	-	Students' Disruptive Behaviour Scale
SPSSIQ	-	Parenting Styles and Social Interaction Questionnaire
WASSCE	-	West Africa Senior Secondary School Certificate Examination

OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF TERMS

For the purpose of this research, the following definitions of terms are used:

Parenting Styles: Refers to the process by which parents relate, interact, rear, react and direct children in the course of upbringing. These include authoritative parenting style, autocratic parenting style, laissez-faire parenting style, democratic parenting style and uninvolved parenting style.

Disruptive Behaviour: These are inappropriate behaviour that interferes with the functioning of student's learning; such as talking when the teacher is speaking, frequently entering class late or leaving early and the use of cell phones or other electronic devices in class.

Authoritative Parenting Style: Is a parenting style that is warmth, highly responsive and caring for children's need. The authoritative parents provide rules and guidance to children without over-bearing and based on their maturity level. They understand their children's feeling and emotions, and provide explanation for why they expect them to behave in a particular way.

Autocratic Parenting Style: Is a parental behaviour that is characterized by firm control and use of power in the upbringing. The autocratic parents set rigid rules and are critical, harsh and angry on their children for not following the rules.

Laissez-Faire Parenting Style: Is the parenting style that is warmth and responsive with children's needs but low in their control, supervision and monitoring.

Democratic parenting Style: Is a parenting style that exhibit participatory leadership style that encourage children to have the right and freedom as well as privileges to make their own decision.

Uninvolved parenting Style: Is a parenting style that is neither classified as being demanding nor responsive, they are indifferent to their children, low in warmth, control, and disengaged from their parental responsibility

ABSTRACT

This study examined the relationship between parenting styles and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis. The sample for the study consisted of 346 students. The study employed correlational design. The instruments used for data collection were parenting styles scale (PSS) and students' disruptive behaviour scale (SDBC) both designed by Erinisha. Data were analyzed using descriptive (frequencies, mean and standard deviation) for analysis of bio data and Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient(r) for testing hypotheses at 0.05 alpha level of significance. Findings revealed that there was significant inverse relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour ($r = -0.759$, $p = 0.002$). There was significant positive relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour ($r = 0.799$, $p = 0.001$) and also between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior ($r = 0.668$, $p = 0.003$). There is a significant inverse relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior ($r = -0.700$, $p = 0.033$). There was significant positive relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior ($r = 0.724$, $p = 0.001$). Based on the findings it was recommended that parents should be enlightened about authoritative parenting style and democratic parenting style and should adopt this styles in rearing of their children. While, autocratic, laissez-faire and uninvolved parenting styles should be avoided by parents.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

The school is one of the institutions in the larger society, consisting of student with distinctive behaviour. Due to lack of moral values in contemporary society, the school since they do not exist in isolation from the outside world are faced with the ever-rising problems of immorality, bullying, truancy, deviant behaviour, such as breaking of rules and regulations and other undesirable behaviour. These are a reflection of developments in the outside world. However these students posing as deviants in schools came from different parents. Parenting style is also different; many parents create their own style from a combination of factors, and these may evolve over time as the children develop their own personalities and move through life's stages. Parenting style is affected by both the parents and children's temperaments, and is largely based on the influence of culture.

Parenting style can be seen as the representation of how parents respond to the demand of their children. It is a psychological construct representing standard strategies that parents use in rearing of their children. The range and depth of emotions which parents display to their children, build up the psychological interior of their children (Barnhart, Raval, Jansari & Raval 2013). Disruptive behaviour are inappropriate behaviour that interferes with the functioning and flow of the students. Common examples of disruptive behaviour include, but are not limited to eating in class, monopolizing classroom discussion, failing to respect the rights of other students to express their viewpoints, talking when the teacher is speaking, frequently entering class late or leaving early, use of cell phones or other electronic devices in the classroom, inordinate or inappropriate demands for time and attention.

Disruptive behaviour by students can cause roadblocks to student's achievements in academic performance. Disruptive behaviour is not merely a naughty behaviour of student but it goes beyond the normal routine of disturbance in the classroom. Sometimes a single child disturbs the whole classroom so much that neither the child who creates disruption nor the other children sitting beside him or her can learn (Ayeeni, 2009).

Every parent has their own parental values, beliefs and practices which can affect student's behaviour towards school activities. According to Ibia (2010), education is aimed at changing behaviour of learners. It believed that when learners respond positively to teaching-learning process, learning has taken place. According to Otu (2012), each secondary school setting is a bundle of behaviour emanating from different parenting style, some parents lay trust and beliefs on schools as the only avenue that could influence students' behaviour. Also, according to Mbiti (2011), parents in the traditional societies often believe that religion and customary norms could shape or influence life patterns or behaviour of students. During the advent of formal education, parents believe in sending their children to school, not only to receive academic lessons but to be behaviorally transformed. However this is not always the case because more often than not, students disruptive behaviour emanate from home as the popular saying goes 'charity begins at home'. Therefore, it has become a matter of great concern for the educators as they put their head down and think of an effective way to curb disruptive behaviour among students. Some of the suggested parenting style according to psychologists that could propel disruptive behaviour by students is as follows; authoritative parenting style, autocratic parenting style, laissez-faire parenting style, democratic style of parenting and uninvolved parenting style.

Authoritative parenting style is demanding and responsive. According to Taylor (2009), authoritative parenting is characterized by a child-centered approach that is high

expectations of maturity. Authoritative parents encourage their children to be independent but still place controls and limits on their actions. The parents will explain their motive for their punishment because they see it as being reasonable and fair. Authoritative parents are attentive to their children's needs and concerns, and will typically punish and forgive if a child falls short. According to Maccoby and Martin (2009), authoritative parents are both highly responsive and very demanding. Autocratic parenting style is centered on one source of authority only. These parents tolerate no arguments from their children. According to Chua (2010), this type of parents requires children to obey the rules and provide reward and punishment for their behaviour.

Laissez-faire parenting style allows the child to do his or her own thing. In this style of parenting there is little respect for order and routine. Few limits are placed on anyone's freedom. According to Adegoke (2010), laissez-faire parenting style contributes immensely to student's disruptive behaviour because they do not care to know whether or not the children are moral. Democratic style of parenting on the other hand, exhibit participatory leadership style that encourages presentation of positive self-concept, honesty, responsibility and acceptance of self and others. According to Bernard (2014), democratic parents are leaders and teachers who encourage cooperation and stimulate learning, democratic parents forgive and teach instead of punishing a child if he/she misbehaves. Uninvolved parenting style is characterized by a lack of responsiveness to a child's needs. According to Baumrind (2009), uninvolved parents make few demands of their children and they are often indifferent, dismissive, or even completely neglectful. These parents have little emotional involvement with their children's. While they provide for basic needs like food and shelter, they are uninvolved in their children's behaviour. It is in view of the foregoing discourse that the research intends to investigate parenting styles that could propel disruptive behaviour among students in Uyo Metropolis.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Parenting style is a complex activity that includes many specific behaviour that work individually and collectively to influence child outcomes. Parents may differ in how they try to control their children and the extent to which they do so is assumed to be the primary role of all parents. Parenting style is the process of promoting and supporting the physical, emotional, social and intellectual development of a child from infancy to adulthood.

Despite attempts by teachers to address the problem of disruptive behaviour of students in classrooms, there is still the increasing problem of disruption by students such as non-attentiveness, fighting, stealing and idleness in class to mention but a few. Teachers usually complain that these disruptive behaviour in the classroom are intolerable and stress-provoking which takes a great deal of time and energy to manage in the classroom thereby frustrating the teachers ability to give their best in lesson delivery thus, leading to poor academic performance among students and mass failures in school exams and other external exams such as West Africa Senior Secondary Certificate Examination (WASSCE). Similarly, research findings also show that disruptive behaviour affect students themselves, hence they do not concentrate on their studies which is the primary objective in secondary school and as the result lead to lowers academic achievement, increases delinquent behaviour by posing a threat to the smooth administrative function of schools and tends to influence other students' to do the same because peers tend to have significant influence over each other and if one student is disruptive, it may encourage similar behaviour in other classmates who might not have had trouble otherwise.

Thus, these might compromise the teachers' authority and ability to control the class as some teachers are often not equipped to deal with some types of extreme disruptive behaviour by students' and as a result the student is either sent out of class or the school, go further to seek alternative remedy in handling these behaviour and enlist the aid of outside

professionals to try to intervene. This takes resources and funding, which could be better used to improve the educational environment for all students instead of one.

Furthermore, many students have complained about the provocative attitudes of their peers in the school and a lot of lamentations have been also expressed by teachers about students' disruptive behaviour in the classroom in Uyo metropolis. Some of these students disruptive behaviour can be traceable to the influence of parenting style on the moral upbringing of the child. It is in view of the foregoing, that the researcher deem it necessary to examine which parenting style contribute more to disruptive behaviour exhibited among secondary school students' in Uyo metropolis.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To determine the relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis.
2. To determine relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis.
3. To determine relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis
4. To determine relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school in Uyo metropolis
5. To determine relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary schools in Uyo metropolis.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions are raised regarding the problem under investigation:

1. What is the relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour?

2. What is the relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour?
3. What is the relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour?
4. What is the relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour?
5. What is the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and student's disruptive behaviour?

1.5 Research Hypotheses

For this particular study, the following hypotheses would be tested:

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour

H₀₂: There is no significant relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour

H₀₃: There is no significant relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour

H₀₄: There is no significant relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour.

H₀₅: There is no significant relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour.

1.6 Basic Assumptions

The study is based on the assumption that:

1. Some students' exhibit disruptive behavior.
2. There are some parenting styles that contribute more to students' disruptive behavior.

1.7 Significance of the Study

It is expected that the findings of this study will be of immense benefit not only to the researcher but also to numerous people in the society and in the educational sector. The findings from this study will have significant implications for policy makers in education. This implication is worth mentioning as policy makers in education can use it to design policies that will take into consideration the impact of parenting styles on students' disruptive behaviour.

It will also help parents to adopt appropriate style in raising their children, through this knowledge, parents will learn and be aware of the various stages of the development of the child and know appropriate style to take into consideration to avoid disruptive behaviour by the students.

The findings of this study will help parents to be flexible in their style of parenting by knowing what style of parenting to adopt at a particular stage in their children's development, by being open to change as the parenting style that was obtainable in the past might not necessary be obtainable in the contemporary times.

It will also help the policy makers in education to understand that parenting style can propel students disruptive in school thereby adopting the content of school programmers' which will elicit desirable behaviour among students. It will provides the school administrators and practicing teachers with in-depth awareness that most of the disruptive behaviour exhibits from students could be trace to styles of parenting and as such see ways of assisting the children out.

The study will help students with the understanding about how their parenting styles can influence their behaviour, and also informed them about disruptive behaviour, its causes and effects. It will also help students to abide by the rules and regulations expected from them by their parents and be able to understand their parents very well. The research will be relevant to the school counselors as it will give them the opportunity to provide

counseling session to the students who display disruptive behaviour aimed at helping them for proper behaviour modification and to arrange a forum with the parents and expose them on the right style of parenting to advert the danger of disruptive behaviour of their children. The study will also help those in academics, the teachers in particular to identify students who display disruptive behaviour in class and seek for the way to help such students either by counseling the students or refers the students to special center for proper behaviour modification.

It will make stakeholders in education to understand the effect of parenting styles on students' disruptive behaviour and as such fashion out ways to talk to parents on proper upbringing of their children to curb disruptive behaviour in school.

It will also serve as a reference material to those who may wish to carryout research on relevant topic in the same or different environment as the findings in this research will cover the area that share the same interest. It is therefore hoped that other prospective researcher will develop interest in the research and help to elaborate it by covering other schools or at most, finding the cause behind the research result, and as well as effect corrections that will be discovered in this work.

1.8 Scope and Delimitations of the Study

The main focus of this study is on the relationship between parenting styles and student's disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo Metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State Nigeria. The study focus on variables including authoritative, autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic and uninvolved parenting styles. The study were targeted to SS1 students in Uyo Metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State. The study does not focus on other senior secondary students such as SS2 and SS3. Also private school students are excluded from this study.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

The following areas of review have been discussed under this chapter. They include: The Conceptual Framework, Theoretical Framework and Review of Empirical studies, The Areas of Discussion include The Concept of Parenting, Parenting Styles, Variables of Parenting Styles and Disruptive Behaviour. The following are the areas of the review:

2.2 Concept of Parenting

2.3 Parenting Styles

2.3.1 Authoritative Parenting Style

2.3.2 Autocratic Parenting Style

2.3.3 Laissez-Faire Parenting Style

2.3.4 Democratic Parenting Style

2.3.5 Uninvolved Parenting Style

2.4 Disruptive Behaviour

2.4.1 Relationship between Parenting Style and Disruptive Behaviour

2.5 Theoretical Framework

2.5.1 Baumrind Theory of Parenting

2.5.2 Erick Erickson's Psychosocial Theory

2.5.3 Bandura's Social Learning Theory

2.5.4 DolarsandMiller'sBehaviourist/LearningTheoryofReinforcement

2.5.5 Durkheim Sociological Theory

2.6 Review of Empirical Studies

2.7 Summary

2.2 Concept of Parenting

Parenting can be simply defined as the process or the state of being a parent, once an individual have a child, such an individual is involved in the process of parenting. However, it is not that simple as according to Morrison (2009), parenting is "the process of developing and utilizing the knowledge and skills appropriate to planning for, creating, giving birth to and rearing or providing care for offspring". This definition implies that parenting starts when there is a plan for it and it involves not just bringing up the children but also providing care for them.

Parenting is one of the complex tasks every parent wants and hopes to succeed in. It forms the basis of a family environment without which it is not possible for parents to fulfill their roles and duties in the society (Kordi & Baharudin 2010). It is a social component and private affair, which occurs in a specific family context; imbued with the emotional ties that bind family members together (Watson, Nizon & Halpanny, 2012). Watabe (2011),described the term parenting refers to mothering, he described parenting as parental behaviour that are functional activities which encompass pleasures, privileges, profits as well as frustrations, fears and failures, he suggests that parenting provides help for parents to derive a considerable pleasure in their relationship and activities with their children. According to Domenech-Rodriguez, Donovanick, and Crowely (2009), posited that, one of the overarching goals of effective parenting is to support children development from dependency and external control to internalization, and the ability to be initiative and socially responsible. Thus, children within the family contexts can internalize social standards and expectations of the parents, parenting, therefore, are complex behaviour and attitudes which are associated with children's outcomes.

Okpako (2009), parenting is an act of parenthood, the child upbringing, training and rearing or child education. Parents world over, are in search of greener pasture, and some

decades, there has been drift of family from their place of origin to urban cities. (Inman, Howard & Walker 2012), opined that parents are often faced with the complex task of parenting their children within a culture that is notably dissimilar from their culture of origin.

Parenting is defined by Abesha (2012), as the regulation of behaviour and development of children with the intention they can live a socially life, adapt to their environment and pursue their own goals. In other words, parenting is a socialization process and patterns which parents transfer their cultural values, beliefs, traditions and norms as well as other socially culturally desirable behaviour to their children, he also defined parenting as categories of behaviour and practices that include: nurturance, teaching, discipline, language, monitoring, management and provision of materials. These according to Rita (2010), include both physical and social environment in the parenting. Parenting in this sense, demonstrates the proximal and social process which mediates between the child and their parents with regard to behaviour formation.

The goal of parenting is to nurture the child to eventually regulate his/her behaviour. Due to the fact that students spend their early childhood with their parents, it may seem logical to state that the family environment has a great influence on their lives. Through interactions with their parents, children become aware of the consequences of their actions and of others' expectations of them. This early socialization process therefore, appears to be a means by which children come to internalize a sense of what is right and of what is wrong (Ludwig & Duncan, 2015). Parenting could be seen as the process of promoting and supporting the physical, emotional, social, financial, and intellectual development of a child from infancy to adulthood. Parenting refers to the aspects of raising a child aside from the biological relationship (Daviesi -Kean, 2009).

2.3 Parenting Styles

Parenting style is the term psychologists use to describe how parents rear their children through behaviour, discipline, methods used that influence children (Kordi & Baharudin, 2010). According to Barnhart, Raval, Jansari and Raval (2013), parenting style is a psychological construct representing standard strategies that parents use in their child upbringing. A parent can spend an entire afternoon with his child, yet the parent may be engaging in a different activity and not demonstrating enough concern towards the child. Parenting styles are the representation of how parents respond and place demand on their children. The relationship between the parent and the child is attachment. In the stage of adolescence, parents encounter new challenges, such as adolescents seeking and desiring freedom (Querido, 2002).

Parenting style have been defined as a complex activity that includes specific parents' behaviour that work individually or together to influence child outcomes through interaction between them across situation (Mize & Pettit, 1997; Ra, 2009). It can also be seen as a complex activity that includes different specific behaviour that work individually or jointly together to influence children's developmental milestone across physical, cognitive, social emotional and moral characteristics. Baumrind (1991), defined parenting styles as a construct used to capture normal variations in parents' attempt to control and socialize their children. For this reason, Santrock (2012), viewed parenting style as a psychological term that centers on the behaviour and attitude of parents, representing standard strategies that they use in their child rearing process. Parenting style is therefore, the process of promoting and supporting the physical disambiguation needed for emotional, social and intellectual development of a child from infancy to adulthood. Parenting style also refers to the aggregates or constellations of behaviour that describe

parent-child interactions over a wide range of situations that are presumed to create a pervasive interactional climate (Mize & Petti, 1991 cited in Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen & McNeilly-Choque, 2012).

Parenting styles is the emotional climate in which parenting practices take place (e.g., display of empathy, tone of voice, burst of anger, etc.). This presupposes parenting style as the constellation of attitude towards the child that is communicated by creating the emotional climate in which the parent's behaviour are expressed. These behaviour according to Darling and Steinberg (2015), comprised parenting practices as well as other aspects of child-interactions that communicate emotional attitude but are not goal directed (e.g. tone of voice, body language, inattention, and burst of temper and so on). Thus, parenting style is expressed through parenting practices, because children infer the emotional attitude of their parents from such practices. Parenting styles therefore, has an indirect influence on the children's development by altering the parents' capacity to socialize their children through changing the effectiveness of their parenting practices. Against this argument, Darling & Steinberg (2015), described parenting style as a contextual variable which moderates the relationship between specific parenting practices and children's behavioural development outcomes.

Parenting styles, is defined as the consistent patterns of parental behaviour and attitude which parents interact and deal with their children along different parental dimensions (Baumrind 1966). Parenting style is a constellation of parental behaviour and attitude toward their children that conveyed as a whole to create an emotional bond in which the parents' behaviour is expressed (Darling & Steinberg, 2015). According to Boroffice (2014) and Hyssong (2013), the incidence of parental separation may result in students' embarrassment, depression and even make them to miss school, perform poorly academically and exhibit disruptive behaviour. Parenting styles are the methods use in

guiding, training and schooling a child from a formative early childhood to adulthood in order to fit into the expected objective of the parents and society. Parenting style by this context therefore, is the emotional attachment between the parents and their children throughout the process of rearing or upbringing.

Parenting style refers to a universal construct reflecting the parental behaviour and attitudes toward their children and the quality of interaction and relationship between parents and children. This specifically deals with encouragement, warmth, and support, as well as communication about school matters between parents and children in one hand, and between parents and school personnel on the other (Abesha, 2012). The persistence aspects of parental rearing styles of children are strong discipline, parental disharmony, rejection of the child and inadequate involvement in the child's activities cause disruption among students (Okorodudu & Okorodudu, 2009).

Some research reports have shown that a large percentage of disruptions come from homes that lack normal parental love and care. Attention, love and warmth go a long way in assisting the child's emotional development and adjustment (Odebunmi, 2014). In fact, students at adolescence stage require parental love, care, warmth and serious attention to be properly adjusted in the environment in which he/she finds him/herself. Parents have major roles to play in the adjustment process of student. The behavioural problems of most students are rooted in their homes (Onyehalu 2012). Otudah (2009), noted that when the relationship between the parent and the student is warm, it creates a healthy environment for the development of student. Students exhibiting traits of friendliness, cheerfulness, positive emotions and good maturity, show evidently, that such student comes from home where they are accepted and love.

Okpako (2009), observed that, a child well brought up will remain a source of joy and happiness for such family. The neglected student gradually becomes a drug addict, aggressive, arm robbery and disobeys rules and regulations and so on. The required parental monitoring and control for student's development may be hindered due to parents' serious involvement in economic activities outside their homes to meet up with family financial commitments. Ukoha (2013), Onyewadume (2012) and Otuadah (2009), observed that parents spend little or no time at home to assist in the upbringing of the children. The children invariably fall into evil association. Loromeke (2009), is of the view that parents bring up their children according to the training they also receive from their own parents. For example, many parent who grew up in the strict environment end up getting such for their own children. African tradition has it that the use of high control, authority and punishment bring the best out of a child. Through interactions with parents, children become aware of the consequences of their actions and of others' expectations of them. This early socialization process therefore, appears to be a means by which children come to internalize a sense of what is right and of what is wrong. (Ludwig & Duncan 2015). These parenting styles includes, authoritative, autocratic, laissez-faire democratic and uninvolved

2.3.1 Authoritative Parenting Style

Authoritative parent have ideas about their children behaviour and discipline which they are willing to explain and discuss with children. Ekpato (2009), argue that authoritative parents are difficult to predict because only his speech and instruction stand's supreme. Taylor (2009), opined that authoritative parents teach their children the importance of being strict and strain. Fastidiousness becomes one moral lesson learned by the children from authoritative parents. Ubom (2017), is of the opinion that student from authoritative parenting are hash and exhibit disruptive behaviour, since the behaviour of such parents is

harsh and uncompromising to the children, the delusive attitude the students learned from parent is extended to the school environment, the children from such parents cannot freely associate with other students rather, they exhibit disruptive behaviour.

Denga (2013), explain that authoritative parents encourage bidirectional communication and verbal give and take of instructions, and the student whose parents use authoritative parenting style score higher in measures of academic performance, and more likely to become independent, self-reliant, socially accepted and well-behaved. Oyedeye (2012), noted that authoritative parents show high level of warmth and they emphasized the reasons why rule should be adhere to, and the parent stand firm expecting their children to behave responsibly, and if the children goes contrary to their rules the child will be punish, shame or even withdrawal of love and when the children from such parents goes to school, they will display disruptive behaviour to their mates and teacher. (Maccoby & Martin 2009) stated that authoritative parents are both highly responsive and very demanding and place limits, consequences and expectation no their children behaviour. Andrew (2014), explained that since children from authoritative parent are encourage with independence and self-reliance when going to school are expected to exhibit such behaviour like being autonomous in class and any restraint from teacher may lead to disruptive behaviour.

Inyang (2010), asserted that children from authoritative parents may have less social competence because the parents generally tell the child what to do instead of allowing the child to choose by him/herself, therefore resulting in disruptive behaviour when the child goes to school, and that children from this style of parenting develop insecurities and exhibit disruption. Authoritative parents like democratic parents are assertive or balance parenting characterized by a child-centered approach that holds high expectations of maturity (Baumrind, 1991), the authoritative parents provide rules and guidance without over-bearing, and can understand their children's feelings, emotions, and teach them how

to regulate them. This parenting style encourages student to be independent, responsive, and think about consequences of their behaviour. The parents are warm, attentive to their children's needs and concern, and they typically forgive and teach instead of punishing furiously, if a child falls short.

Authoritative parents provide clear, reasonable expectations for their children, set limits and demands based on the maturity level of their children, explanations for why they expect their children to behave in a particular way. When using punishment, they are measured and used consistently, not harsh or arbitrarily; and will explain the motive for the punishment. The parents set clear standards for their children, monitor their behaviour to make sure that they follow through the rules, but in a warm and loving manner. They try to catch their children to good, and reinforce them for good behaviour, rather than focusing on the bad ones. As children grow mature, authoritative parents involve them in making rules, and give them choices based on their ability and maturity. The authoritative parent's guides student's behaviour by teaching and not by punishment.

Authoritative parenting is characterized by optimum balance of responsiveness and demandingness; and directs student in a rational and disciplined manner by clarifying the reasoning behind rules. This type of parenting is high in all four dimensions of family functioning such as high standards as expected for children, high emotional attachment, and support to children (Abesha, 2012) positive communication between parents and children (Cramer, 2016; Watabe, 2011) and use of positive reinforcement and induction to guide student. Induction involves explaining reasons and consequences of behaviour to assist children in forming and internalizing good moral concepts.

Authoritative parent demonstrates responsiveness to the child's needs, demandingness (setting expectations behaviour of consequences for noncompliance), monitoring of the

child's behavior, providing clear standards of conduct, and discipline based on reasoning rather than based on power assertion or withdrawal of love. Authoritative parents provide home environments rich with strict behavioral supervision with high degrees of emotional support. Within this style of parenting, children are encouraged to behave with prosaically behavior and to reason autonomously about moral problems, to respect adults, and to learn to think independently (Baumrind 1996) goes on to comment that the primary two child-rearing goals are to foster moral character and optimal competence.

Dwairy and Menshar (2005), opined that authoritative parenting style provides warmth, love and acceptance for their children in order to educate them to become progressively more autonomous. They further noted that an important characteristic of the authoritative parent is the use of verbal give-and-take between parents and children. Open communication and reciprocal dialogue can be found within this style of parenting.

Odebunmi (2014) and Okapko (2009) identified some factors which would make for authoritative parenting as: provision of children's needs: good food, shelter, love, warmth, affection, education, control, monitoring, supervision, dialogue and so on. According to Darling (2007), authoritative parenting style have been shown to help American teenagers earn good grades avoid disruption, and also enhance ethnic pride in teens who are ethnic minorities.

2.3.2 Autocratic Parenting Style

Pellerin (2005) in consonance with Baumrind (1991), stated that autocratic parent apply firm control and require their children to obey with a reasonable set of rules and guidelines. They are high on demandingness and low on responsiveness. They value obedience and favour punitive, forceful means, for instance, the use of power assertion to curb the self-will of their children. They attempt to shape, control and evaluate the

behaviour and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set absolute standard of conduct. Autocratic or authoritarian parents attempt to inculcate conventional values such as respect for authority and preservation of order and traditional structure because these parents believe that their offspring should accept their rules and expectations without question, they do not encourage verbal give-and-take on discipline-related matters. This style ultimately does not foster their children's autonomy, but instead restrict independent behaviour (Hsieh, 2009).

Huver, Otten, Vries & Engel (2009), pointed out that compliance, conformity, strict parental control and respect for authority are the major concern of autocratic parents. They prefer exercising high degree of demands on their children rather than nurturance and open communication. They punish when they disobey the strict rule and regulation which are set. They utilize control to make disciplinary decisions, while harsh forms of punishment are discouraged. Autocratic parents expect much from their children but generally do not explain the reasons for establishing rules or boundaries. The parents are less responsive to their children's needs, and are prone to spank a child rather than discuss the problem. Autocratic parenting style is characterized by low warmth, high control, demands, parental harshness, lack of love affection and care, aggression, adequate monitoring and supervision and lack of control to mention but few. These and others conditions may put the students in to disruptive behaviour, (Maccoby & Martin, 2009). The autocratic parents are often emotionally detached but restrictively controlling (Cramer, 2013).

Besides, strict parents always try to be in control and extend their control on their children. They set strict rules and tend to be very critical of children for not meeting those standards. They provide children with options or choices of things to do, but tell them what to do; in command language (i.e. just to obey their directives). The autocratic parents, on a similar manner, do not explain why they want their children to do things and if a child questions a

rule or command, the parent might answer "because I said so." Autocratic parents also tend to focus on bad behaviour rather than positive one, and children are scolded often harshly and angrily for not following the rules. The parents do not consider children's desire or opinions and they enforce rules rigidly. They show anger and displeasure clearly, and often confront children regarding bad behaviour, and use harsh, punitive discipline.

Children of autocratic parents tend to develop characteristics such as being conflicted, irritable, moody, unhappy, fearful and apprehensive, easily annoyed and passively hostile. They also alternate between disruptive behaviour and sulky withdrawal, and become vulnerable to stress (Baumrind, 1991; Hetherington & Parke, 2009). This parenting style negatively associated with student's disruptive behaviour (Hill, 2010).

Huver (2009) stated that compliance, conformity, strict parental control and respect for authority are the major concern of autocratic parents. They prefer exercising high degree of demands on their children rather than nurturance and open communication. Student from autocratic homes will be punished when they disobey the strict rules and regulations which are set by parents (Bornstein & Zlotnik, 2008). According to Udoh (2018), autocratic parents do not permit contribution from the children and any other member of the family, parents who are autocratic believe in self-concept and decisions, they expect that their experiences and practices as final, and their pronouncement and disciplinary actions are blinding to all their children.

Mbiti (2011), explained that autocratic parents are extremely difficult to live with they are never friendly or accommodating. Stephen (2013) asserted that autocratic parents are self-centeredness, student whose parents are autocratic learn hash behaviour, autocratic parents rarely laugh or create smiles, they look serious and cruel to other individuals, and such cruelty is learned by the student even at childhood. Igwe (2010), observed that student

who are raised by autocratic parent are prone to alleviant and lawless behaviour in school, such student, since they were brought up in the hostile home, believe that disruptive behaviour is the best pattern of behaviour and may find it difficult to adopt to school rules and regulation. According to (Dacey & Dacey 2009), autocratic parents value obedience and believe in restricting the student autonomy, such parents do not believe in discussion with student but want the student to accept their words for what is right. They believe that autocratic parent discipline may range from reasonable restraint on the student's behaviour to rigid restraints that permits turn no freedom of action except that which conforms to prescribed standard by autocratic parents, that in most case, student who were brought up by autocratic parents are stubborn because they had become prone to hash controls and physical punishments right from childhood.

Autocratic or authoritarian parents usually discourage autonomy and disallowed decision making by their children (Bornstein & Zlotnik, 2008). Gould and Martindale (2009), stated two types thus, which are non-authoritarian and directive authoritarian. The non-authoritarian is directive but will not either be tyrannical in the use of power while directive authoritarian are highly strict in the way they use their power.

2.3.3 Laissez - Faire Parenting Style

They are permissive parents that are high on responsiveness, but low on demanding. These parents interact with their children in a passive manner, of avoiding the use of power when dealing with issues of discipline. They view themselves as resources available to the children, the children, may or may not choose the use. Laissez-faire parents are likely to view discipline as an infringement upon the freedom of their offspring, which they believe impinges upon their healthy development. Consequently, these parents attempt to behave in a non-punitive, accepting and affirmative manner toward their children's impulses, desires and actions. Laissez-faire or lenient parenting is characterized as having few

behaviour expectations for the child, with excessively lax and inconsistent discipline and encouragement of children's free expression of their impulses (Santrock, 2012). This style of parenting dates back to the philosopher Rousseau in the eighteenth century and was strongly promoted in 1970s by children's movement (Baumrind, 1970 & Cramer, 2013).

Laissez-faire parenting is high in nurturance but low in maturity demands, supervision and bi-directional communication between parents and children. This parenting style is characterized by affirmative and accepting manners that frees children from restraint, but are prone to sudden outburst of anger when they reach their capacity of tolerance.

Baumrind (1991), found that both authoritative and laissez-faire parents view their children as dominated by primitive self-centered impulses, over which they had little control. However, the laissez-faire parents thought that free expression of these impulses was desirable, whereas the authoritative parents perceived impulses as something to be suppressed. Therefore, laissez-faire parenting is that which parents are lax, exercise inconsistent discipline, and encourage children to express their impulses freely. The parents give up most control to their children, make few rules (if any), and they are usually not enforced consistency. They want their children to feel free, make as many choices as possible; even when the children are not capable of making good choices, and tend to accept in warm and loving manner their children behaviour however they behave (good or bad). They may be involved, nurturing, accepting, as well as responsive to their children's needs and wish; meanwhile, they place little control on them. Santrock (2012) and Baurmrind (1991) maintained that laissez-faire parenting style can create "spoiled brats" or "spoiled sweet" children.

Barnhart (2013), sees laissez-faire parents as setting no rules and the students is permitted to do what he/she thinks is right. These is the underlying believe that the wrong done, they

will learn from the consequences of his act that is wrong. That learning by experience, as it says experience is the best teacher. He further stated that students who have grown up in laissez-faire parent tend to become spoiled. They tend to be uncooperative with rules and regulations. Also, they lack control, are rebellious, hostile and aggressive. Looking at the opinion of Baumrind (1991), laissez-faire parents are non-controlling and one who make few demands on the child. Generally, they are warm and allow the children to control their own behaviour and establish their own guidelines without any specific standards. Children are consulted on family decisions and issues. Laissez-faire parenting raises children who are immature and low in responsibility.

Hertherington and Parke (2009) said that the effect of laissez-faire style of parenting on the child's behaviour include self-reliance, independence and discipline that generate a certain amount of anger by preventing the child from doing motivated acts, that communicates some disapproval by the parents and that it affects the learning or socially desirable behaviour when parent for example, condone cheating, the students attitudes towards it becomes lenient. Santrock (2012) observe that laissez-faire parents allow their children to have more influence than the parents themselves had in decision making.

According to Halloran (2009) laissez-faire parent are non-directive, vesting the highest authority with the children. Crystal (2010), stated that children from laissez-faire parent have a great deal of latitude to do what they like, and that there may be no rules that direct the conducts of the children, if at all there is any, it is usually very few. Jekel (2009), express that laissez-faire parent is such who exerts little or no influence over the behaviour of his/her children. According to him, in this type of parenting, there is little or no rules in the home and as such, the children are free to behave anyway they like. student who come from laissez-faire parents may usually exhibit disruptive behaviour in school, since they come from home backgrounds with little or no parental guidance, such students hate to be

discipline in school, they hate to see their behaviour sanctioned and prefer to be allowed every freedom they desire (Denga, 2013).

According to Akpan (2013), laissez-faire parents contribute immensely to children disruptive behaviour because they do not care to know whether or not the children are moral. Ukpe (2009), stated that student from laissez-faire parent are commonly engage in causal peer relationships, and seen to copy different disruptive behaviour from peer instead from parents and care-givers. David (2015), emphasized that children whose parents are laissez-faire share with public than with family members, they take delight in gaining undue social freedom and exhibit undesirable behaviour from gangsters and deviants. Uche (2010), explained that laissez-faire parenting is characterized by freedom, confusion and low esteem since the parents lacks confidence in his ability to supervise their children.

Student from laissez-faire parents tend to be more aggressive, domineering, impulsive, quick to anger, non-compliant and resistant. They also lack self-control, and display little self-reliance and achievement orientation. Although these parents foster a great sense of creativity and confidence in their children, the children tend to exhibit significant impulsivity and lack maturity which often lead them to exhibit disruptive behaviour in school (Parrot, 2010). The children may be very social and excellent communicators but they also have a tendency to shirk responsibility which often leads to disruptive behaviour (Levine, 2017).

2.3.4 Democratic Parenting Style

In a democratic parent, the children's have the right and freedom as well as privileges of every child is taken into consideration. Okoro (2009), in his study stated that under democratic style of parenting the children has voice and both the parent and the children's work for the good of the home, the parents are like the director or manager they are more

experience so they get to set rules, the rules, however, are discussed with the children and explained as to why they are in place and how it benefits the child to have the rules. According to Bernard (2014), democratic parents' exhibited participatory leadership style that encourages presentation of children matter and decision-making and important discussion under a participatory and threat-free climate, student from democratic parents emulate a lot of behaviour including fairness, justice, and equity.

According to Dacey and Traver (2016), democratic style of parenting does not mean that parents especially, father does not have any leverage to take decisions without the members of the children but decided to carry the children along to promotes peace and calmness. According to Udoh (2018) democratic parenting stresses choices; children are encouraged to make choices daily on many different areas in their lives. Patrick (2009) asserts that using democratic style of parenting make the children to realize that their parents value them and their education, they are polite in school and more committed, most disruptive behaviour exhibited by students in school may be as a result of frustration due to little or no care from parents at homes.

Halloran (2009), provided a framework which states that democratic parenting recognize that increased freedoms comes with responsibility, he stated that children are conscientiously taught to begin making choices from a very early age so that they become skilled at making increasing more complex decisions as they grow older. Halloran (2009) asserted that student from democratic parents demonstrate high productivity because they are given a fair amount of freedom to maximize their potentials and become creative and satisfied. Liket (2010) is of the opinion that the more fully this democratic parenting is applied the greater the extent of participative and motivation arise from the student, and that communication and dialogue on important issues are made very clear and given their rightful places, emphasis tends to be on high productivity and motivation. Ukpe (2009),

asserted that when parents fails to use this style effectively, either because of lack of knowledge or unawareness, they often end up with spoiled, manipulative and undisciplined children, and that disruptive behaviour occur sometime as a response to parental injustice, where there is no justice or fair treatment between parent and children the children are likely to exhibit disruptive behaviour.

Hetherington and Parke (2009), stated that democratic parents value both instrumental and expressive attributes, for instance, discipline conformity and freedom of self-will, yet assume ultimate responsibility for the behaviour of their children. They are mindful of their own rights and also acknowledge their children's idiosyncratic ways. Democratic parents like authoritative parents set clear standards of behaviour which take into account the developing capabilities and needs of the child. They guide their children's activities firmly and consistently require them to participate in the functioning of the household by helping out with chores. When dealing with issues of discipline, democratic parents engage their children in dialogue in a rational, issue-oriented manner. Moreover, democratic parents are considered warm and responsive to the needs of the children. They are effectively responsive by being loved, committed and supportive. They are also cognitively responsive by providing a situating and challenging home environment. Pellerin (2005) in agreed with Mackay (2016) that democratic parents apply firm control and require their children to obey with a reasonable set of rules and guidelines.

2.3.5 Uninvolved Parenting Style

Uninvolved parenting style according to Maccoby and Martin (2009) was neither classified as demanding nor responsive. It is also called neglect, detached, dismissive, or hands-off parenting (Santrock, 2012). According to Maccoby and Martin (2009), neglecting-rejecting parenting style is believed to be the most detrimental of the four types of parenting styles on children's and student behavioral development. In this parenting

style, parents are characterized as being indifferent to their children, low in warmth, and control, disengaged, undemanding and low in responsiveness. The parents are generally not involved, and do not set limits for their children. Uninvolved parents are generally not involved, and do not set limits for their children. Uninvolved parents are parent-centered rather than child centered. They focus on their own needs and dismiss children's emotional, psychological and behavioral needs. They often ignore their children, letting the children's preferences prevail as long as those preferences do not interfere with their own activities. Many children of this parenting style often provide for themselves or halt, depending on the parents to get a feeling of being independent and mature beyond their years.

Ehnavall, Parker, Hadzi-Pavlovic and Malhi (2009) found that female depressed patients who underwent rejected or neglected parenting in their childhood had a higher chance of attempting suicide during their lifetime. In contrast, males who had rejected experiences in their childhood were not at risk of suicide attempts. According to Baumrind (1960), uninvolved parenting sometimes referred to as neglectful parenting, is a style where the child does not get an adequate amount of emotional support, physical time, basic needs such as food, shelter, health care, childhood play, and academic support, from the parents. Baumrind, states that uninvolved parents have least amount of involvement or response towards their children's needs. They just provide the most basic of facilities but not any room or opportunity for recreational and developmental activities, and are characterized by a lack of responsiveness to a child's need. They make few demands from their children and they are often indifferent, dismissive, or even completely neglectful.

Baumrind further stated that uninvolved parent combines low levels of warmth and low levels of control, and does not utilize any particular discipline style. He or she often displays little interest in being a parent. Communication is limited, nurturance is low, and

the child, generally, has an excessive amount of freedom, because the uninvolved parent is neither demanding, nor responsive, and because young children are highly dependent on parental structure and support, uninvolved parenting has been associated with behavioral problems and depression. According to Downey and Coyne (2014) adolescents who are exposed to uninvolved parenting practices often perceive high levels of rejection and tend to exhibit more externalizing behaviors, aggressive behaviors, disruptive behaviors, hostility, and attention problems. Ruchkin and Barnow (2013), posited that it is possible that the effects of uninvolved parenting persist through adolescence and into adulthood. Nijhof and Engles (2009) in a study of first year college students, researchers found that individuals who reported being raised by uninvolved parents showed more internalizing and externalizing problems in reaction to negative emotions such as homesickness and these students' generally coped with problems less effectively than individuals who reported growing up in a loving and accepting home environment.

In conclusion, understanding parenting style as a context, would facilitate parents' efforts to socialize their children would in turn, hold greater influence on students behavior in school. Parenting style is best understood as a context within which socialization occurs rather than as socialization practice itself, further studies of the major linkages in the contextual theory and careful investigation of how the effectiveness of specific parenting style varies on student behavior of this context must be conducted.

2.4 Disruptive Behaviour

Disruptive behaviour in the classroom is playing an increasingly negative role and is occurring with greater frequency (Sulbarán & León 2014). As a result, it now poses one of the biggest and most worrying problems in education (Peña & Ángulo 2015).

Disruptive behaviour according to Urbina (2011), is student behavior that systematically disrupts educational activities, undermines the habitual development of the tasks carried out in the classroom, and causes the teacher to invest a significant amount of time in dealing with it, time that should otherwise be devoted to the processes of teaching and learning.

According to Garcia (2001), this disruptive behaviour has become increasingly prevalent in school over the last few decades, the most frequent types of such behavior being the transgression of classroom rules, the interruption of tasks, the challenging of teachers' authority, and aggression towards other classmates. It is also worth highlighting the categorization provided by Urbina (2011), who identify two types of violence within disruptive behaviour. The first of them is verbal violence, which includes insults, shouting, swearing, taunting, jokes, insults and name-calling, all of which are engaged in with the aim of ridiculing, humiliating and unsettling a classmate or teacher or making them feel bad. Secondly, there is physical violence, which includes molesting, manhandling, hitting, kicking and pushing, each with the aim of harassing, attacking or provoking the victim. The term disruptive behaviour according to NTI (2010), refers to those behaviours of student which are against school or class routines, practice and minor rules. Also, disruptive behavior in the study of Parry-Jones and Gay as cited in Siawju (2008), refers to the various unwanted forms of behaviour that can cause interruption to the flow of teaching and learning process in the classroom. Moreover, Siawju (2008), defined disruptive behaviour as undesirable behaviour that is executed by students whether consciously or unconsciously to disrupt the process of teaching and learning in the classroom and prevents learning from occurring.

In this context, disruptive behaviour is defined as behaviour that inhibits the student's own learning, the peers learning and/or the teacher's ability to operate efficiently in the

classroom. Corrie (2012), viewed disruptive behavior as the end product of complex Interactions that occurs in home and classroom. Students are continuously in interaction with their parent, teacher and are in turn affected by their surroundings. It is a mutual dynamic interaction. Befring and Duesund (2012), indicated that children that display disruptive behavior in school often have developed the behavior as a result of negative attention from their parent and constant abuses, which could result in low self-esteem and low coping skills. The students that display the behavior might have entered a negative circle where the behaviour can induce negative attention, and the negative attention might release an even more disruptive behaviour.

Charles (2011), mentioned several factors such as parenting styles that may promote disruptive behaviour of student in the classroom. He relates it to factors concerning the student, the class-peer group, the instructional environment and the teacher. According to Charles (2011), a student may disrupt the class to avoid failure or because they want attention from the teacher or peers. Conditions in the class-peer group are suggested to be provocation from other students or contagious group behavior. In the instructional environment the conditions are implied to be tedium. A student may begin to fidget or move around after a time when an instructional activity requires continued close attention, especially if the topic is perceived as hard, not appealing, and/or lack meaning.

A student might grow restless when required to work on topics they do not comprehend or see as without purpose or lack of stimulation. The teacher might also be a factor that influences the student to disrupt. The teacher's behavior may for example be seen as unclear or unfair, and thus create reactions from the students in return (Charles, 2011). Greene (2009), challenges the assumptions that students just want attention or are not motivate or have a bad attitude. He sees the challenging behavior as a reaction to demands being placed on the student that exceed his/her capacity to respond adaptively to the

situation, and view the behavior displayed as a reaction to the skills students may be lagging. Greene (2009), emphasizes that if the teacher identifies the skills a student is lacking, one can understand why the child is challenging in the classroom. Corrie (2012), wrote that disruptive behaviour may be a result of struggling with academic work in school or from abusive parent. In other words, there are suggested several reasons and meanings behind the displayed of disruptive behaviour by students.

2.4.1 Relationship between Parenting Style and Disruptive Behaviour

The style of parenting used by parents could influence the behaviour and emotional stability of student which could either make or mar them. Inconsistent and harsh parenting is the main cause of disruptive behaviour by students. The persistence aspects of parental disharmony, rejection of the child and inadequate involvement in the child's activities also cause disruption among students (Okorodudu, 2010). One major components of parental control is excessive monitoring behaviour. Studies have shown that parental excessive monitoring is associated with lower level of disruption (Hoeve, Dubas, Vander & Garvis, 2009).

Disruptive students may have parents who are often not aware of what they are doing and where they are spending their time. In addition, with less attention paid to their daily activities, students have more opportunities to participate in disruptive behaviour (Peterson and Stouthamer, 1994). Autocratic parents are often strict and in some homes unfair in punishing their children. Excessive discipline can be harmful to a child as he or she is maturing. Laissez-faire parenting do not impose rules on their children, their children are at liberty to do what they want. Lamborn, Mount, Steinberg and Dornbusch 1991, cited in Sokol and Poti (2017), have found out from research that students who characterized their parents as democratic and authoritative reported significantly perform higher in academic achievement, lower level of disruptive behaviour and higher level of psychosocial

development. Loeber and Stouthamer (1996), also posit that lack of parental supervision, discipline, emotional attachment and rejection are the significant factors in predicting disruptive behaviour in students.

2.5 Theoretical Framework

2.5.1 Baumrind Theory of Parenting Styles

The first theoretical model of parenting styles was postulated by Baumrind (1973). She began by observing nursery- school pupils in their daily activities for fourteen weeks, and gradually identified three groups of pupils with varying patterns of behaviour; energetic-friendly pupils, conflicted- irritable pupils impulsive aggressive pupils. Baumrind then interviewed parents of each of the children and observed them while interacting with their pupils both at home and in the laboratory. After that, she found that some parenting styles namely: authoritative, autocratic and laissez- faire were related to the pattern of the pupil's behaviour she observed.

According to Baumrind (1996) the study of socialization of competence can provide different kinds of parenting which would produce disruptive behaviour in student. Baumrind (1996) defined parenting style as a consistent pattern which parents interact with their children along two dimensions; responsiveness (emotional quality) and demandingness (discipline). Parental demandingness (also referred to as behavioural control) refers to claims or efforts parents make to integrate children into the family, through maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to control disruptive behaviour and confront the child who disobeys. It is the extent to which parents show control, supervision, and maturity demand in their parenting. Parental responsiveness (also known as parental warmth or supportiveness) refers to the extent to which parents

intentionally foster individuality, self- regulation and self- assertion by being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children's special needs and demands (Maccoby & Martin, 2009).

In other words, demandingness refers to the parents' willingness to act as socializing agents, whereas responsiveness implies parent's recognition of the child's individuality. Thus, the two dimensions reflect two types of demands; those made by the society on child (as conveyed through the parents), and those made by the child on the society. Demandingness, in this context, is conceptualized by the standards and demands set by parents (such as control and supervision) while responsiveness represents parents' response and communication with their children (such as warmth, love, acceptance and involvement). Subsequently, a third dimension of parenting styles was found as autonomy granting, which refers to allowing children the autonomy and individual expression within the family (Watabe, 2011).

Based on the degree of responsiveness and demandingness by parents in rearing their children, Baumrind (1973), classified three parenting styles as authoritative (warm and firm), autocratic (firm but not warm) and laissez- faire (warm but not firm) and all the styles have been linked to student's disruptive behaviour (Baumrind, 1973, 1991) by this classification, focused on four important aspects of family functioning, namely, nurturance or warmth, firmness and clarity of control, level of maturity demands, and degree of communication between parents and children. According to Baumrind (1973, 1991) authoritative like democratic parenting seems best for not contributing to students disruptive behaviour (through the development of instruments of disruptive behaviour), while autocratic and laissez- faire parenting appear to contribute to student's disruptive behaviour because they do not allow children to develop a range of self-directing, self-

monitoring, and self-regulatory abilities that support proper character and behaviour formation.

Table 1: Baumrind's Styles of Parenting and their Characteristics

		Parenting Styles				
S/No.		Authoritative Style	Autocratic Style	Laissez-Faire Style	Democratic Style	Uninvolved Style
1.	Warmth	High	Low	High	High	Low
2.	Communication with children	High	Low	Moderate	High	Low
3.	Maturity and expectation	High	High	Low	High	Low
4.	Style of discipline	Reasoning	Forceful	Lax	Dialogue	Lax
5.	Setting of limit	High	High	Low	High	Low

In relating this theory to the work, one cannot think in a vacuum that socialization can provide different kinds of parenting which would produce disruptive behaviour in students. Also, parenting functioning namely, nurturance or warmth, firmness and clarity of control between parent and children can be related to parenting styles such as authoritative, autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic and uninvolved parenting styles contribute to students' disruptive behaviour.

2.5.2 Erick Erickson's Psychosocial Theory

Erik Erikson 1994, cited in Mohammed, Umaru and Abdullahi (2016) was a stage theorist who extended Freud's psycho-analytic theory to incorporate the effects of social and cultural factors on the development of personality. He proposed eight life stages through which each person must develop in order to move on to the next stage, the person must work out a crisis, in which a dilemma must be solved for an individual to develop into healthy well-adjusted adult in each stage, they must understand and balance two conflicting forces, because failure to master these tasks lead to feelings of inadequacy and disruption, and so parents might choose a series of parenting styles that helps each child to mould their behaviour appropriately at each stage. These stages are:

1. **Trust versus Mistrust (Birth 2 Years) Existential Question:** Can I trust the world?

The first stage of Erik Erikson's theory centered around the infant's basic needs being met by the parents and this interaction leading to trust or mistrust, and is considered a critical stage in behaviour development because whatever pattern of experience that is established may tend to influence the child throughout life. The child's opportunity for exploration within the environment is limited to his parents or caregiver who provides his basic needs. The child appears to note how his basic needs are met if the child experiences continuity of affection; if his needs for food, water, rest and elimination are met; if his emotional need for warmth and affection is satisfied, and if he is protected from danger, the child may likely develop trust and confidence in those around and may perceived the worlds as a worthwhile place. Whereas the child's whose needs are not regularly provided, there is the tendency for the child to develop fears and distrust about people and things in the world, thereby leading to disruptive behaviour.

2. **Autonomy versus Shame or Doubt (2-4 Years) Existential Question:** Is it okay to be me? This stage corresponds with the second stage in Freud's theory of development. The increasing physical maturation and development experienced at this stage gradually frees the child from complete dependence on the parents and the child begins an active exploration of his immediate environment. The child operates and manipulates everything in his environment. The major child rearing crisis of this stage centers on toilet training through the acquisition by the child of bowel and bladder control. When the child is carefully guided, encouraged and supported by the parents, he/ she develop a sense of self-control, autonomy or independence which may likely be generalized to other circumstances of life. However, when the child is rigidly

controlled or overprotected by the parents, the likely consequence may be that the child recoils into shame or self-doubt which often leads to disruption by students.

3. **Initiative versus Guilt (4-6 Years) Existential Question:** Is it okay for me to do more and act? The child's overall development at this stage is rapid. The child social boundaries extend beyond his immediate home environment. The child begins to express his initiatives that is, the ability to select goals and plan activities that will lead to their realization. At the same time children at this stage begin to develop sense of right or wrong. Children in the process of expressing their initiatives through parental guidance, understanding, encouragement and support whereas children whose imitative are not allow by their parents tend to develop guilt and become rebellious to the parents and others around him/her thereby leading them to disruptive behaviour.
4. **Industry versus a Sense of Inferiority (6-12 Years):** This stage extends from six years to about twelve years of age. The child through interaction within the environment acquires both social and manipulative skills. The child directs his energies towards the mastering of his environment and achieving acceptable social relationship with people around them. The child also struggles to cope with peers in intellectual and physical activities as well as achieving competence in interpersonal relationship. The child tries to master the appropriate sex role expected by the society he/she belongs. If a child fails to achieve these, what may result would be a feeling of inferiority, inadequacy and social incompetence that will eventually leads to disruptive behaviour.
5. **Identity versus Role Confusion (12-20 Years):** This is the most crucial stage in the Ericksonian psychosocial theory of personality and behaviour formation that establishing a secure sense of self-identity while avoiding the development of identity

diffusion. This stage is concerned with the need to establish a self-identity which is unique, stable, and enables an individual to provide a satisfying answer to the question, who am I? Individual struggles to achieve behaviour characteristics earn him respect from others and enable the child achieve a sense of self-worth and dignity. Peer influence is very strong at this stage as acceptance or rejection by peers may have serious implications the child works towards the resolution of identity crisis. When an individual fails to positively resolve the crisis at this stage, there may be what is referred to as identity diffusion. In this case, the individual may perceive himself as an inferior and unimportant member of the social group. He may become a social isolate or may engage in disruptive behaviour to achieve the recognition which he supposedly lacks.

6. **Intimacy versus Isolation (Young Adult):** This stage is a period when adolescent attempt establishing a close relationship with members of the opposite's sex, achieving successful relationship would require adolescents relaxing of the rigid principles they may hold in order to accommodate and be accommodated in an interpersonal relationship. Entering into and maintaining an intimate relationship would also require cooperation, ability to share close affiliation with others. An individual who is unable to develop Intimate relationship with others may become lonely, unhappy and a social isolate which may results to disruption.
7. **Generating versus Self-Absorption or Stagnation:** This occurs during the adulthood stage. It is a period characterized by the adults' desire to cater for the needs of others and solve their problems. In attempting to achieve this, one is less concerned about his personal affairs while satisfaction is achieved through the resolution of the needs of others. When a person fails to achieve a sense of generatively, he feels worthless and ineffective within his social group. In applying this stage to this work is

that when a parents use appropriate parenting style in training and provides the child basic need such child will grow to become well behave individual thereby making the parents to feel sense of generativity, but if the parent fails to provide for the child and not using appropriate style of parenting in rearing the child the grows to exhibit disruptive behaviour both in the house and in the school.

8. **Ego Integrity versus Despair (Old Age):** At this stage, Erickson believes that the human person tries to evaluate his existence and achievement as he thinks about his approaching death. The evaluation leads him to one of two alternative decisions. He may come up with the decision that he lived his style so honorably and adequately well that he regrets nothing about his existence here on earth. This signifies ego integrity which is evidenced by satisfaction with one's life in a given social group. The alternative decision is where an individual perceives major shortcomings in his life which he would wish to correct given the opportunity to do so. This signifies despair and a sense of failure. In applying this stage to this research work is that a parent will develop ego integrity looking back to see how he train his children and seeing how successful and well-behave the child are and despair if the children grow up to bring them reproach and shame.

In relating Erick Erickson's psychosocial theory to the work, it implies that the first five of his eight stages occurs in childhood. The virtue of "hope" requires balancing trust with mistrust, and typically occurs from birth to two years old. "Will" balance autonomy with shame or doubt and it is between ages of 2 to 4 years, "purpose" balances initiative with guilt it is around the ages of 4 to 7 years. "Competence" balances industry against inferiority it is around ages seven to twelve. "Fidelity" contrasts identity with role, confusion, in ages 19 to 20 years, and it is important for parents to choose a series of parenting styles that will helps each child to mould their

behaviour appropriately at each stage. The remaining adult virtues are love, care and wisdom that provide parents with and insightful and plausible descriptions of how to rear a child.

2.5.3 Bandura's Social Learning Theory

This theory explains parent- child relationships. This is associated with the ideas and findings of (McLeod, 2011) as earlier propounded by Albert Bandura. Social learning theories posit that those children's real life experiences and exposures directly or indirectly shape behaviour. Also if a child receives an immediate reward for his/her behaviour, such as getting parental attention or approval, then that child is likely behave well. But when the child is ignored or given excessive punished, he/she may drop the good behaviour for bad.

This method according to Bandura is called traditional behavioural principle of reinforcement and conditioning. Balarabe (2003) agreed with this when he opined that adults, leaders, and role- models behaved in certain ways which they copy by the processes of imitation and identification. The model suggests that children learn strategies about managing their emotions, resolving disputes and engaging with others not only from their experiences, but also from the way their own reactions were responded to. In relating this theory to the work, it implies that students behaviour are learn through observation and imitation. The observation are refers to as perception while the imitation is the reproduce exhibited behaviour. Thus, what the learners perceives (observes) he usually behave (imitates).

The study of parenting styles on students' disruptive behaviour are function of observation and imitation of parents who serve as a role model to their children and the

behaviour of students depend largely on what the parents hands down to the children through teaching and counselling, students are likely to copy their parents because they see them as role model and parents on the other hand should choose the best style of parenting to their children's because their behaviour development depends on them. This invariably means that students' behaviour is direct reflection of the type of parenting style.

2.5.5 Dollard and Miller's Behaviourist/Learning Theory of Reinforcement

Dollard and Miller 1937, cited in Phares and Chaplin (1997) developed a new theory in behaviorism called reinforcement theory. They emphasized on four fundamentals to the theory, namely; drive, cue, response, and reward. Drive, or want, is the internal stimuli or change within someone that compels them to act. There are two kinds of drive: primary or innate drives such as hunger, and secondary or learned drives such as fear. Cue, or the notice, is the external stimuli or change within the environment that someone detects. Cue can also be internal, but is related to drive. Response is how someone chooses to act in response to the cue. In other words, it's what someone does. If the response is successful in satisfying the drive, then it is rewarded and the behavior is reinforced. However, if the response fails to satisfy the drive, then the behavior is not reinforced and will eventually become extinct or less likely to occur in the future (Phares & Chaplin, 1997).

Dollard and Miller believed in the idea of stimulus generalization, or the grouping of similar stimuli together. As a result, behaviors that occur in one situation will be the same in similar situations. Humans categorize and generalize and this is what helps them get through their day. Another type of generalization is mediated-stimulus generalization, or when learning a response in one setting is generalized to another because of their similarity. When someone learns to label someone or something as having a certain characteristic, such as a bear being scary then all bears become scary to that person. Lastly, Dollard and Miller emphasized the importance of language in cue-producing response.

Using certain words when labeling something or someone influences behavior, such as calling something fun versus calling it procrastination. Thus, learning is crucial in the lives of human beings according to Dollard and Miller (Phares & Chaplin, 1997).

Dollard and Miller proposed the idea that infant has innate characteristics: specific reflexes, innate response hierarchies, and primary drives. As the name implies, specific reflexes allow the infant to respond to very specific stimuli. Innate response hierarchies is the preference of certain responses to stimuli over the others in a specific situation. Primary drives are the innate internal stimuli such as hunger, thirst, etc. These three shape the infant's personality through drive reduction and reinforcement from parents. In other words, through these basic characteristics and learning, the infant can become a fully functioning adult over time (Phares & Chaplin, 1997).

Dollard and Miller supported the idea of four situations as a child, in which learning shapes one's personality. The first situation is the feeding situation, which has to do with how a parent feeds their child. If a parent feeds their child when they're not hungry, then the child learns that rewards means nothing and become spoiled. If a parent does not feed their child when the child cries, then the child learns a lack of trust or becomes disinterested in the world. A balanced feeding situation is needed for a strong foundation of love and social growth. The second situation is cleanliness training, or how parents teach potty training. If a child has an accident and they are punished by their parents, then the child can learn to associate parents with punishment. As a result, they may either avoid their parents or conform to their rules to avoid punishment. The third situation is early sex training, and it's when parents teach children about the avoidance of taboos when it comes to sex such as masturbation or homosexuality, thus instilling a learned sense of anxiety for years to come. The fourth situation is anger-anxiety conflicts. If a child gets angry and they are punished by their parents, then the child will learn to suppress their anger and

become less assertive as a result. All of these results are due to learning associations between the parents and the child's behavior (Phares & Chaplin, 1997).

Dollard and Miller believed that there were three types of conflict situations which influence one's behavior. The approach-approach conflict results when a choice must be made between two desirable alternatives such as eating a cookie or eating a cupcake. Avoidance-avoidance conflict results when a choice must be made between two undesirable alternatives such as doing homework or doing chores. Approach-avoidance conflict results when a decision regarding whether to pursue or avoid something has both positive and negative aspects. For example, one may feel the desire to watch a movie (approach), but by doing so will fail to study for their exam the next day and will receive a bad grade as a result (avoidance). Generally, Dollard and Miller proposed that the drive to avoid a negative goal is stronger than the drive to approach a positive one. Therefore, avoidance wins out for the most part (Phares & Chaplin, 1997).

In relating this theory to the work it implies that students disruptive behaviour are learn from their parent and children whose parent don't care about their wellbeing are bound to display disruptive behaviour in school, because student are likely to repeat a particular disruptive behaviour in school if they are condole by their parent at home, also student are likely to exhibits disruptive behaviour if they don't properly manage conflict situation at home and in order to curb disruptive behaviour in school parent should strike a balance on their style of parenting.

2.5.6 Durkheim Sociological Theories

Sociologists have examined the role of societal factors to explain disruptive behaviour. They study the relationships between individual, socio-economic groups, social processes and societal structures. Krisberg (1975) a sociologist explained that socio-economic

conditions and pressures from parents shape individual and collective behaviour which may lead to disruptive behaviour. Again, inequality and deprivation are associated with disruptive behaviour. Conditions such as poor educational achievement, inadequate housing and family dysfunction may lead to disruptive behaviour.

Durkheim (1994), clearly stated that disruptive behaviour arise between dominant groups and religious affiliations. This is seen when the “haves” often underrate the “haves-not”, with the latter being labeled as criminals and can at best be controlled by social institutions rather than completely eradicated. Therefore, sociologist quite believed that disruptive behaviour and most social behaviour are learned and that it is learned in the process of social interactions (Sykes & David, 1998). In relating this theory to the work, it clearly indicated the dynamic nature of human behaviour. The variance is stressed to the manner in which early childhood socialization and internalization instructions and parenting styles occurred. That the family is an initial agent of socialization and orientation of a child, any approach towards prevention of disruptive behaviour must begin at the family level and at a child’s formative stage of development. And there is a continuous interaction between the child and the environment. The individual effect changes in the environment and the environment to a great extent influences the individual’s behaviour. Since the biological and environmental factors interacts simultaneously, a child needs a lot of things such as love, care and moral orientations, and if these needs are not met, a child resorts to stealing or engage in other disruptive behaviour in other to meet his wants.

2.6 Review of Empirical Studies

Shehzadi, Bajwa, Batool, and Shah (2018), examined the effect of perceived parenting styles on disruptive behavior among adolescents in Islamic International University Islamabad. According to the authors adolescence is a very crucial stage of development. In order to determine the effect of perceived parenting styles on disruptive behavior, this

study was planned to conduct among adolescents. The sample consisted of 120 adolescents who were taken from Multan City by using Purposive sampling technique. Parenting styles scale developed by Jody Powell (1990) and Beck Disruptive Behavior Inventory developed by Beck (2005) were used to assess perceived parenting styles and disruptive behavior respectively. The results indicated that there was a negative correlation between democratic and authoritative parenting styles and disruptive behavior. Results also shows that there is significant difference among male and female adolescence disruptive behavior and also defined that there is no significant difference in disruptive behavior among rural and urban adolescence.

Destiny (2010), examined the influence of authoritative parenting and its effects on student disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. It studied the impact of authoritative parenting on the disruptive behaviour of student. Four research questions and null hypotheses were formulated in the study.

It utilized the ex-post facto design. A total of 3,066 students were found in the 13 public secondary schools during the time of the study. This study selected 320 students from 8 public secondary schools through a simple random sampling technique. Forty students were sample in each of the selected schools to take part as respondents. A researcher-developed questionnaire was used in obtaining data from respondents. It was entitle “authoritative behaviour”. It had section A for demographic data, while section B measured authoritative parenting and its impact on student’s disruptive behaviour.

After administration, the scripts were scored using a 4-point rating scale Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), disagree (D) and strongly disagree (SD). After collation of the scores, the data were subjected to independent t-test analysis. The result shows that the t-calculated value is greater than t-critical value at 0.05 level of significance under a two-tailed test

with 318 degrees of freedom at each test of null hypotheses. This result reveals that the four null hypotheses were rejected. It showed that there is negative significant influence of authoritative parenting on student's disruptive behaviour.

Bernard (2014), investigated the effect of autocratic parenting on student's disruptive behaviour among primary school pupils in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State four research questions and four research null hypotheses formulated to guide the study. One of the significance of the study was to sensitize parents on the effect of autocratic parenting on their children future behaviour. Teachers in public secondary schools in Uyo Local Government Area made up the sample.

The study utilized the ex-post facto design which allows the researcher to obtain opinions from selected samples which represented the study population of 2,000 and a sample of 200 respondents who were drawn from 8 selected public secondary schools through simple random sampling technique where 25 teachers were selected in each sampled schools to participate in the study. The instrument used in this study was a researcher's developed questionnaire. It has section A which measured the study respondent's demographic data, while section B measured the effects of autocratic parenting on the disruptive behaviour of students. It was administered and scored using the 4-point rating scale of strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). The scores were later subjected to the related t-test analysis.

Results of the findings revealed that there is no significant relationship between autocratic parenting style on students' disruptive behaviour. The result also revealed that the calculated t-value is greater than the t-critical value at 0.05 level of significance under a two- tailed test with 198 degrees of freedom at each test of null hypotheses. This means

the four null hypotheses were rejected. It is believed that autocratic parenting affect disruptive behaviour of students in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State.

Hosokawa and Katsura (2019), examined the role of parenting style in children's behavioral problems through the transition from preschool to elementary school according to gender in Japan. The authors stated that while effective discipline can be attributed to authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, little research has examined the role of gender in the association between parenting style and early childhood behavioral problems. Thus, their study was aimed to clarify the effects of authoritarian/autocratic and permissive parenting on children's externalizing and internalizing behaviors during school-to-elementary-school transition according to gender in Japan. A sample of 1668 Japanese children (853 boys and 815 girls) were followed longitudinally over one-year intervals, and assessed based on parenting styles (the Parenting Scale), children's behavioral problems (the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire), and family characteristics. Multivariate analyses revealed that, when analyzed by gender, authoritarian/autocratic discipline influenced externalizing problems in boys ($\beta = 0.048$, $p = 0.047$) and girls ($\beta = 0.067$, $p = 0.023$), while permissive discipline influenced externalizing problems in boys only ($\beta = 0.049$, $p = 0.038$). The results document the relationship between family processes and the development of disruptive behavior disorders in children. Support for parents employing such child-rearing styles in early childhood may be effective in reducing school maladjustment.

A survey on laissez-faire parenting and disruptive behaviour by student was carried out by Udom (2011) in Uruan Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State. It studied how the laissez-faire parenting affects students' disruptive behaviour in schools. Four research questions and four research null hypotheses were formulated in the study.

Ex-post factor research design was utilized, a total of 24,016 students from 11 public secondary schools through a sample in each of the selected schools to take part as respondents. A researcher developed questionnaire was used in obtaining data from respondents. It was entitled “Laissez- Faire Parenting and Students Disruptive Behaviour” (LPASDB). It had section A for demographic data, while section B measured the influence of laissez- faire parenting and disruptive behaviour. After validation, the instrument was administered and scores as follows: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD). The score data were subjected to the independent t-test analysis.

The result of the study shows that the t- calculated value is greater than t - critical value at 0.05 level of significance under a two tailed test with 238 degrees of freedom at each test of hypothesis. This indicates that four null hypotheses were rejected. It was concluded that there is no significant difference in student’s disruptive behaviour based on laissez-faire parenting in Uruan Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State.

Alizadeh, Talib, Abdullah and Mansor (2011), examined the relationship between parenting style and children’s behavior problems in India. The authors posited that in the family, parenting style directly impacts children’s behavior and symptoms of behavior. There is ample evidence to support the correlation between parenting style and children’s behavioral problems. However, parenting style and children’s behavioral problems have received little attention and research interest in Iran. Therefore, the current research is deemed necessary and timely. Thus, the major purpose of this current study is to investigate the relationship between parenting style and children’s behavioral problems. Parenting styles (Authoritative, Permissive, and Authoritarian) were assessed by Parent Authority Questioner (PAQ) and children’s behavioral problems (internalizing and externalizing symptoms) were assessed with the Children’s Behavior Checklist (CBCL). Respondents comprised 681 mothers of children in primary school (347 girls and 334

boys) who were identified through their children selected by cluster sampling in the Iranian capital of Tehran. The results of the present study indicate that there is a significant correlation between Authoritative and internalizing ($r = -.32, p < .001$) externalizing ($r = -.28, p < .001$), Permissive and internalizing ($r = .12, p < .001$), externalizing ($r = .12, p < .001$), Authoritarian and internalizing ($r = .25, p < .001$), externalizing ($r = .26, p < .001$). In conclusion Authoritative parenting style with high responsiveness and high demanding in parenting behavior has shown to be directly related to less children's internalizing and externalizing symptoms.

A study was carried out by Daniel (2014) in Ibiono locality of Akwa Ibom State, on democratic parenting on student's disruptive behaviour. The study focused on the effect of democratic parenting and student disruptive behaviour. Four research questions and four research null hypotheses were formulated in the study, the study used ex-post facto design, and it had a total population of 2,208 students from 11 public secondary schools within the study under study. 200 students were selected using a simple random sampling technique 25 students were drawn from each selected schools to participate in the study as respondents. The research instrument used in this study was a researcher developed questionnaire. The questionnaire had section A for respondents' personal data, and section B for democratic parenting and students and students disruptive behaviour. The questionnaire was administered on the respondents in the sample schools, and were scored using the Likert-rating scale thus, Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SD). After collating the scores were subjected to the independent t-test statistical analysis.

The study result shows that the t-calculated value is greater than the t-critical at 0.05 level of significance under a two-tailed test with 98 degrees of freedom, at each test of hypotheses. This shows that the four null hypotheses were rejected. This means that there

is significance relationship between democratic parenting on student's disruptive behaviour in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State.

Zaman, Arslan, Malik, and Mehmood (2014) examined the effect of parenting style on child behaviour: a qualitative analysis in Islam a bad, Pakistan they stated that Parenting styles and its impact of child behavior is core phenomena of behavioral science that needs specific attention from researcher and practitioner around the globe. The purpose of present qualitative study was to explore the new trend of parenting style emerging in the society and their impact on child behaviors by using unstructured interviews through homogeneous sampling of parents located in Islam a bad and native areas. The data gathered from unstructured interviews was transcribed and processed through thematic analysis using N - Vivo 10 software. The findings of study reveal the notion that ultimately behaviour of child depends upon parenting style and many factors contribute in shaping parenting style that may be external environment, support, love, affection and opportunities. Effective communication is the ultimately outcome that is effective among majority of parents and that can be used by parents in accessing their child behavior and adjusting their parenting strategies

A survey on parents' rearing style and students' disruptive behaviour was carried out by Ubom (2017) in Calabar North, Cross River State. It studied autocratic parenting, authoritative parenting, democratic parenting, and laissez-faire parenting styles. Four research questions and four null hypotheses were formulated in the study to examine differences in students' disruptive behaviour.

The ex-post facto research design was utilized to study 24,016 senior secondary three students in public schools in Calabar North; there are eleven public schools within the area of investigation. Two hundred and forty students were selected through simple random

sampling technique to draw 30 students from 8 sampled schools to take part in the study as respondents. A researcher developed questionnaire entitled “Parenting Style and Students’ Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire” (PSASDBQ). Two sections were created, were section A was for demographic data while B was for parenting style and students disruptive items. After validation, the instrument was administered and scored as follows: Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Disagree (D), and Strongly Disagree (SA). The scores were subjected to the independent t-test analysis.

The result of the study shows that the t-calculated value is greater than t-critical value at 0.05 level of significance under a two-tailed test, with 238 degrees of freedom at each test of hypotheses. This indicates that the four null hypotheses were rejected. It proved that there is a no significant difference in students’ disruptive behaviour based on parenting styles in Calabar North Government Area of Cross River State. Based on this result, it is inferred that students in Calabar differ significantly in their pattern of disruptive behaviour based on parents’ rearing style.

A survey on parenting styles and social interaction was carried out by Chidiebre (2016) in Imo state. It studied autocratic parenting, authoritative parenting, and laissez-faire parenting styles. Three research questions and three null hypotheses were formulated in the study to examine the relationship in students’ social interaction.

The Ex-post facto research design was design to study 31,067 senior secondary two students in public schools in Imo state. There are 274 public schools within the area under investigation. 1,553 were selected through stratified random sampling technique to draw 27 students from 6 sampled schools to take part in the study as respondents.

A researcher developed questionnaire entitled “Parenting Styles, and Social Interaction Questionnaire (SPSSIQ). After validation, the instrument was administered and score using

one way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The results indicated that most parents seemed to adopt authoritative parenting style in their child rearing. The study showed that parenting styles have significant influence on students' social interaction. It was inferred that authoritative parenting enables students to have positive self-concept, assertion, self-reliance, understanding, and creativity that lead to high performance and social competence. While, other parenting styles lead to anti-social behaviour. Authoritative parenting style was therefore recommended to enhance students' social interaction.

Sarwar (2016), investigate parenting style on children's behaviour in Habib public secondary in Kenya school. It studied different parenting styles to understand which style leads the children to be juvenile delinquent. A qualitative research design using a case study approach was used where the primary data were collected through in-depth interviews from the mothers who had experienced juvenile delinquency in term of their own children. Mother A had a 17-years-old son, who has been arrested by local police three times, while mother B had a 15-years old son, who had attempted several times to run away from home. In order to analyze the primary data, the researcher made used of method coding. The findings revealed that authoritarian parenting style leads the children to become rebellious and adopt problematic behaviour due to more than necessary power exercised on children by parents. In contrast, authoritative parenting style is effective for children, as it encourages moderate parenting style. It was inferred that parents who spend maximum time with their children reduce the probability of developing delinquent behaviour among their children, spending more time together with students reciprocate through reducing their problematic behaviours.

Ghazi and Khan (2013), investigate Parenting Style, and Causes of Students' Disruptive Behaviour in Classroom at secondary level in Khyber Pakhtunkwa, Pakistan. Teachers who were teaching in secondary schools of Khber Pakhunkwa constituted the population.

Five hundred (500) teachers were taken as sample, using multi-stage random sampling method. A researcher developed questionnaire was used on five point Likert scale was distributed among the sampled teachers and collected their responses regarding the parenting styles and causes of student's disruptive behaviour in classroom. The study indicates that some of the disruptive behaviour exhibited by students in the classroom were reported unanimously traceable to most parents that display uninvolved parenting style with their students. However, a significant deviation has been reported. It was inferred that proper training should be arranged for parents to equip them regarding disruptive behaviour of their children.

Jimenez, Valenzuela and Suarez (2016), investigated the influence of parenting styles on disruptive behaviour among elementary students in physical education in faculty of sports sciences, University of Murcia, Murcia, Spain. The study adopted observational design approach and the sample size was 96 students aged between 10 and 13. Data was recorded using an observation instrument (a combination of a field format and a categorical system) and was analyzed using the "HOISAN" software tool, with a sequential analysis and Polar coordinates being conducted. The results of the study revealed that disruptive behaviour occur more frequently with students whose parents are autocratic, permissive and uninvolved in their parenting styles than those whose parents are authoritative and democratic, and that the most common of this disruptive behaviour is being disinterested behaviour, followed by indiscipline, with no statistically significant differences being detected in violent behaviour. The study showed that disruptiveness is far common in physical education sessions, affects the development of sessions, and has a negative impact on student learning.

John (2018), investigated the impact of parenting styles on child development in India. The study was conducted using a sample of 72 families (father and mother of preschool

and preadolescent children) ranging in age from 20 to 45 years. Subjects were selected from 12 divisions of Cochin City, located in the state of Kerala, India. Data were collected using a socio-demographic information sheet and parenting styles and dimensions Questionnaire developed by Robinson (2001). The socio demographic information sheet was used to collect the social and demographic information of the parents. Parenting style and dimensions questionnaire helps to find out the parenting styles adopted in these families. It was found that seventy three percent of the parents are using the authoritative approach irrespective of their social class. Findings of the study indicated that sex of parent and child socioeconomic statuses was not related to the choice of parenting style. A positive correlation was found on democratic parenting style with education of the parents, and sixty five percent of the parents who are professionals would like to use permissive parenting style for their children. Duration of marital life was found to be significantly correlated to choice of parenting styles in both age groups that is preschool and preadolescent children.

Konnie and Alfred (2013), investigated influence of parenting styles on the social development of children in Rome- Italy. The study utilized a sample of 480 basic school pupils who were in their adolescent stage and 16 teachers. The survey study was employed a structured a structured review schedule and a questionnaire for the data collection. The study instruments were pre-tested to establish their validity and reliability. The results of the study revealed that the majority of the parents were perceived to adopt authoritative parenting styles in the upbringing of their children. It was also revealed that parenting style has influence on students' social development. The study inferred that authoritative parenting based on the reasoning, understanding, consensus and trust resulted in pre-social behaviour.

Obiagaeri (2018), investigated Influence of Family (Single/Step-Parent) and parenting styles (Authoritarian/Authoritative/Laissez-faire) on Adolescent's Social Behaviour in Yenagoa Local Government Area of Bayelsa State. The study adopted an ex-post-facto design for the study. A sample of 383 respondents was used for the study. The sample size was statistically drawn using Taro Yamen's formula for sample size. The researcher adopted simple random sampling technique to select 10 schools from the 18 public schools and purposive sampling technique to determine respondents for the study. Two instruments were used to collect data for the study. Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II) developed by Darling and Steinberg (1993) was adapted and used to collect data relating to parenting styles while Social Behaviour Inventory (SBI) developed by the researcher was used to collect data on social development of the adolescents. Data collected were answered with mean and standard deviation statistics, while the hypotheses were tested with an independent t-test. The study revealed that laissez-faire parenting positively influence on social behaviour of adolescents, family type (single/step-parent) had insignificant influence on social behaviour of adolescents.

Jonathan and Anwuri (2017), conducted study on Parenting Styles as Correlates of Adolescents behaviour among Senior Secondary School Students in Obio-Akpor Local Government Area of Rivers State, Nigeria. The study was guided by three research questions and similar number of null hypotheses. The study adopted a correlation research design. The population of the study consisted of all the 12,000 senior secondary students in thirteen public secondary schools in Obio-Akpor Local Government Area. The study had a sample of 1200 students. The proportional stratified sampling technique was used to draw the sample size. Two instruments called Parenting Styles Questionnaire (PSQ) and Adolescent behaviour Questionnaire (ABQ) were used for the study. The instruments face and content validities were determined. The result indicates that among others is that

democratic and authoritative parenting styles have a very low positive relationship with adolescents.

Harry, Scott, Doolan, and Beckett (2012), discussed how is parenting style related to child anti-social behaviour? Preliminary findings from the helping children achieve study. This study examined in detail 278 families living in inner city areas who had children at higher risk of poor social and academic outcomes due to anti-social behaviour. The children were aged 4 - 7, starting out on their school careers. It found that laissez-faire parenting, and uninvolved parenting has a positive significant relationship to child ant-social behaviour and that it is characterized by harsher, in consistent discipline was clearly associated with more severe child antisocial behaviour. This remained true even after a range of child and family socioeconomic factors were taken into account. Being in the top quarter of parents using of negative discipline was associated with having twice the rate of severe child behaviour problems in the clinical range (rising from 21% of children in families who didn't use it, to 40% if they did).

However, maternal wellbeing (depression and stress), and partner violence each were additionally associated with child antisocial behaviour over and above the effect of negative parenting. Since the study has confirmed the link between negative parenting and child antisocial behaviour in England today, the implications are that it is appropriate to offer parents parenting programmes that have been shown to reduce coercive parenting practices, improve positive parenting, and reduce child antisocial behaviour. Similar processes operate with younger children from age two onwards, for whom parenting help would also be beneficial. Likewise, since maternal wellbeing and partner violence are independently associated with child antisocial behaviour, it is appropriate to offer interventions that reduce depression and stress, and improve the couple relationship.

Sangawi, Adams, and Reissland (2017), examines the literature regarding the effects of parenting styles on children's behavioural problems in different cultures in Durham University, Durham City, United Kingdom. An initial literature search yielded 941 articles. Subsequent screening of titles and abstracts identified 86 potentially relevant studies. These were stored in full text for additional checks in order to further verify if they corresponded to the purposes of the review.

In conclusion criteria yielded 21 studies from the following twelve countries: USA, Canada, UK, Spain, Portugal, Netherlands, Finland, Croatia, Iran, China, Taiwan and Pakistan. Results indicate that parenting styles like uninvolved have a positive impact on children's behavioural problems. Specifically, children from parents showing contributory factors such as "involvement with the child", "monitoring the child" and other positive dimensions tended to have low levels of behaviour problems. Based on the literature review we conclude that this impact of parenting styles may vary across societies. However, a number of methodological limitations were noted which may have contributed towards some inconsistency of the findings. Further cross-cultural research is needed in order to be able to compare the effect of parenting styles more reliably.

Bru (2007), investigated parenting styles associated with disruptive in the classroom. The study was conducted in Norway and a survey design was among a national representative sample of 3834 pupils in Years/Grades 6 and 9 who were attending Norwegian schools. The results indicate that low perceived cognitive competence, perceived low relevance of schoolwork, and the belief that norm-breaking behaviour elicits peer approval all the likelihood and incidence of off-tasking behaviour are caused by uninvolved parenting style. Results also suggest a tendency for perceived cognitive competence and perceived relevance of schoolwork to be more important predictors of authoritative parenting style.

Marcone, Affuso, and Borrone, (2017), examine the contribution of parenting style to externalizing/internalizing problems in children and early-adolescents, on the hypothesis that parenting style would affect externalizing and internalizing problems via its effects on behavioral deregulation. The participants were parents and teachers of 199 children (111F) from 6 to 15 years old. A multi-informant study was carried out to assess parenting style (parents reports), and behavioural deregulation, aggressive behaviour with peers, hyperactivity/distractibility, anxiety/fear, in an ecological interactive context such as the classroom (teacher report). The researchers tested hypotheses with Structural Equation Model analysis. Authoritarian style is associated with aggressive behavior with peers, hyper activity/distractibility, and anxiety/fear, via its effects on behavioral deregulation. These findings confirm that the authoritarian style plays an important role in externalizing and internalizing problems by increasing behavioral deregulation, and it has broad implications for interventions aimed at reducing maladjustment in children and adolescents.

Bartholomeu (2016), investigated the relationship between parenting styles and children's social skills, establishing correlations between those two constructs. A total of 202 children, 7 to 10 years old, male and female, attending second to fourth year of government schools in Sao Paulo, Brazil, were participants of this research. They collectively completed Children's Social Skills Test (THAS-C) and Parental Styles Inventory (IEP). Results suggest that democratic parental styles are predictors of altruism, while uninvolved parenting styles are predictors of assertiveness, conversation, and social confidence. Regarding general social skills, variables that offered the best probable model were positive monitoring, lax discipline, moral behaviour, and physical abuse (the higher the general social skill, the lesser the abusive parenting styles). As conclusion, it seems

that different social skills are related to positive and negative parenting styles, reinforcing the idea of a social skill as attribute behaviour.

Latouf and Dunn (2014), investigated the relationship between parenting styles as a correlate of social behaviour among five-year olds. Participants were 30 parents of 25 pre-primary students of a school in Northern Province of South Africa, and the children's teacher. The participants were mostly of the indigenous African ethnic background. The parents completed the Parental Styles Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen and Hart (2001). The teacher rated the five-year olds' social behaviour using the Behavioural Questionnaire (BQ) Latouf (2008). The results indicated primarily that an authoritative parenting style was most endorsed by the parents of the five-year olds. Parents self-rating on parenting style were significantly associated with teacher ratings of the student's social behaviour.

Ekechukwu and Amaeze (2016), investigated the influence of parenting styles on disruptive behaviour of senior secondary school students in Imo state, Nigeria. Four research questions and four null hypotheses were asked. The design of the study was an ex post facto research design. The population of the study comprise all the 11874 (1387 males and 10487 females) teachers in senior secondary school students in the 314 public secondary schools in Imo State. A stratified random sampling technique was used to draw the sample size of 1187 students using 10% of the population. A researcher self-designed instrument titled 'Influence of Teachers' Parenting Styles on Students Disruptive Behaviour (ITPSDB). Face and content validities were ensured. The Cronbach alpha reliability was used to establish internal consistency reliability of 0.77. Mean, standard deviation, independent sample z-test and One Way Analysis of Variance was used for data analysis. It was found out that laissez-faire parenting positively influence disruptive behaviour of students in secondary schools in Imo State, Nigeria. It was recommended

among others that parents should do away with laissez-faire parenting as it affects student disruptive behaviour. The school system should encourage mentor the younger parents to understudy the superior parents.

Opeyemi (2015), examined the predictive effect of Parenting Practices on Social Interaction of Pupils in Ijebu North Local Government Area of Ogun State, Nigeria with a view to suggesting ways of improving students' social interaction and performance in school. The design of the study was descriptive research design of ex-post facto type was adopted. The sample of the study comprised of two hundred and fifty (250) respondents that were randomly selected from five primary schools. Fifty respondents (50) respondents were randomly selected from each of the five primary schools. Alabama Parenting questionnaire and social Interaction scale were used in gathering the needed information. Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) and Multiple Regression Analysis were used to analyze the data collected. The results of the findings were as follows: There was a significant contribution of Parenting Practices on students' Social Interaction and there was a relative effect of Positive Parenting on Social Interaction of Pupils. Based on the findings of this study, it was recommended that Educators should realize how essential it is to ensure the appropriate parenting style which in turn would result in a better students' social interaction in school. The awareness of the importance of the impact of parenting practices will also assist the educators, counselors, and psychologist to understand to what extent the role played by home could help them to manage students' performance in academic life.

Belle (2017), examined and discussed the influence of parenting styles on the behaviour of the secondary school students in Mauritius, Reduit, Mauritius who are adolescents. The adolescent student according to the researcher is often in a difficult phase of his/her life and therefore, important people in his/her life may negatively influence his/her behaviour

at school. The study reveals that laissez-faire parenting, the school, the family, the peer pressure, the community and the new media negatively impact on the student behaviour. It concludes that these same systems should endeavour to teach socio-emotional skills to the students: this is likely to enhance their social competence. This may help eliminate student disruptive behaviour: this problem is a socio-emotional problem that requires socio-emotional approaches.

2.7 Summary

This chapter has reviewed and explained the relevant literature. The chapter is sub-divided into subheadings; the introductory aspect that highlighted the items on conceptual framework it explains the concept of parenting, parenting styles and variables on parenting styles such as authoritative, autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic and uninvolved parenting styles. The concept of disruptive behaviour has also been explained. The relationship between parenting styles and disruptive behaviour was properly discussed.

The theoretical review was on Baumrind theory of parenting was used to explain parenting styles, Erick Erickson's psychosocial theory was used to explain both parenting styles and students disruptive behaviour. Social learning theory by Bandura's was reviewed to understand how children learn from their parents. Dolars and Miller's Behaviourist/learning theory of Reinforcement explains disruptive behaviour which could be exhibited by individuals as a result of parenting styles and that children learn from their parent through what they see and not what they are told to do. Emile Durkheim sociological theory was also reviewed; it stated the role of societal factors to explain disruptive behaviour which was the interrelationships between individual, socioeconomic groups, social process and societal structure. He further explained that socioeconomic conditions and parenting styles shape individual and collective behaviour which may lead to disruptive behaviour.

On the review of empirical studies, as it relates to the study were discussed. The influence of authoritative, autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic and uninvolved parenting styles its relations to students disruptive behaviour were all reviewed and discussed in this chapter.

This study is unique from other work because no work of this nature has been carried out in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria. It was therefore crucial to examine the relationship between parenting styles and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the method to be used in the study. These include research design, population of the study, sample and sampling techniques, instrumentation, pilot testing, validity and reliability of the instruments, procedure for data collection and procedure for data analysis.

3.2 Research Design

This study employed correlational design. Nworgu (2006), defined correlational design as a type of study that seeks to establish what relationship exists between two or more variables.

Usually such studies indicate the direction and magnitude of the relationship between the variables. The reasons for adopting this design was that all the hypotheses are based on relationships. This is justified based on the views of Baji, Sani, Mammon, Ugochukwu (2015), Mitchell and Jolley (2007) that when researchers want to find out about the relationship between two variables then correlation design should be used. Therefore, this study established the relationship among variables of authoritative, autocratic, laissez-faire, democratic and uninvolved parenting styles and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo Metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State.

3.3 Population of the Study

The population of the study comprised of S.S.1 students with disruptive behaviour in the public secondary schools within Uyo metropolis of Akwa-ibom state, of which three (3) are boarding schools and seven (7) are day schools. The number stands at three thousand and nine (3,009) SS1 students. This is the population of SS1 students with disruptive behaviour. However, three thousand and nine (3,009) students were found to exhibit disruptive behaviour in the classroom. The process was carried out through the use of

teacher log book to identify the students with disruptive behaviour. Table 3.1 below shows the target population of the study;

Table 2: Showing the Gender Distribution of S.S.1 Students' in the Public Secondary Schools Who are found with Disruptive Behaviour According to Their Schools and Percentage.

S/No.	School	No. of Students			percentage
		male	female	total	
1.	Cornelia Connelly College, Afaha Oku, Uyo	-	319	319	10.6
2.	Uyo High School,Uyo	234	94	328	10.9
3.	Christian Secondary Commerical School, Uyo	107	69	176	5.8
4.	Community Comprehensive Secondary School, Four Tows, Uyo	243	106	349	11.6
5.	Government Technical College, Ewet, Uyo	237	54	291	9.7
6.	Secondary School, Etoi, Uyo	240	114	354	11.8
7.	Offort Ukwu Community Secondary School, Obio Offort, Uyo	163	69	232	7.7
8.	Community Secondary Commerical School, Ikot Oku Ikono, Uyo	197	92	289	9.6
9.	Community Secondary Commercial School, Aka Offot, Uyo	283	101	384	12.8
10.	Community Secondary Commercial School, Ikot Ekpeyak Ikono, Uyo	211	76	287	9.5
	Total	1915	1094	3,009	100%

Source: Class Teacher Log Book (May, 2019).

3.4 Sample and Sampling Techniques

The sample for this study was 346 male and female students of public schools within Uyo Metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State. This sample was drawn from the population of SS1 students which is 3,009. The selection conforms to the Research Advisors (2006) table for determining sample size from a given population at 5.0%,

Simple random sampling technique was used to select ten (10) schools for the study using balloting method. According to Abdullahi (2015), simple random sampling is a method of selecting a portion of population such that each member of the population has equal chance of being selected. The selected schools include: boarding and day school, boys' school only and girls' school only. Then purposive sampling method was used to select the sample for the study. The reason for purposive sampling technique is that it is characterized by the use of judgment and deliberate effort to obtain representative samples. (Kerlinger in James 1997). Below is the table showing the sample size.

Table 3: Distribution of Sample Size of SS1 Students from the selected Schools who were found to Exhibits Disruptive Behaviour

S/No.	School	No. of Students	Sample Size
1.	Cornelia Connelly College, Afaha Oku, Uyo	319	37
2.	Uyo High School,Uyo	328	38
3.	Christian Secondary Commerical School, Uyo	176	20
4.	Community Comprehensive Secondary School, Four Tows, Uyo	349	40
5.	Government Technical College, Ewet, Uyo	291	34
6.	Secondary School, Etoi, Uyo	354	40
7.	Offort Ukwa Community Secondary School, Obio Offort, Uyo	232	27
8.	Community Secondary Commerical School, Ikot Oku Ikono, Uyo	289	33
9.	Community Secondary Commercial School, Aka Offot, Uyo	384	44
10.	Community Secondary Commercial School, Ikot Ekpeyak Ikono, Uyo	287	33
	Total	3,009	346

Source: Class Teacher Log Book(May, 2019).

3.5 Instrumentation

The researcher made use of two instruments to collect data for this research. The instruments are parenting styles questionnaire, and students' disruptive behaviour questionnaire. The questionnaire was structured in three sections, section a demographic data of the student, section b parenting styles, section c students' disruptive behaviour. The parenting styles and students' disruptive behaviour instruments were adapted from Erinisha (2012).

3.5.1 Parenting Style Questionnaire

This instrument measures authoritative parenting, autocratic parenting, laissez-faire parenting, democratic parenting and uninvolved parenting to find out which parenting style contribute more to student's disruptive behaviour. It consists of 50 items. Considering the research questions and hypotheses raised for the study, each column is provided with question items to give the best feeling of the respondent on the 5 point likert scale that is strongly agree, agree, not decided, strongly disagree and strongly disagree. The scale will be scores as follows:

- Strongly Agree = 5
- Agree = 4
- Not Decided = 3
- Decided = 2
- Strongly Disagree = 1.

3.5.2 Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaire

This instrument measures disruptive behaviour of students. It contains 10 items. It has five points scale ranging from Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Not Decided (ND), Disagree (D) and strongly Disagree (SD). And the scale will be scores as follows:

- Strongly agree = 5
- Agree = 4
- Not Decided = 3
- Disagree = 2
- Strongly Disagree = 1.

The questionnaires are distributed thus:

- Item 1-10 measures authoritative parenting.
- Item 11-20 measures autocratic parenting.
- Item 21-30 measures laissez-faire parenting.
- Item 31-40 measures democratic parenting.
- Item 41-50 measures uninvolved parenting.
- And section C contains item 1-10 and measures students' disruptive behaviour.

3.6 Validity of the Instrument

An instrument is valid when it is able to measure what it is designed to measure, to establish the reliability index of Parenting Style Questionnaire (PSQ) and Student Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaires (SDBQ). The researcher made copy of the questionnaires to the supervisors and other experts from Educational Psychology and Counselling Department, Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria to read, correct and make their input, the observations was taken and incorporated.

3.6.1 Pilot Testing

In order to ensure the reliability of the instrument, pilot testing was conducted in Community Secondary School, Mbak Etoi, Uyo. The school is not part of the ten selected senior secondary schools of the main study. A pilot testing is usually carried out on member of the relevant population, but not on those who will form the final sample. The

reason is that they may influence the later behaviour of research subjects if they have already been involved in the research Haralambo and Holborn (2000). Copies of 40 questionnaires was distributed to S.S.1 students both male and female. The data collected was analyzed using Cronbach Alpha reliability method

3.6.2 Reliability of the Instrument

The reliability of instrument using Cronbach Alpha reliability method was used to test the reliability for forty students each selected from Community Secondary School, Mbak Etoi, Uyo. The reliability was done for each section of parenting styles. The reliability for authoritative parenting styles was .797, for autocratic parenting styles .711, for laissez Faire parenting styles .946 and for democratic parenting styles it was .748, for uninvolved parenting style .861. Combined reliability for all the fifty (50) items for parenting styles questionnaire is .887. While the reliability for items under students' disruptive behavior was .949 respectively.

This reliability coefficient obtained for the items in this study titled relationship between parenting styles and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria showed that the instrument as reliable for the study. This was a confirmation of test of reliability by Spiegel (1992), Stevens (1986), and Olayiwola (2010). According to them an instrument is considered reliable if it lies between 0 and 1, and that the closer the calculated reliability coefficient is to zero, the less reliable is the instrument, and the closer the calculated reliability co-efficient is to 1, the more reliable is the instrument. This therefore confirms the reliability of the data collection instrument used as fit for the main work.

3.7 Procedure for Data Collection

The researcher collected a letter of introduction from the Department of Educational Psychology and Counselling, ABU, Zaria which was taken to the principals of the target

population where the research was carried out. Copies of three hundred and forty-six (346) questionnaires was produced by the researcher for distribution to the target population. (Five (5) percent of the total questionnaire was added to care of any mortality). After permission was sought from the principal, the researcher administered the questionnaire to the respondents, with the assistance of the members of the staff in the area of study, who were trained on the administration of instruments. The process lasted approximately one hour duration. After completion, the researcher collected them back, for analysis.

3.8 Procedure for Data Analysis

The data collected from this study were analyzed using descriptive and inferential statistics. The study made use of tables for the presentation of result. The descriptive statistics was used to analyze the Bio-data of the respondent; percentage, mean and standard deviation was used to answer the research question raised while the inferential statistics of Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) was used to test all the five hypotheses. The hypotheses were tested at 0.05, alpha level of significance. SPSS version 20.0 statistical software was used for data analysis and storage.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter deals with the analysis and discussion of results from findings of the research conducted on the relationship between parenting styles and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria. The research questions raised at the beginning of the study were scrutinized by administering the questionnaire to 346 respondents that constituted the sample for the study. The statistical package of Version IBM 23 was used for the data analysis obtained from 341 respondents out of the 346 sampled for the study representing 98.4%. The data was presented in four sub-sections. The first section presents the information on personal characteristics of respondents, the second phase presents the testing of hypotheses, summary of findings and discussion of result.

Below is the descriptive statistics of frequency and percentage distribution for respondents' personal information that responses to questionnaire items

4.2 Demographic characteristics of respondents

The bio data of the respondents is presented below:

Table 4: Distribution of Respondents by sex

	Frequency	Percent
Male	164	48.1
Female	177	51.9
Total	341	100.0

A total of 164 or 48.1% of the students in this study are male students and the rest 177 representing 51.9+% are female students.

Table 5: Distribution of Respondents by age

	Frequency	Percent
14-16	174	51.0
17-19	167	49.0
Total	341	100.0

Regarding the age group of the students, a total of 174 or 51.0% are between 14-16 year ranges while the rest 167 representing 49.0% are within age group of 17-19 years.

Table 6: Distribution of Respondents by school system

	Frequency	Percent
Day	201	58.9
Boarding'	140	41.1
Total	341	100.0

The students of day school system were 201 representing 58.9% of the total sample while the rest 140 representing 41.1% are boarding school system students.

4.2 Hypotheses Testing

The following tables present the result of analysis providing answers to the hypotheses raised for the study.

Hypothesis One: The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour.

This was analyzed by looking at the relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour the result is presented in table 4.3.1

Table 7: Summary of Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	r	p
Authoritative parenting	341	34.0117	11.08920	339	-0.759**	0.002
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

*P < 0.05, **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Outcome of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics above showed that a significant inverse relationship existed between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour. ($r = -0.759$, $p = 0.002$). The negative relationship (-0.759) showed that the more authoritative parents are, the less their children exhibit disruptive behaviour and vice versa. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant

relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour, was rejected.

Hypothesis Two: The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour.

Hypothesis two was tested using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) on the relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour and the result was presented below

Table 8: Pearson product Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	r	p
autocratic parenting	341	33.3578	10.80718	339	0.799**	0.001
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

*P < 0.05, **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Outcome of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics above showed that a significant positive relationship existed between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. ($r = 0.799$, $p = 0.001$). The positive relationship ($r = 0.799$) showed that the more autocratic parents are, the more their children exhibit disruptive behaviour. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior, was rejected.

Hypothesis Three: The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour.

To test this hypotheses on the relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour using Pearson Product Moment Correlation the result is presented in table 9

Table 9: Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	R	P
laissez-faire parenting	341	28.7742	10.69849	339	0.668 **	0.003
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

*P < 0.05, **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Outcome of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics above showed that a significant positive relationship exist between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. ($r = 0.668$, $p = 0.003$). The positive relationship ($r = 0.668$) showed that the higher the laissez-faire parents are, the higher their children disruptive behavior and vice versa. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior, was rejected.

Hypothesis Four: The null hypothesis states that there is no significant relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior.

Table10 shows Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) used to analyze the relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour

Table 10: Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	R	P
democratic parenting	341	35.6364	8.52141	339	-0.700**	0.033
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

*P < 0.05, **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Outcome of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics above showed that a significant inverse relationship existed between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour. ($r = -0.700$, $p = 0.033$). The negative relationship ($r = -0.700$) showed that the more democratic parenting are, the less their children exhibit disruptive behavior and vice versa. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior, was rejected.

Hypothesis Five: The null hypothesis state that there is no significant relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour.

This was presented in table showing Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) used to analyze the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour

Table 11: Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics on the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	R	P
uninvolved parenting	341	26.4076	10.71919	339	0.724 **	0.001
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

*$P < 0.05$, **. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).*

Outcome of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) statistics above showed that a significant positive relationship existed between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. ($r = 0.724$, $p = .001$). The positive relationship ($r = 0.724$) showed that the more uninvolved parents are, the more their children exhibit disruptive behavior and vice versa. Therefore the null hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior, was rejected.

4.4 Summary of the Findings

Based on the analysis of data and test of hypotheses, the following are the major findings:

1. There is a significant inverse relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis ($r = -0.759$, $p = 0.002$)
2. There is a significant positive relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis ($r = 0.799$, $p = 0.001$)
3. There is a significant positive relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis ($r = 0.668$, $p = 0.003$)
4. There is a significant inverse relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis ($r = -0.700$, $P = 0.033$)
5. There is a significant positive relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis ($r = 0.724$, $p = 0.001$)

4.5 Discussion

The research focused on the relationship between parenting styles and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom state. Thus, the findings are presented below;

Authoritative parenting style and disruptive behaviour: This result indicates that inverse significant relationship existed between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis. This finding is in line with Shehzadi, Batool, and Shah (2018) that examined the effect of perceived parenting styles on disruptive behaviour among adolescents. It is also in line with Destiny (2010) in his study on the influence of authoritative parenting and its effects on student disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom state. In supporting this finding, Chidiebre (2016) carried out a survey on parenting styles and social interaction. Equally relevant to the result of this study was a research carried out by Alizadeh, Talib, Abdullah and Mansor (2011) on the relationship between parenting style and children's behavior problem.

Still in support of the result is the study by Sarwar (2016) that studied different parenting styles to understand which leads the children to be juvenile delinquent. Similarly the finding agreed with Howenstein, Kumar, Casamassimo, McTigue, Coury and Yin (2015), the result agreed with that of Konnie and Alfred (2013) who examined the influence of parenting styles on the social development of children in Rome-Italy. The reason for this result is that authoritative parents are highly responsive and highly demanding, this parents expect high maturity from their children, and the also encourage their children to be independent but still place controls and limits on their actions, they explain their motive for their punishment because they see it as being reasonable and fair. Also, authoritative parents are attentive to their children's needs and concerns, and will typically punished and forgive if a child falls short. Authoritative parents encourage bidirectional communication and verbal give and take of instructions.

Autocratic parenting style and disruptive behaviour: The finding of this study revealed that a positive relationship exists between autocratic parenting style and students'

disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis. This is in line with position of Bernard (2014) who investigated the effect of autocratic parenting on student's disruptive behavior. Hosokawa and Katsura (2019) also supported the finding of this study.

In line with result is study by Hernández and Zafra (2018) they examines the influence of parental styles and other psychosocial variables on the development of externalizing behaviour in adolescents. More so, Alizadeh, Talib, Abdullah and Mansor (2011) agrees with the finding of this study. Supported with the result is the study by Sarwar, (2016) that studied different parenting styles to understand which leads the children to be juvenile delinquent. Similarly the finding agrees with Howenstein, Kumar, Casamassimo, McTigue, Coury and Yin (2015), the result agrees with the study of Marcone, Affuso, and Borrone (2017). The reason for this result is that autocratic parents centered on one source of authority, the parents tolerate no arguments from their children, this type of parents requires children to obey the rules and reward and punishment for their behaviour, autocratic parents do not explain why they want their children to do things and if a child questions a rule or command, the parent might answer 'because I said so.' Autocratic parents also tend to focus on bad behaviour rather than positive one, and children are scolded often harshly and angrily for not following the rules. The parents do not consider children's desire or opinions and they enforce rules rigidly, this parenting style ultimately does not foster their children's autonomy, but instead restrict independent behaviour. Also, children of autocratic parents tend to develop characteristics such as being conflicted, irritable, moody, unhappy, fearful and apprehensive, easily annoyed and passively hostile. They also alternate between disruptive behaviour and sulky withdrawal, and become vulnerable to stress, and this parenting style is associated with student's disruptive behaviour.

Laissez-faire parenting style and disruptive behaviour: The result obtained in this finding indicates that significant positive relationship exists between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis. This finding is in line with Udom (2011) who carry out a survey on laissez-faire parenting and disruptive behaviour, this study is also in agreement with Hosokawa and Katsura (2019) and Ekechukwu and Amaeze (2016), further research conducted by Belle (2017), also agreed with this result. Similarly the findings agreed with Baumrind (1973), also the finding supported Obiagaeri (2018) that examined the Influence of Family (Single/Step-Parent) and parenting styles (Authoritarian/Authoritative/Laissez-faire) on Adolescent's Social Behaviour. Supporting the finding the study of Harry, Scott, Doolan, and Beckett (2012), this result agreed with Adegoke (2010) and Akpan (2003). The reason for this result is that laissez-faire parents allows their children to do his or her own thing, and that they do not care to know whether or not the children are moral.

Also laissez-faire parents are high on responsiveness, but low on demanding, these parents interact with their children in a passive manner and avoid the use of power when dealing with issues of discipline, they view themselves as resources available to the children, the children, may or may not choose to use, laissez-faire parents are likely to view discipline as an infringement upon the freedom of their offspring, which they believe impinges upon their healthy development, consequently, these parents attempt to behave in a non-punitive, accepting and affirmative manner toward their children's impulses, desires and actions. Students from laissez-faire tends to exhibits disruptive behaviour because they come from home backgrounds with little or no parental guidance, such students hate to be discipline in school, they hate to see their behaviour sanctioned and prefer to be allowed every freedom they desire.

Democratic parenting style and disruptive behaviour: The result obtained in this finding indicate that significant inverse relationship exist between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis. This finding is in agreement with Daniel (2014) that examines the effect of democratic parenting and student disruptive behaviour. It is also in line with Shehzadi, Bajwa and Shah (2018) that examined the effect of perceived parenting styles on disruptive behaviour among adolescents. The study agree with Ubom (2017), this study is also in agreement with Jonathan and Anwuri (2017) This also collaborated with John (2018), this finding is in agreement with Bartholomeu (2016) and Bernard (2014), the finding is in line with the study of Okoro (2002). The reason for this result is that democratic parents are leaders and teachers who encourage cooperation and stimulate learning, democratic parents forgive and teach instead of punishing a child if he/she misbehaves, and democratic parent respect the right and freedom of their children and the child privileges is also taken into consideration, democratic parent does not mean that parents especially, father does not have any leverage to take decisions without the children but decided to carry the children along to promotes peace and calmness, and that democratic parent stresses choices and their children are encouraged to make choices daily on many different areas in their lives, democratic parents make their children to realize that they value them and children from these parent are polite in school.

Also, democratic parent let their children realized that increased freedoms comes with responsibility, children from democratic parent are conscientiously taught to begin making choices from a very early age so that they become skilled at making increasing more complex decisions as they grow older.

Uninvolved parenting style and disruptive behaviour: The result obtained in this finding indicate that significant positive relationship exist between uninvolved parenting

style and students' disruptive behavior among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis. The study agreed with Sun and Shek (2012), in another related finding, Sangawi, Adams, and Reissland (2017), the study agreed with Bru (2007) in which he investigated parenting styles associated with disruptive in the classroom. This study is also in agreement with Ghazi and Khan (2013) and Ehnvall, Parker, Hadzi-Pavlovic and Malhi (2008), the result agreed with the study Nijhof and Engles (2007). The reason for this result is that uninvolved parents are detached from their children, and that they are parent-centered rather than child centered, they focus on their own needs and dismiss children's emotional, psychological and behavioural needs, this parents often ignore their children, letting the children's preferences prevail as long as those preferences do not interfere with their own activities, children from this parents often provide for themselves, children who are exposed to uninvolved parents often perceive high levels of rejection and tend to exhibit more externalizing behaviour, aggressive behaviour, disruptive behaviour, hostility, and attention problems.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the whole research work conclusion drawn from the study and recommendations based on the findings of the work. Finally suggestions for further studies were made in this chapter.

5.2 Summary

The study examined the relationship between parenting styles and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom State. The study has five chapters. In chapter one, background to the study and the problem that lead to the study was highlighted. Five objectives and exact number of research questions and null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study, basic assumption, significance of the study and scope and delimitations of the study were properly explained in this chapter.

Chapter two presented literature review of the study. The literature review was done under the following broad headings: concept of parenting, parenting styles, authoritative parenting style, autocratic parenting style, laissez-faire parenting style, democratic parenting style, uninvolved parenting style, disruptive behaviour and relationship between parenting style and disruptive behaviour. The theoretical framework adopted for this study include; Baumrind Theory of Parenting. Erick Erickson Psychosocial Theory, Bandura's Social Learning Theory, Dollard and Miller's Behaviourist/Learning Theory of Reinforcement and Durkheim Sociological Theory. Related empirical studies were also reviewed.

Chapter three focused on the methodology adopted for the study. The design of the study was correlational design. The population of the study consist of three thousand and nine (3,009)SS1 students selected across ten schools within Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom

State with disruptive behaviour. The sample of the study was 346 SS1 students who were selected using the purposive sampling technique from a population of 3,009 students with disruptive behaviour. Two instrument were used for data collection. The instruments are parenting styles questionnaire and student disruptive behaviour questionnaire adapted from Erinisha (2012). Procedure for data collection were discussed and Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) was used to test all the hypotheses at 0.05 alpha level of significance.

Chapter four contains the analysis of the data obtained from the study. This includes the analysis presented the frequencies of the demographic variables, testing of null hypotheses using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (r) and all the null hypotheses were rejected, also summary of findings and discussions of findings was captured in the chapter. Following the analyzed data collected it was found that significant inverse relationship exist between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour. The level of relationship is at -0.759 implying a negative or inverse relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour. This shows that the more authoritative parents are, the less their children exhibit disruptive behaviour and vice versa.

The study discovered that significant positive relationship exist between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour the level of relationship is at 0.799 implying a positive or direct relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour. This shows that the more autocratic parents are, the more their children exhibit disruptive behaviour and vice versa. The study established that significant positive relationship exists between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. The level of relationship is at 0.668 implying a positive or direct relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour. This shows that

the more laissez-faire parents are, the more their children exhibit disruptive behavior and vice versa. The finding of the study discovered that Significant inverse relationship exist between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour. The level of relationship is at -0.700 implying a negative or inverse relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. This shows that the more democratic parents are, the less their children exhibit disruptive behavior and vice versa. The finding also discovered that significant positive relationship exists between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour the level of relationship is at 0.724 implying a positive or direct relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. This shows that the more uninvolved parents are, the more their children exhibit disruptive behavior and vice versa.

Chapter five being the last chapter presented the study's summary, conclusion and recommendation.

5.3 Conclusion

In light of the findings obtained in this study, the following conclusions are made.

1. That authoritative parenting style does not leads to students' disruptive behaviour in Uyo metropolis.
2. That autocratic parenting style leads to students' disruptive behaviour in Uyo metropolis.
3. That laissez-faire parenting style leads to students' disruptive behaviour in Uyo metropolis.
4. That democratic parenting style does not leads to students' disruptive behaviour in Uyo metropolis.
5. That uninvolved parenting styles leads to students' disruptive behaviour in Uyo metropolis.

5.4 Contribution to Knowledge

Based on the findings of the study, the researcher established that:

1. The more authoritative parents are, the less their children disruptive behaviour and vice versa in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom State
2. The more autocratic parents are, the more their children disruptive behaviour in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom State
3. The more laissez-faire parents are, the more their children disruptive behaviour and vice versa in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom State.
4. The more democratic parents are, the less their children disruptive behaviour and vice versa in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom State.
5. The more uninvolved parents are, the more their children disruptive behaviour and vice versa in Uyo metropolis of Akwa Ibom State.

5.5 Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendation are hereby made;

1. Authoritative parenting such as teaching children good behaviour in loving manner, setting clear rules with positive outcome and subtle punishment if such rules are violated should be adopted by parents. This can be done by the school through organizing seminars and workshops to create awareness on the variables that are on authoritative parenting style so as to encourage the parents to use this type of parenting style with their children in order to curb disruptive behaviour of students in school.
2. There should be less of autocratic parenting style by parents on their children, by not punishing them unnecessarily as this hardens the mind of the children, instead there should be close relationship between parents and their children for discussion

on offences committed. This should be done, by school counsellororganizing counselling session to the parents during parents teacher association (PTA)meeting to the parents in order to informed them about the danger of using autocratic parenting style on their children behaviour

3. Laissez-faireparenting style should be avoided and that parents should be involved in the child decision making processes through positive interference and lots of communication between parents and their children. This could be achieved by class teachers' to know that family condition promote disruptiveness by students 'with this understanding the teacher can alert parentsand also referred them to educational psychologists to identify the problem and furtherreferred them to school counsellor for proper counselling
4. Democratic parenting style should be utilized by parents such as explaining in details the reason behind expectations from their children a respect tie opinions through positive enagement as expression of love and concern towards their children. This can be done by policy makers in education, educational psychologist and school counsellors creating an awareness, educating and sensitizing the parents on the benefits of adopting democratic parenting styles on their children and the students on the harmful effect of disruptive behaviour in the case of their study.
5. Uninvolved parenting style should be discouraged by parents by making sure they offer guided supervision in the affairs of their children. Efforts should be made by educational planner to fashion out ways to talk to parents on proper upbringing of their children to curb disruptive behaviour in school, and students should also understand the harmful effect of this kind of parenting style on their behaviour.

5.6 Suggestions for further studies

The focus of this study was directed at examining the relationship between parenting styles and students' disruptive behaviour among secondary school students in Uyo metropolis of Akwa-ibom state, Nigeria. Therefore, further studies below:

1. Effect of parenting styles on academic performance of secondary school students across other states in Nigeria
2. The relationship between home background, parenting styles and student disruptive behaviour of secondary school students in metropolis across other states in Nigeria.

References

- Abdullahi, M.I. (2015). *Basic Concept in Educational Research*. Tunlad Prints & Publishing Coy, Beirut Road, Kano.
- Abesha, A. G. (2012). *Effects of Parenting Styles, Academic Self-efficacy & Achievement Motivation on Academic Achievement of University Students in Ethiopia*. PhD. Thesis, Edith cowan university, Addis Ababa.
- Adegoke, R. T. (2010). *Deviant Behaviour. A Social Learning Approach*. Ibadan. Belmont mass.
- Akpan, R. J. (2013). *Theories & Practice of Parenting Style in Educational Administration*. Uyo. MEF Publishing Limited, Nigeria.
- Alizadeh, S., Talib, B. M., Abdullah, R., & Mansor, M. (2011). Relationship between Parenting Style & Children's Behavior Problems. *journal Asian Social Science Archive 7 (1)*. Retrieved from <http://www.ccsenet.org/>
- &rew, C. F.(2014).*Parenting Style in Nigeria*. Lagos. Wusen Printing Press
- Ayeni, A.A.(2009). *Parent's& Student's Counseling H&book for Schools in Nigeria*. Ilorin. Cashen Printing Press.
- Baji, S., & Mamman, U. (2015). *A h&book on Fundamentals of Educational Research*. Minna: Havilah kingdom press.
- Balarabe, M. (2003). Psychology Perspective to Corruption in Nigeria. *Journal of Counselling & Human Development, ABU Zaira, 3(1)*. 8-17
- B&ura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Barnhart, C., Raval, V., Jansari, A., & Raval, P. (2013). Perception of parenting styles among college students in India & the United States. *Journal for child family stud.* 22(5); 684-693. Doi;10.1007/s10826-012-9621-1
- Barnow, R.M. (2002). The Moderator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic & Statistical Considerations: *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*,51(6).1173-1182
- Bartholomeu, D. (2016). *Predictive Power of Parenting Styles on Children's Social Skills*. SAGE Open. 155-162
- Baumrind, D. (1960). The Influence of Parenting on Adolescents' Competence & Substance Use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11(1)*. 56-95
- Baumrind, D. (1970). Current Patterns of Parental Authority. *Developmental psychology, 4 (1)*.51-59

- Baumrind, D. (1973). The Development of Instrumental Competence Through Socialization. In A. D. Pick (Ed), *Minnesota Symposium of Child Psychology. Vol. 7*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Current Patterns of Parental Authority & Genetic Psychology. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*.15(5).321-336
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The Influence of Parenting Style on Adolescent Competence & Substance Use. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 11 (1)*. 887-907
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The Influence of Parenting Style on Anti-social Behaviour. New York. Oxford University, Press.
- Baumrind, D. (1996). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behaviour. *Child Development*,37. 84-95
- Baurmind, D. (2009). Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behaviour. *Child Development, 37(4)*.
- Befring, M. F. & Duesund, M. A. (2012). *Classroom Disruption Management: A Causal-Preventive-corrective Model*. Retrieved from <http://sil.stanford.edu>.
- Belle, J. L. (2017). Factors that Influence Student Behaviour in Secondary Schools. *European Journal of Educational & Development Psychology. Vol 5(5)*. 405 - 414
- Benard, R. I. (2014). *Family Size & Students' Moral Behaviour in Uruan Local Government Area*. Unpublished Seminar, Akwa Ibom State College of Education. Afaha Nsit.
- Bornstein, M. H. & Zlotnik, D. (2008). *Parenting Styles & their Effects. Encyclopedia of Infant & Early Childhood Development*. Retrieved from www.sciencedirectdatabase.
- Boroffice, O. B. (2014). *Parenting styles, Recreation & Health Behaviour of Adolescents. In Contemporary Issues & Researches on Adolescents* edited by (I,A. Nwanuoke, O. Bamgbose & O. A. Moronkola) Ibadan. Omoade Printing Press.
- Bru, E. (2007). Parenting Styles Associated with Disruptive in the Classroom. *Sc&inavian Journal of Educational Research*,50(1). 88 -89
- Charles, P. (2011). *Dealing with Disruptive Classroom Behaviour*. Colorade state university. Retrieved from <https://cpi.stanford.edu/Tomprof/postings/301.html>.
- Chidiebre, N. V. (2016). Parenting Styles & Social Interaction of Senior Secondary School Students in Imo State, Nigeria. *International Educational Applied Scientific Research Journal*, 11(11). Retrieved from https://archive.org/stream/editor_ieasrj_05/05_djvu.txt
- Chua, I. M. (2010). *Autocratic Parenting & Behaviour of Students: Theories of Behaviouralism*. New York. Peter Hyden Press.

Copyright, (2006). The Research Advisors (<http://research-advisors.com>), All right reserved.

Corrie J. D. (2012). *Aggressive & Anti-social Behaviour*. New York: Willey.

Cramer, K. E. (2013). *The Influence of Parenting Styles on Children's Classroom Motivation. Master of Science in the School of Human Ecology*. Faculty of the Lousiana State University, Lousiana.

Crystal, M., D. (2016). Society Influence of Early Childhood & Culture. *Ibadan Journal of Curriculum Organization of Nigeria*, 3 (3) 41-54

Dacey, K. S. & Dacey, R. C. (2009). Does Parenting Behaviour Impact Delinquency? A Comparative Study of Delinquents & Non-delinquents. *Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*. 5(2). 337-346

Dacey, R., & Traver, K. (2016). *Practical Approaches to Individualizing Instruction*. New York. Parker publishing Press.

Daniel, E. I. (2014). *Democratic Parenting on Student's Disruptive Behaviour*. Unpublished Seminar, Akwa Ibom State University, Ikot Akpaden.

Darling, H., M. (2007). *Family & the Stress of Child Up-bringing*. *Journal of Family Psychology*. (5).

Darling, N. & Steinberg, L. (2015). Parenting styles as Context: An Integrated Model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116 (2). 33-36

David, A. H. (2015). *Educational Leadership. The Moral Arts*. New York, University of New York Press.

Davies-kean, P.E. (2009). The Influence of Parent Education & Family Income on Child Achievement. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 19(2). 205-222

Denga, D.I. (2013). *Special Counseling & Special Education Services for Primary & Secondary Schools in Nigeria*. Calabar. Nigerian Rapid Educational Publishers.

Destiny, C. F. (2010). *Influence of Authoritative Parenting & its Effects on Student Disruptive Behaviour*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of Uyo at Akwa Ibom State.

Domenech-Rodriguez, M.M. Donovan, M.R., & Crowley, S. L. (2009). Parenting Styles in a Cultural Context: Observations of Protective Parenting in First-generation Latinos. *Family*: 48(2). 845-862

Donald, J. (1993). *Frustration & Aggression*. New Haven, CT, US: Yale University Press.

Dornbush, S. M. (1991). Family Decision Making & Academic Performance in a Diverse High School Population. *Journal of Adolescent Research*. 5.

- Downey, G. & Coyne, J.C. (2014). *Children of Depressed Parents: An Integrative Review*. Psychological Bulletin, 108(1). Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.108.1.50>
- Durkheim, E. (1994). *The division of Labour in Society*. New York. W.D Halls Free Press.
- Dwairy, M. & Menshar, K.E. (2005). Parenting Style. Individuation & Mental Health of Egyptian Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescents*. Retrieve from www.sciencedirectdatabase.com
- Ehnvall, A., Parker, G., Hadzi-pavlovic, D., & Malhi, G. (2009). Perception of Rejecting & Neglectful Parenting in Childhood Regulates to Lifetime Suicide Attempts for Females, but not for Males: *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, 117(1).1193-1203
- Ekechukwu, R. & Amaeze, F. E. (2016). Influence of Teachers' Parenting Styles on Disruptive Behaviour Among Senior Secondary School Students. *European Virtual Conference on Social Sciences, Education & Law*.
- Ekpat, M. U. (2009). *Juvenile Delinquency in Nigeria*, 2nd Edition. Ikot Ekpene. Development Universal Press.
- Erinisha, I.I. (2012) *Parenting Styles & the Formation of Antisocial behaviour*. Mississippi, USA. The Aquila digital community press
- Esturgo-Deu, E, M. & Sala-Roca, J. (2009). Disruptive Behaviour of Students in Primary Education & Emotional Intelligence. *Science Direct, Vol. 26(4)*.175-193
- Garcia, A. (2001). Violence in Schools in North America & European Countries: Political Measures Designed to Promote Coexistence in Schools. *Rev Interuniv Form Profr. 12*. 167-177
- Ghazi, R., S. & Khan, Q., A. (2013). Types & Causes of Students' Disruptive Behaviour in Classroom. *Journal of Educational Research, 1(9)*. 154-157
- Gould, P., C., & Martindale, S.A. (2009). The Mechanism of Child Rearing & Family Issues. *Journal of Adolescent Psychology*.
- Greene, C.L. (2009). Parents' Motivation for Involvement in Children's Education: an Empirical Test of a Theoretical Model of Parental Involvement. *Journal of Educational psychology, 10(2)*.
- Halloran, J. B. (2009). *Parenting Administrative Style & its Effect on Students Work Performance in Educational Zone in Calabar*. (P.G.) Project (unpublished) Faculty of Education, University of Calabar.
- Haralambo, B.K. & Halberd, M.S. (2000) *Research Information Techniques*. London Queens Press.

- Harry, S., Scott, B. S., Doolan, M., & Beckeet, C. (2012) *How is parenting style related to child anti-social behaviour? Preliminary findings from the Helping Children Achieve Study*. Department for education retrieved from <https://www.researchgate.net/scientific-contributions/2038752553>
- Hart, C. H., Nelson, D. A., Robinson, C. C. Olsen, S. F; & Mcneilly-Choque, M. K. (2012). Overt & Relational Aggression in Russian Nursery-school-age children; Parenting Style & Marital Linkages. *Developmental Psychology*, 34. 687-697.
- Hernández, R.A. J., & Zafra, M.E., (2018). Influence of Parental Styles & Other Psychosocial Variables on the Development of Externalizing Behaviors in Adolescents: A Sytematic Review. *The European journal of psychology applied to legal context*. 11(1). 9-21. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5093/ejpalc2018a11>
- Hetherington, E. M. & Parke, R. D. (2009). *Child Psychology: A Contemporary View Point* (5th edition). New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.
- Hill, N. E. (1995). The Relationship Between Family Environment & Parenting: A Preliminary Study of Africa American Families. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 21 (4). 1-22
- Hoeve, T. U., Dubas, A. T. V&er, R. M., & Garvis, O. P. (2009). *Delinquency & Adolescent Training*.
- Hoff, K.F., Lairsen J. D. & Tardif, J.L. (2002). *Unconditional Parenting: Moving From Rewards & Punishments to Love & Reason*. New York, NY: Africa Books.
- Hosokawa, R., & Katsura T., (2019). Role of Parenting Style in Children's Behavioral Problems through the Transition from Preschool to Elementary School According to Gender in Japan. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*. 16 (1)<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16010021>
- Howenstein, J, Kumar, A., Casamassimo, S. P., McTigue, D., Coury, D. & Yin, H. (2015). Correlating Parenting Styles With Child Behaviour & Caries. *Pediatr Dent*. 37(1). 59-64
- Hsieh, E. L. (2009). *Relating Parenting Styles & Children Temperament to Behavioural Adjustment & Academic Achievement. Of Taiwanese Children*. USA. Unpublished PhD Thesis of Texas Technology University.
- Hunt, J. C. (2013). *"Associations Between Different Parenting Styles & Child Behaviour*. PCOM Psychology Dissertations. Paper 262.
- Huver, R. M. E. Otten, R. Vries, H. & Engel, R. C. (2009). Personality & Parenting Style in Parents of Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*. Retrieved from www.sciencedirectdatabase.com.

- Huwer, R.M. (2009). *Parent Education Programmes for Children's Behaviour Problems: Medium to Long Term Effectiveness*; Birmingham: West Midlands Development & Evaluation Service.
- Hyssong, A. (2013). *Perceived Peer Context & Adolescents Adjustment. Journal of Research & Adolescents Influences in Programs for Youth*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ibia, E. I. (2010). *Sociological Foundation of Education*. Uyo. Dor& publishers limited.
- Igwe, S. I. (2010). *The Role of Contemporary Parents in the Society*. In Umoren, D.N. (Ed) *A Handbook on Teaching Profession in Nigeria*. Uyo: Guidepost Publishers.
- Inman, A., G. Howard, E., E. Beaumont, R. L. Walker, J. A. (2012). Cultural Transmission: Influence of Contextual Factors in Asian Indian Immigrants Parents Experiences: *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 54(1).
- Inyang, E. B. (2010). *Juvenile Delinquency & Impacts on Students Academic Performance in Akwa Ibom State*. Ph.D Thesis (Unpublished) Faculty of Education, University of Calabar.
- James, P. K. (1997). *Research Design in Occupational Education*. Oklahoma State University. Retrieved from <https://www.okstate.edu/agedcm4h/academic/aged5980a/5980/newpage/15.htm>.
- Jekel, L. N. (2009). Patterns of Aggressive Behaviour in Experimental Created Social Climate. *Journal of Social Psychology*. 3(1).1006-1017
- Jimenez, J. L., Valenzuela, A. V., & Suarez, A. D. (2016). Disruptive Behaviour Among Elementary Students in Physical Education. *Springer plus*. 5(1).830-837
- John, J. (2018). Impact of Parenting Styles on Child Development. *Global Academic Society Journal: Social Science Insight*, vol. 1(5). 111-117
- Jonathan, O. N. & Anwuri, M. C. (2017). Parenting Styles as Correlates of Adolescents Drug Addiction among Senior Secondary School Students. *Journal of Education & e-learning Research*, 4 (1).393-405
- Jung, J. & Boman, P. (2003). Comparison of Disruption Behaviours in South. *Journal of Educational Enquiry*. 4(2) 90-101.
- Konnie, M.M. & Alfred, K. (2013). Influence of Parenting Styles on the Social Development of Children. *Academic Journal of International Studies*, Vol. 2(3).217-225
- Kordi, A. & Baharudin, R. (2010). Parenting Attitude & Style & its Effect on Children's School Achievements. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 2(2)233-252
- Krisberg, B. (1975). *Crime & Privilege; Toward a New Criminology*. Englewood Cliffs. Prentice Hall Press.

- Latouf, N & Dunn, M. (2014). Parenting Styles Affecting the Social Behaviour of Five-year olds. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 20(1). 56-95
- Levine, M. (2017). *The Price of Privilege: How Parental Pressure & Material Advantage are Creating a Generation of Disconnected & Unhappy Kids*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Liket, P.T. (2010). *Management of Organizational Behaviour, Utilizing Human Resources*. New York. Prentice Hall.
- Loromeke, C. J. K. (2009). *Relationship Among Parenting Styles, Self-concept & Students Career. Dispositions in Warri Local govt. of Delta State*. Abraka. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation of Delta State University.
- Ludwig, J. & Duncan, G. (2015). *Parent's Monitoring Relevant Knowledge & Adolescents Delinquent Behaviour; Evidence of Correlated Developmental Changes & Reciprocal Influences*. London. McGraw-Hill Inc
- Maccoby, E. E. & Martin, J. (2009). *Social Learning Limitation*. New York. Yale University Press.
- Mackay, R. B. (2016). *Parenting Styles & Family Reinforcement*. Mississippi, USA. Aquila Digital Communication Press.
- Marcone, R., Affuso, G. & Borrone, A. (2017). Parenting styles & children's internalizing-externalizing behavior: The mediating role of behavioral regulation *Curr Psychol*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-017-9757-7>
- Maslow, A. H. (1962). *Towards a Psychological of Being*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand.
- Mbiti, J. S. (2011). *African Religious & Philosophy (Revised)*. Ibadan. Heinemann Publisher Limited.
- McLeod, B. A. (2011). *Social Learning Theory & its Implication to Family Sustainability*. Cincinnati, OH Anderson Press.
- Mitchell, M.L., & Jolley, J.M. (2007). *Research Design Explained*. Belmont CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Mize, J. & Petti, G. S. (1997). Mothers' Social Coaching, Mother-Child Relationship Styles, & Children's Peer Competence; Is the Medium Message?. *Child Development*, 68(2). 139-147.
- Mohammed, A. I., Umaru, Y. & Abdulwahid, U. (2016). *Understanding Educational Psychology*. Kano. Tunlad Prints & Publishing Coy.
- Morrison, Y. S. (2009). *Parent Involvement in the Home, School & Community*. Ohio: Anderson Press.

- Nijhof, k. S. C & Engels, M.E. (2009). Parenting styles, Coping Strategies & the Expression of Homesickness. *International Journal of Adolescence*, 30(5). 709-720
- NTI, (2010). *Educational Psychology: Child Development 111*. Kaduna: National Teachers Institute.
- Nworgu, B. G. (2006). *Educational research, basic issues & methodology*. By University Trust Publishers Nsukka Enugu.
- Obiagaeri, R. E, (2018). Influence of Family Type (Single/Step-Parent) & Parenting Styles (Authoritarian/Authoritative) on Adolescent's Social Behaviour. *Journal of Humanities Social Sciences & Education*, 5(1).92-97
- Odebunmi, A. (2014). *Parenting: A Cross-Cultural & Psychological Perspective*, Abuja. Afabunmi Nigeria Ltd.
- Okoro, E.C. (2009). *Basic Concepts in Educational Psychology*. Enugu. U.C.O. Academic Publishers.
- Okorodu, R. I. (2003). Cases of Behaviour Problems Among Adolescents. *Journal of Nigeria Society for Educational Psychologists (NISEP)*, 2 (1). 84-96
- Okorodudu, S. (2010). A Review of a Relationship Among Parenting Practices, Parenting Styles & Adolescent School Achievement. *Educational psychology review* 17(2). 350-359
- Okorodudu, G.N. (2010). *Influence of Parenting Styles on Adolescent Delinquency in Delta Central Senatorial District Abaraka*. Publication of Institute of Education, Delta State.
- Okorodudu, R. I. & Okorodudu, G. N. (2009). Causes of Behaviour Problems Among Adolescents. The Nigerian Educational Psychologist. *Journal of Nigerian Society for Educational Psychologist*. 2(1).
- Okpako, J. E. (2009). *Parenting the Nigerian Adolescents Towards Smooth Transition to Adulthood. In Contemporary Issues & Research in Adolescents*. Ibadan: Omoade Printing Press.
- Olayiwola, A. O. (2010). *Procedures in Educational Research*. Nigeria: HANJAM Publications. <http://www.hrdc-drhc.gc.ca/arb/> Retrieved August 14 2012.
- Onyehalu, A. S. (2012). Juvenile Delinquency: Trend, Causes & Control Measures. The Behaviour Problem of the Nigerian Child. *Nigerian Society for Educational Psychologists*. 5.
- Onyewademe, M. A. (2012). *Parent's Involvement of Housemaid in Home Reading in an African Setting: Current Trends & Implications*. Nwazuoke, A., Amgbose, O. B. & Morokola, O., A. (Ed.). Ibadan. Omoade Printing Press.

- Opeyemi,S.(2015). Predictive Effect of Parenting Practices on Social Interaction. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary studies*. 4(1). 2281-4612
- Otu, C.A. (2012). *The Home & the School*. Uyo. &igraph Press Limited, Nigeria.
- Otuadah, C. E. (2009). *Parenting Behaviour & Peer Group Influences as Correlates of Delinquent Behaviour Among Secondary School Students in Warri Metroplis*. Unpublished M.Ed . Dissertation of Delsu, Abraka.
- Oyedeye, Q. I. (2012). *Early Childhood Education. Theory & Practice*. Calabar. Bon universal Limited.
- Parrott,J. D. (2010). *How Academic Advisers & Administrators Perceive the Role & Influence of Heavily Involved Parents*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of Illinois at Urban-Champaign.
- Patrick, O. E. (2009). *Social Status of Parents & Students' Academic Achievement*. Ilorin. Preplex Printing Press.
- Pellerin, L. A. (2005). Applying Baumrinds Parenting Typology to High Schools: Toward a Middle Age Theory of Authoritative Socialization. *Social science Research*.34. Retrieved from www.sciencedirectdatabase
- Pena, D. & Angulo, L., C. (2015). Current Disruptive Behaviours in Third-year Students of Media General Education. *Administrative Education*.Vol. 2
- Peterson, G. R, & Stouthamer, R. (1994). The Correlation of Family Management Practices & Delinquency. *Journal of Child Development*. 55.
- Phares, E. J.&Chaplin, W. E.(1997): Introduction to personality (4th ed,). New York : Longman.
- Querido, J. (2002). Parenting Styles & Child Behaviour in African American Families of Pre-school Children. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*. 31(2). 823-832
- Ra, A. (2009). *The Relationship of Teachers' Parenting Styles & Asian American Students' Reading Motivation*. PhD Thesis, University of Southern California.
- Rita, F. D. (2010). *The Impact of Early childhood Poverty on Academic Achievement & Influence of Supporting Parenting*. Unpublished PhD. Thesis, University of Rochester, New York.
- Robinson, C. C. (2001). The Parenting Styles & Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ). In B. F. Perlmutter, J. Touliatos, G. W. Holden (Eds.). *H&book of Family Measurement Techniques*. Vol.3. Instruments & Index. *Thous& Oaks: Sage*.319-321

- Ruchkin, V. & Barnow (2013). Parental Rearing & Problem Behaviours in Male Delinquents Versus Controls in Northern Russia. *Social Psychiatry Epidemiology*, 33(10). 720-731
- Sangawi, S. H., Adams, J. & Reissl, N., (2017). The Effects of Parenting Styles on Behavioral Problems in Primary School Children: A Cross-Cultural Review. *Canadian Center of Science & Education* 11 (22). Retrieved from URL:<http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v11n22p171>
- Santrock, J. W. (2012). *A Topical Approach to Life-span Development*. New York. McGraw-Hill Publishing House.
- Sarwar, S. (2016). Influence of Parenting Style on Children's Behaviour. *Journal of Educational & Educational Development*, 3(2). 222-247
- Shehzadi, F., Bajwa, S.R., Batool, I., & Shah A. A. (2018) Effect of Perceived Parenting Styles on Disruptive Behavior among Adolescents. *Peshawar Journal of Psychology & Behavioral Sciences*. 4(1). 1-13
- Siawju, K. (2008). Challenging Behaviour in Secondary School Students: Classroom Strategies for Increasing Positive Behaviour. New Zealand. *Journal of Teachers work*, 10 (1). 89-101
- Skykes, B. A. & David, S. O. (1998). *Sociological Approach in Child Training*. London. Cambridge University press.
- Spiegel M (1992). *Synthesizing Evaluation Perspectives, Practices & Evidences, Proceedings of the American Evaluation Association*: 92 Extension evaluation Topical Interest Group, Seattle WA, 27-37.
- Stephen, C. D. (2013). *Authoritative Parenting & its Effects on Students Behaviour*, Asaba. Ikediashi Printing Press.
- Stevens, J (1986). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences*: Hillsdale: NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sulbaran, A., & Leon, A. (2014). Disruptive Behaviour Study in School Taking into Account Teacher's Perception. *Administrative Education*. 2
- Sun, F. C. R. & Shek, L. T. D. (2012). Students Classroom Misbehavior: An Exploratory Study Based on Teachers' Perceptions. *Scientific World Journal*.
- Sokol, R. L., Qin, B., Poti, (2017). Parenting styles & body mass index: a systematic review of prospective studies among children, *Obesity Reviews*, 18(3). 281-292.
- Taylor, J.A. (2009). A Personality scale of Manifest Anxiety. *Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology*, 4(1). 557-563

- Ubom, C. S. (2017). *Laissez-faire Parenting Style & Children Disruptive Behaviour Pattern in Secondary Schools in Calabar North Municipality*. Unpublished M.Ed. Dissertation Faculty of Education, University of Calabar.
- Uche, D. M. (2010). *Early Marriage & Health Risk of Problems*. Akwa; Nneka Printing Press; Nigeria.
- Udoh, T. A. (2018). Permissive Parenting & Child Abuse in a Nationally Representative Nigeria Sample. *Journal of Child Abuse & Neglect*. 10 (3)
- Udom, K. T. (2011). *A survey of the Problem Associated with Secondary School Disruptive Behaviour in Uyo Local Government Area of Akwa Ibom State*. M.Ed. Dissertation, University of Port Harcourt.
- Ukoha, E. K. (2013). Self-concepts & Cult Activity Tendencies among Secondary School Students in Abia State in the Behaviour Problem of the Nigerian Child. *Nigerian Society for Education Psychologist*. 2(1). 158-170
- Ukpe, B. S. (2009). Child Development & Relationship. *Clinical Psychology Review* 18:971.
- Urbina, C. (2011). Teachers' Conceptions about Disruptive Behaviours: Analysis From an Inclusive Perspective. *Infancia Aprendiz*. 34(2). 205-217
- Watabe, A. (2011). *The Influence of Parenting on Children's Academic Achievement. Comparison Between the United states & Japan*. A Master of Arts Thesis, California State University, Chio.
- Watson, D., Nizon, E., & Halpanny, A.M.(2006). *Parents' Perspectives on Parenting Styles & Disciplining Children*. Dublin: The Stationary Office.
- Zaman, R., Arslan, M., & Mehmood, A. (2014). Effect of Parenting Style on Child Behavior: A Qualitative Analysis. *Journal of Education & Practice*. 5 (21) ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper) ISSN 2222-288 X (Online)

APPENDIX B

Department of Educational Psychology

Faculty of Education

Ahmadu Bello University Zaria.

Date:

Dear respondent,

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENTING STYLES ON STUDENTS' DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOUR

I am a master's student of the Department of Educational Psychology and Counselling Ahmadu Bello University Zaria, currently conducting a research on the relationship between parenting styles and student's disruptive behaviour among Secondary Schools students in Uyo Metropolis of Akwa-Ibom State, Nigeria. I am here by soliciting your support to fill the items accordingly.

I want you to know that any information collected from you will be considered highly confidential for it will be used solely for the purpose of this research.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours faithfully

Udo Menyene-abasi Andem

P16EDPC8001

Section A: Participants Demographic Data

Instruction: Indicate your responses by writing the name of your school and ticking (✓) the appropriate box.

Name of School: _____

Sex: M () F ()

Age: 14 – 16 () 17-19 ()

School System;

- Day ()
- Boarding ()

Section B: Parenting Styles Questionnaires

Instruction: This questionnaire is designed to collect information on parenting styles that contributes more to disruptive behaviour of students. Read the following statements carefully and choose from five categories by ticking the category that best describe your reports about the parenting styles used on you by parents, the five categories are:

5. = Strongly Agree (SA)

4. = Agree (A)

3. = Not Decided (ND)

2. = Disagree (D)

1. = Strongly Disagree (SD)

S/No	ITEMS	SA	A	ND	D	SD
1.	My parents teach me good behaviour in a loving manner					
2.	My parents set clear rules and expects me to follow					
3.	My parents punish me if I violate rules and regulations expected of me but are not hash on me					
4.	My parents show me sympathy when I am disturbed					
5.	My parents monitor my behaviour to make sure that they suit their rules and expectation					
6.	My parents explain the reasons why they punish me if I offend them					
7.	My parents allow me to decide for myself what I was going to do					
8.	My parents explain to me why rules should be obeyed					
9.	My parents consider my feelings when they give me direction.					
10.	My parents discuss family issues with me in a friendly manner					
11.	My parents punish me beyond little wrong I do					
12.	My parents always try to change the way I think without explaining why to me					
13.	The relationship between me and my parents is like master servant					
14.	My parents take decisions that hurt me and I must not complain					
15.	My parents spank me in the public with little or no wrong					
16.	My parents usually disgrace me in the public at little wrong I do					
17.	When I ask my parents why I have to do what they tell me to do, they say because they say so					
18.	My parents blowup in anger toward me when I do little wrong					
19.	My parents use threats as a form of punishment with no justification for it					
20.	There is no clear rules on what I should not do at home					
21.	My parents don't care about my behaviour at all					

22.	My parents do not ask me where I have been if I do not sleep at home					
23.	My parents do not punish me when I misbehave					
24.	There is little or no communication between my parent and I					
25.	My parents do not set any rules to guide my behaviour					
26.	My parents do not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behaviour					
27.	My parents allow me to decide most things for myself without interference					
28.	My parents sometime don't come home					
29.	My parents don't respond to my school needs					
30.	My parents do not feel offended even when I do wrong					
31.	My parents explain to me how they feel about me					
32.	My parents take my wishes into consideration before they ask me to do something					
33.	My parents encourage me to talk about my feelings and problems					
34.	My parents explain the reasons behind their expectations from me					
35.	My parents respect my opinion and encourage me to express them					
36.	My parents encourage me to freely speak my mind, even if they disagrees with me					
37.	My parents set rules and explain to me why I should follow them					
38.	My parents punish me when am wrong and take privileges away from me, e.g. tv, games or visiting friends					
39.	If my parents make a decision in the family that hurts me, they are willing to discuss that and admit if they make mistake					
40.	My parents consider my preferences when making plans for the family					
41.	My parents offer little supervision for me					
42.	My parents often ignore me					

43.	My parents only focus on their own needs					
44.	My parents allows me to learn by myself					
45.	My parents have little emotional involvement for me					
46.	My parents do not bother about my discipline					
47.	My parents neglect me completely					
48.	My parents do not set limits for me at all					
49.	My parents do not provide for my basic needs					
50.	My parents spent most time on their job					

Source: Adapted from Erinisha (2012)

Section C: Students' Disruptive Behaviour Questionnaires

Instruction: The Following Items Describe a Number of Different Disruptive Behaviour. Please Read each item and Tick (✓) in the Appropriate Column using the following Scale

	ITEMS					
S/No.		SA	A	ND	D	SD
1.	I sometimes ask for answer from my friends during examination					
2.	I sometimes eat in the classroom					
3.	I sometimes join my friends to fight people					
4.	I leave school before closing time					
5.	I sometime use my cell phone in the classroom					
6.	I left home for an extended period of time without telling my parents					
7.	I silently fails to follow teacher's instruction					
8.	I sometimes fail to respect the rights of other students to express their viewpoint					
9.	I sometimes skip classes without permission					
10.	I sometimes chat in the classroom					

Source: Adapted from Erinisha (2012)

APPENDIX C

The Entire Population of S.S.1 Students in Public Secondary Schools in Uyo Metropolis of Akwa Ibom state, Nigeria

TOTAL NUMBER OF PUBLIC SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN UYO LOCAL GOVERNMENT AREA, AKWA IBOM STATE

S/N	NAME OF SCHOOL	NUMBER OF SINGLE GENDER SCHOOLS	NUMBER OF BOARDING SCHOOLS	MALE	FEMALE	POPULATION OF EACH SCHOOLS
1	Cornelia Connelly College, Afaha Oku. Uyo	Single Gender	Boarding	-	4261	4261
2	Uyo High School, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	2245	1761	4006
3	Community Secondary Commercial School, Ikot Oku Ikono, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	2464	1534	3998
4	Christian Secondary Commercial School, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	1124	644	1768
5	Community Comprehensive Secondary School, Four Towns, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	2599	2039	4638
6	Community Secondary Commercial School, Ikot Ekeyak Ikono, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	1955	423	2378
7	Ikono Ibom Community Secondary School, Ikot Ayan Ikono, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	752	484	1236
8	Community Secondary Commercial School. Aka Offot, Uyo	Mixed	Boarding	2566	2238	4804
9	Community Secondary School, Mbak Etoi. Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	985	638	1623
10	Community Secondary Commercial School, Ikot Okubo Offot. Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	2932	302	3234
11	Offot Ukwa Community Secondary School, Ohio Offot. Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	723	607	1330
12	Secondary School, Etoi, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	1395	3526	4921
13	Northern Ikono Community Secondary School, Ikot Odung Ikono, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	632	368	1000
14	Special Education Centre, Mbiabong Etoi, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	252	400	652
15	Community Secondary School, Ikot Nsung Ikono, Uyo	Mixed	Non-Boarding	124	100	224
16	Government Technical College, Evvet, Uyo	Mixed	Boarding	2512	1000	3512

Source: Ministry of Education Uyo, Akwa Ibom State (May, 2019).



Summary

- Total Number of Boarding. Schools: 3
- Total Number of Mixed Schools: 15
- Total Number of Single Gender Schools: 1
- Total Number of Public Secondary Schools in Uyo Local Government Area: 16

APPENDIX D

Required Sample Size

Population Size	Confidence = 95%				Confidence = 99%			
	Margin of Error				Margin of Error			
	5.0%	3.5%	2.5%	1.0%	5.0%	3.5%	2.5%	1.0%
10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
20	19	20	20	20	19	20	20	20
30	28	29	29	30	29	29	30	30
50	44	47	48	50	47	48	49	50
75	63	69	72	74	67	71	73	75
100	80	89	94	99	87	93	96	99
150	108	126	137	148	122	135	142	149
200	132	160	177	196	154	174	186	198
250	152	190	215	244	182	211	229	246
300	169	217	251	291	207	246	270	295
400	196	265	318	384	250	309	348	391
500	217	306	377	475	285	365	421	485
600	234	340	432	565	315	416	490	579
700	248	370	481	653	341	462	554	672
800	260	396	526	739	363	503	615	763
1,000	278	440	606	906	399	575	727	943
1,200	291	474	674	1067	427	636	827	1119
1,500	306	515	759	1297	460	712	959	1376
2,000	322	563	869	1655	498	808	1141	1785
2,500	333	597	952	1984	524	879	1288	2173
3,500	346	641	1068	2565	558	977	1510	2890
5,000	357	678	1176	3288	586	1066	1734	3842
7,500	365	710	1275	4211	610	1147	1960	5165
10,000	370	727	1332	4899	622	1193	2098	6239
25,000	378	760	1448	6939	646	1285	2399	9972
50,000	381	772	1491	8056	655	1318	2520	12455
75,000	382	776	1506	8514	658	1330	2563	13583
100,000	383	778	1513	8762	659	1336	2585	14227
250,000	384	782	1527	9248	662	1347	2626	15555
500,000	384	783	1532	9423	663	1350	2640	16055
1,000,000	384	783	1534	9512	663	1352	2647	16317
2,500,000	384	784	1536	9567	663	1353	2651	16478
10,000,000	384	784	1536	9594	663	1354	2653	16560
100,000,000	384	784	1537	9603	663	1354	2654	16584
300,000,000	384	784	1537	9603	663	1354	2654	16586

† Copyright, The Research Advisors (2006). All rights reserved.

APPENDIX E

Authoritative parenting style

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.797	.837	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
My parents teach me good behaviour in a loving manner	4.7000	.46410	40
My parents set clear rules and expects me to follow	4.7500	.43853	40
My parents punish me if I violate rules and regulations expected of me but are not hash on me	4.5500	.93233	40
My parents show me sympathy when I am disturbed	4.3000	1.06699	40
My parents monitor my behaviour to make sure that they suit their rules and expectation	4.8250	.38481	40
My parents explain the reasons why they punish me if I offend them	4.2750	1.03744	40
My parents allow me to decide for myself what I was going to do	3.5500	1.31948	40
My parents explain to me why rules should be obeyed	4.6000	.84124	40
My parents consider my feelings when they give me direction	4.7500	.49355	40
My parents discuss family issues with me in a friendly manner	4.5000	1.01274	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	4.480	3.550	4.825	1.275	1.359	.141	10

Autocratic Parenting style**Reliability****Scale: ALL VARIABLES****Case Processing Summary**

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.711	.710	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
My parents punish me beyond little wrong I do	4.2250	1.32988	40
My parents always try to change the way I think without explaining why to me	3.7000	1.57219	40
The relationship between me and my parents is like master servant	3.8750	1.58822	40
My parents take decisions that hurt me and I must not complain	3.8500	1.61006	40
My parents spank me in the public with little or no wrong	4.2250	1.27073	40
My parents usually disgrace me in the public at little wrong I do	3.8500	1.40603	40
When I ask my parents why I have to do what they tell me to do, they say because they say so	3.9500	1.21845	40
My parents blowup in anger toward me when I do little wrong	3.7250	1.39574	40
My parents use threats as a form of punishment with no justification for it	3.7000	1.47109	40
There is no clear rules on what I should not do at home	3.1250	1.69747	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.823	3.125	4.225	1.100	1.352	.097	10

Laissez-faire Parenting style**Reliability****Scale: ALL VARIABLES****Case Processing Summary**

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.946	.946	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
My parents don't care about my behaviour at all	2.8250	1.90663	40
My parents do not ask me where I have been if I do not sleep at home	2.5250	1.75393	40
My parents do not punish me when I misbehave	2.8250	1.78149	40
There is little or no communication between my parent and I	3.0000	1.85362	40
My parents do not set any rules to guide my behavior	3.1250	1.72742	40
My parents do not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior	2.9500	1.81094	40
My parents allow me to decide most things for myself without interference	3.2500	1.61325	40
My parents sometime don't come home	2.6500	1.71793	40
My parents don't respond to my school needs	2.6250	1.70501	40
My parents do not feel offended even when I do wrong	3.0000	1.75412	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.878	2.525	3.250	.725	1.287	.053	10

Democratic parenting style**Reliability****Scale: ALL VARIABLES****Case Processing Summary**

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.748	.831	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
My parents explain to me how they feel about me	4.7750	.47972	40
My parents take my wishes into consideration before they ask me to do something	4.5250	.75064	40
My parents encourage me to talk about my feelings and problems	4.7000	.72324	40
My parents explain the reasons behind their expectations from me	4.4250	1.19588	40
My parents respect my opinion and encourage me to express them	4.5500	.95943	40
My parents encourage me to freely speak my mind, even if they disagree with me	4.1000	1.15025	40
My parents set rules and explain to me why I should follow them	4.3750	1.21291	40
My parents punish me when am wrong and take privileges away from me, e.g tv, games or visiting friends	4.1500	1.31168	40
If my parents make a decision in the family that hurts me, they are willing to discuss that and admit if they make mistake	4.1500	1.36907	40
My parents consider my preferences when making plans for the family	4.4750	1.08575	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	4.423	4.100	4.775	.675	1.165	.054	10

Uninvolved parenting style
Reliability
Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.861	.856	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
My parents offer little supervision for me	3.8750	1.39940	40
My parents often ignore me	3.2750	1.73925	40
My parents only focus on their own needs	3.5750	1.64687	40
My parents allows me to learn by myself	3.5750	1.66237	40
My parents have little emotional involvement for me	3.7250	1.69445	40
My parents do not bother about my discipline	2.7250	1.79726	40
My parents neglect me completely	3.4750	1.69445	40
My parents do not set limits for me at all	2.9500	1.67867	40
My parents do not provide for my basic needs	2.8750	1.69747	40
My parents spent most time on their job	4.2500	1.23517	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.430	2.725	4.250	1.525	1.560	.229	10

Student's Disruptive behavior questionnaire

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Case Processing Summary

	N	%
Valid	40	100.0
Cases Excluded ^a	0	.0
Total	40	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.949	.951	10

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
I sometimes ask for answer from my friends during examination	2.4000	1.70670	40
I sometimes eat in the classroom	2.5250	1.73925	40
I sometimes join my friends to fight people	2.2750	1.67925	40
I leave school before closing time	2.2250	1.73187	40
I sometime use my cell phone in the classroom	2.1750	1.44803	40
I left home for an extended period of time without telling my parents	2.0750	1.43915	40
I was once suspended or expelled from school as a result of walking out of teacher	2.2250	1.49336	40
I sometimes fail to respect the rights of other students to express their viewpoint	2.6250	1.73482	40
I sometimes skip classes without permission	2.2500	1.54837	40
I sometimes chat in the classroom	1.8750	1.34331	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	2.265	1.875	2.625	.750	1.400	.046	10

(Combined reliability for all the 50 items of parenting styles questionnaire)

Reliability

Scale: ALL VARIABLES

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.887	.857	50

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.887	.857	50

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
My parents teach me good behaviour in a loving manner	4.7000	.46410	40
My parents set clear rules and expects me to follow	4.7500	.43853	40
My parents punish me if I violate rules and regulations expected of me but are not hash on me	4.5500	.93233	40
My parents show me sympathy when I am disturbed	4.3000	1.06699	40
My parents monitor my behaviour to make sure that they suit their rules and expectation	4.8250	.38481	40
My parents explain the reasons why they punish me if I offend them	4.2750	1.03744	40
My parents allow me to decide for myself what I was going to do	3.5500	1.31948	40
My parents explain to me why rules should be obeyed	4.6000	.84124	40
My parents consider my feelings when they give me direction	4.7500	.49355	40
My parents discuss family issues with me in a friendly manner	4.5000	1.01274	40
My parents punish me beyond little wrong I do	4.2250	1.32988	40
My parents always try to change the way I think without explaining why to me	3.7000	1.57219	40
The relationship between me and my parents is like master servant	3.8750	1.58822	40

My parents take decisions that hurt me and I must not complain	3.8500	1.61006	40
My parents spank me in the public with little or no wrong	4.2250	1.27073	40
My parents usually disgrace me in the public at little wrong I do	3.8500	1.40603	40
When I ask my parents why I have to do what they tell me to do, they say because they say so	3.9500	1.21845	40
My parents blowup in anger toward me when I do little wrong	3.7250	1.39574	40
My parents use threats as a form of punishment with no justification for it	3.7000	1.47109	40
There is no clear rules on what I should not do at home	3.1250	1.69747	40
My parents don't care about my behaviour at all	2.8250	1.90663	40
My parents do not ask me where I have been if I do not sleep at home	2.5250	1.75393	40
My parents do not punish me when I misbehave	2.8250	1.78149	40
There is little or no communication between my parent and I	3.0000	1.85362	40
My parents do not set any rules to guide my behavior	3.1250	1.72742	40
My parents do not view themselves as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior	2.9500	1.81094	40
My parents allow me to decide most things for myself without interference	3.2500	1.61325	40
My parents sometime don't come home	2.6500	1.71793	40
My parents don't respond to my school needs	2.6250	1.70501	40
My parents do not feel offended even when I do wrong	3.0000	1.75412	40
My parents explain to me how they feel about me	4.7750	.47972	40
My parents take my wishes into consideration before they ask me to do something	4.5250	.75064	40
My parents encourage me to talk about my feelings and problems	4.7000	.72324	40
My parents explain the reasons behind their expectations from me	4.4250	1.19588	40
My parents respect my opinion and encourage me to express them	4.5500	.95943	40
My parents encourage me to freely speak my mind, even if they disagrees with me	4.1000	1.15025	40

My parents set rules and explain to me why I should follow them	4.3750	1.21291	40
My parents punish me when am wrong and take privileges away from me, e.g tv, games or visiting friends	4.1500	1.31168	40
If my parents make a decision in the family that hurts me, they are willing to discuss that and admit if they make mistake	4.1500	1.36907	40
My parents consider my preferences when making plans for the family	4.4750	1.08575	40
My parents offer little supervision for me	3.8750	1.39940	40
My parents often ignore me	3.2750	1.73925	40
My parents only focus on their own needs	3.5750	1.64687	40
My parents allows me to learn by myself	3.5750	1.66237	40
My parents have little emotional involvement for me	3.7250	1.69445	40
My parents do not bother about my discipline	2.7250	1.79726	40
My parents neglect me completely	3.4750	1.69445	40
My parents do not set limits for me at all	2.9500	1.67867	40
My parents do not provide for my basic needs	2.8750	1.69747	40
My parents spent most time on their job	4.2500	1.23517	40

Summary Item Statistics

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Range	Maximum / Minimum	Variance	N of Items
Item Means	3.806	2.525	4.825	2.300	1.911	.481	50

APPENDIX F STATISTICAL RESULT OUTPUT

H1 Correlations

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
students_disruptive_behaviour	31.3666	10.76885	341
authoritative_parenting	34.0117	11.08920	341

Correlations

		students_disruptive _behaviour	authoritative_parenting
students_disruptive_behaviour	Pearson Correlation	1	-.759**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	341	341
authoritative_parenting	Pearson Correlation	-.759**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	341	341

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

CORRELATIONS

```

/VARIABLES=students_disruptive_behaviour autocratic_parenting
/PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES
/MISSING=PAIRWISE.

```

H2

Correlations

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
students_disruptive_behaviour	31.3666	10.76885	341
autocratic_parenting	33.3578	10.80718	341

Correlations

		students_disruptive _behaviour	autocratic_parenting
students_disruptive_behaviour	Pearson Correlation	1	.799**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	341	341
autocratic_parenting	Pearson Correlation	.799**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	341	341

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

CORRELATIONS

```

/VARIABLES=students_disruptive_behaviour laissezfaire_parenting
/PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES
/MISSING=PAIRWISE.

```

H3

Correlations

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
students_disruptive_behaviour	31.3666	10.76885	341
laissezfaire_parenting	28.7742	10.69849	341

Correlations

		students_disruptive _behaviour	laissezfaire_parenti ng
students_disruptive_behaviour	Pearson Correlation	1	.668**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.003
	N	341	341
laissezfaire_parenting	Pearson Correlation	.668**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.003	
	N	341	341

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

CORRELATIONS

```

/VARIABLES=students_disruptive_behaviour democratic_parenting
/PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES
/MISSING=PAIRWISE.

```

H4

Correlations

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
students_disruptive_behaviour	31.3666	10.76885	341
democratic_parenting	35.6364	8.52141	341

Correlations

		students_disruptive _behaviour	democratic_parentin g
students_disruptive_behaviour	Pearson Correlation	1	-.700**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.033
	N	341	341
democratic_parenting	Pearson Correlation	-.700**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.033	
	N	341	341

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

CORRELATIONS

```

/VARIABLES=students_disruptive_behaviour unininvolved_parenting
/PRINT=TWOTAIL NOSIG
/STATISTICS DESCRIPTIVES
/MISSING=PAIRWISE.

```

H5

Correlations

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
students_disruptive_behaviour	31.3666	10.76885	341
uninvolved_parenting	26.4076	10.71919	341

Correlations

		students_disruptive _behaviour	uninvolved_parenti ng
students_disruptive_behaviour	Pearson Correlation	1	.724**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	341	341
uninvolved_parenting	Pearson Correlation	.724**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	341	341

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

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=school sex age system

/ORDER=ANALYSIS\

FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=A1 A2 A3 A4 A5 A6 A7 A8 A9 A10

/ORDER=ANALYSIS.

Frequency Table

Sex				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Male	164	48.1	48.1	48.1
Valid female	177	51.9	51.9	100.0
Total	341	100.0	100.0	

Age				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 14-16	174	51.0	51.0	51.0
Valid 17-19	167	49.0	49.0	100.0
Total	341	100.0	100.0	

school system				
	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Day	201	58.9	58.9	58.9
Valid Boarding'	140	41.1	41.1	100.0
Total	341	100.0	100.0	

APPENDIX G

Questions and Answers

Question One: What is the relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behavior?

Table 4.2.1: Correlation statistics on the relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	r	Remarks
Authoritative parenting	341	34.0117	11.08920	339	-0.759**	Inverse relationship exist. The higher the authoritative parenting style the lower the disruptive behavior and vice versa
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

The Correlation statistics above showed that an inverse relationship exist between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. The level of relationship is at -0.759 implying a negative or inverse relationship between authoritative parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. This shows that the higher the students' authoritative parenting style, the lower the students disruptive behavior and vice versa.

Question Two: Is there any relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior?

Table 4.2.2: Correlation statistics on the relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	r	Remarks
autocratic parenting	341	33.3578	10.80718	339	0.799**	The higher the autocratic parenting style, the higher the level of students disruptive behavior and vice versa
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

Outcome of the Correlation statistics above showed that a proportional or positive relationship exist between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. The level of relationship is at 0.799 implying a proportional or direct relationship between autocratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. This shows that the higher the students' autocratic parenting style, the higher the students disruptive behavior and vice versa.

Question Three: does any relationship exist between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour?

Table 4.2.3: Correlation statistics on the relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	r	Remarks
laissez-faire parenting	341	28.7742	10.69849	339	0.668 **	There is a huge proportional relationship between students disruptive behavior and laissez-faire parenting style
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

Outcome of the Correlation statistics above showed that a proportional relationship exist between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. The level of relationship is at 0.668 implying a proportional or direct relationship between laissez-faire parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. This shows that the higher the students' laissez-faire parenting style, the higher the students disruptive behavior and vice versa. Moreover the value of 0.796 is above the critical r value of 0.113 also implying a great relationship between the two variables.

Question Four: what type of relationship exist between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior?

Table 4.2.4: Correlation statistics on the relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	r	Remarks
democratic parenting	341	35.6364	8.52141	339	-0.700**	Inverse relationship exist between students disruptive behavior and democratic parenting
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

Result of the Correlation statistics above showed that an inverse relationship exist between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. The level of relationship is at -0.700 implying a negative or inverse relationship between democratic parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. This shows that the higher the students' democratic parenting style, the lower the students disruptive behavior and vice versa.

Question Five: What is the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behaviour?

Table 4.2.5: Correlation statistics on the relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior

Variables	N	Mean	Std.dev	df	r	Remarks
uninvolved parenting	341	26.4076	10.71919	339	0.724 **	Proportional relationship exist between disruptive behavior and uninvolved
Students disruptive behaviour	341	31.3666	10.76885			

Outcome of the Correlation statistics above showed that a proportional relationship exist between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. . The level of relationship is at 0.724 implying a proportional or direct relationship between uninvolved parenting style and students' disruptive behavior. This shows that the higher the students' uninvolved parenting style, the higher the students disruptive behavior and vice versa.

APPENDIX H

Table of r Critical Values: Pearson Correlation

DF	<i>1-tailed</i>		<i>2-tailed</i>
	0.05	0.025	0.005
	<u>0.1</u>	<u>0.05</u>	<u>0.01</u>
1	0.988	0.997	0.999
2	0.900	0.950	0.990
3	0.805	0.878	0.959
4	0.900	0.950	0.990
5	0.805	0.878	0.959
6	0.729	0.811	0.917
7	0.669	0.754	0.875
8	0.621	0.707	0.834
9	0.582	0.666	0.798
10	0.549	0.632	0.765
11	0.521	0.602	0.735
12	0.497	0.576	0.708
13	0.476	0.553	0.684
14	0.458	0.532	0.661
15	0.441	0.514	0.641
16	0.426	0.497	0.623
17	0.412	0.482	0.606
18	0.400	0.468	0.590
19	0.389	0.456	0.575
20	0.378	0.444	0.561
21	0.369	0.433	0.549
22	0.360	0.423	0.537
23	0.352	0.413	0.526
24	0.344	0.404	0.515
25	0.337	0.396	0.505
26	0.330	0.388	0.496
27	0.323	0.381	0.487
28	0.317	0.374	0.479
29	0.311	0.367	0.471
30	0.306	0.361	0.463
35	0.283	0.334	0.430
40	0.264	0.312	0.403
45	0.248	0.294	0.380
50	0.235	0.279	0.361
60	0.214	0.254	0.330
70	0.198	0.235	0.306
80	0.185	0.220	0.286
90	0.174	0.207	0.270
100	0.165	0.197	0.256
200	0.117	0.139	0.182
300	0.095	0.113	0.149
400	0.082	0.098	0.129
500	0.074	0.088	0.115
1000	0.052	0.062	0.081h

**Please call 877-437-8622 to request a quote based on the specifics of your research, or email Info@StatisticsSolutions.com*