UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

PATERNAL PARENTING STYLES, SELF-EFFICACY AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG ADOLESCENTS OF GEIDAM METROPOLIS, YOBE STATE, NIGERIA

SHETTIMA ALHAJI UMAR

FEM 2017 14
PATERNAL PARENTING STYLES, SELF-EFFICACY AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG ADOLESCENTS OF GEIDAM METROPOLIS, YOBE STATE, NIGERIA

By

SHETTIMA ALHAJI UMAR

Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia, in Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science

March 2017
COPYRIGHT

All material contained within the thesis, including without limitation text, logos, icons, photographs and all other artwork, is copyright material of Universiti Putra Malaysia unless otherwise stated. Use may be made of any material contained within the thesis for non-commercial purposes from the copyright holder. Commercial use of material may only be made with the express, prior, written permission of Universiti Putra Malaysia.

Copyright © Universiti Putra Malaysia
DEDICATION

This pieces of work was dedicated to Almighty Allah (SWT) for His infinite mercies toward me and for making this work reality.

It is also my devotion and dedication goes to my late Mother Ya Zara, my grand Mother Ya Girgidi Koila, Ya Fajimata and my Father Alhaji Umar Mohammed and also the entire family members for their supports, love, care and moral upbringing.
Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfillment of the requirement for the Degree of Master of Science

PATERNAL PARENTING STYLES, SELF-EFFICACY AND ANTISOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMONG ADOLESCENTS OF GEIDAM METROPOLIS, YOBE STATE, NIGERIA

By

SHETTIMA ALHAJI UMAR

March 2017

Chairman : Associate Professor Ma’rof Redzuan, PhD
Faculty : Human Ecology

Antisocial behaviour has always been one of the basic problems in many societies. Despite the fact that huge amount of budget has been spend by government on correctional institutions to ensure that this issue should be insignificant, yet the case of antisocial behaviours is still thriving. Moreover, the research on the relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviours has received a negligible consideration, particularly in Nigeria. Hence, this study is imperative which intended to determine the relationships between paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents. The study was carried out in Geidam Metropolis area of Yobe State, Nigeria.

The study was a cross-sectional, employed quantitative approach and using survey and correlational research designs. The respondents of the study comprised of 339 students (male and female, aged 15-18 years old) from two secondary schools. The selection of respondents used stratified sampling and simple random sampling techniques. The instruments for data gathering comprises of Parental Authority Questionnaire, General Self-efficacy and Youth Self-Repot. Meanwhile, this study used descriptive and inferential statistical analyses (t-test, ANOVA, Pearson’s Correlation, Multiple Linear Regression and Bootstrapping).

The descriptive findings showed that, all the levels of the variables were at the moderate levels. Meanwhile, the study indicated that males demonstrated high antisocial behaviours compared to the females. Moreover, the finding revealed that respondents whom their parents did not acquired formal education have higher level of antisocial behaviours compared to those whose parents have formal education. The results of the correlation analysis indicated that, paternal authoritarian and permissive parenting styles have significant positive relationships with antisocial behaviours; however, paternal authoritative parenting style and self-efficacy have significant
negative relationships with antisocial behaviours. Meanwhile, multiple linear regression analysis showed that, independent variables have contributed significantly on antisocial behaviours. Also, the results of bootstrapping analysis revealed that self-efficacy mediated the relationships between paternal parenting styles and antisocial behaviours. The findings of this study highlighted on the important role of the paternal authoritative parenting style in nurturing their adolescents in order to instil a high self-efficacy which hopefully could lead to low antisocial behaviour.
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Tingkah laku antisosial dalam kalangan remaja sentiasa menjadi salah satu masalah asas dalam kebanyakan masyarakat. Walaupun pada hakikatnya banyak kajian telah dijalankan dan perbelanjaan yang besar telah dicurahkan oleh kerajaan dalam mengurus institusi pemulihan untuk memastikan bahawa isu ini tidak menjadi isu yang signifikan, namun gejala tingkah laku antisosial masih lagi berleluasa. Namun demikian, kajian ini penting dalam menentukan hubungan antara gaya keibupabaan dengan tingkah laku antisosial dalam kalangan remaja. Kajian ini dijalankan keatas remaja di kawasan Metropolis Geidam, Negeri Yobe, Nigeria.


Hasil analisis deskriptif menunjukkan bahawa semua pembolehubah adalah pada tahap sederhana. Sementara itu, hasil kajian menunjukkan bahawa responden lelaki telah menunjukkan tingkah laku antisosial lebih tinggi berbanding dengan responden wanita. Tambahan pula, hasil kajian menunjukkan responden yang ibu-bapa mereka tidak mempunyai pendidikan formal mempunyai tahap tingah laku antisosial yang
lebih tinggi berbanding dengan responden yang ibu-bapa mereka mempunyai pendidikan formal. Hasil analisis korelasi menunjukkan bahawa gaya keibubapaan authoritarian dan permissif bapa mempunyai hubungan positif signifikan dengan tingkah laku antisosial; sebaliknya gaya keibubapaan autoritatif bapa dan efikasi diri mempunyai hubungan yang negatif signifikan dengan tingkah laku antisosial. Sementara itu, analisis regresi linear telah menunjukkan bahawa pembolehubah bebas telah menyumbang secara signifikan keatas tingkah laku antisosial. Begitu juga, hasil analisis bootstrapping menunjukkan bahawa efikasi diri berperanan secara signifikan sebagai pengantara dalam hubungan antara gaya keibubapaan autoritif, authoritarian, dan permissif bapa dengan tingkah laku antisosial. Hasil kajian ini dengan demikian telah memperlihatkan peranan penting gaya keibubapaan bapa dalam mengasuh anak-anak remaja mereka dalam menanamkan efikasi diri yang tinggi, yang akhirnya diharapkan dapat meredakan lagi tingkah laku antisosial.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Introduction

The contemporary modern term and concept of antisocial behaviour can be traced back to the early 19th century and undeniably this has often been linked to modern societal behaviours towards criminal justice and civil liberties (Tyrer and Davidson, 2000). In the early 1800, clinicians tried to comprehend antisocial behaviours as those offences that were repugnant and thought to be lunatic. In describing such adolescence, Prechard (1835); in (Andrews, 2010) coined the term as “moral insanity” which is a form of antisocial behaviours in which the sound faculties are unimpaired but the consciousness of the mind “perverted” and individual is incapable of running the affairs of his or her life in accepted procedures. Antisocial behaviours committed by adolescents cannot adversely affect themselves only; but such problems immensely affect animals, properties and the society at large.

Antisocial behaviour refers to the activities that usually harm people, violate the accepted norms and values as well as rules and regulations of the society (Burt, and Donnellan, 2009). Also Farrington (2005) explained antisocial behaviours as any types of behaviour that does not conform to accepted and standard behaviours of the society during childhood and adolescence; these behaviours include recklessness, stealing, harming of others, physical and psychological violence and other aspect of behaviour that is contrary to defined rule and regulation of the society and country at large, and most of these negative behaviours it came into existence as a result of lack of sufficient monitoring and supervision as well as punitive behaviours of parents. Antisocial and externalizing behaviours are terms synonymous with delinquency was asserted by Wachikwu and Ibegbunam (2012) as cited by Ikediashi and Akande (2015) as a crime or violation of norm and values committed by young people below the age of eighteen years, usually characters that lead to violation of existing norms and value. Likewise, Mayer (2001) maintained that, antisocial behaviour is that kind of behaviours of children that is not complying with defined rules and regulations which eventually lead to affect the national development of the country.

Adolescents are considered to be facing many changes and transitional movement from childhood to adulthood with regard to their mode of life under the care of their parents (Blackwell, Trzesniewski, kali and Dweck, 2007). In this period of socialization and learning, the children and adolescents are better to be close to their biological parents to learn and adopt the norms and values of the societies in order to function and contribute vital roles to the smooth running of the society (Crowell, Fraley, and Shaver, 1999). In such a situation, adolescents who lack supervision and parental control are bound to ignite the excessive and frequent rate of violence behaviours which eventually led to dysfunctional and antisocial adolescents (Crowell, Fraley, and Shaver, 1999). Equally, humanitarian studies like sociology, psychology, psychotherapy, guiding and counselling and other social sciences field of studies
explained the harmful effects of antisocial behaviours among adolescents (Rutter, Giller and Hagell, 1998)). Meanwhile, Family is one of the most important agents of socialization, and socialization is the process of learning, and this learning would take one to either abide by the norms and values or to deviate from the rules and regulations of the society. Most children behaviours depend on the type of parenting styles that one socialized to. The adequate supervision and monitoring of adolescents are the major roles of the parents in order to produce socially accepted behaviours for the functioning of the society, whereas antisocial and other related deviance and crime behaviours is the product of their parents as a result of undesirable rearing (Gottfredson and Hirsch, 1990). Similarly, Patterson (1984). Lack of efficient supervision of parents or families would easily lead to children and adolescents to engage in antisocial behaviours and other social vices.

It is a general belief that those adolescents who’s close to their biological parents are less to be found in committing antisocial behaviours. Lack of intimate supervision and poor parenting styles by parents would increase children’s preference to commit in antisocial behaviours (Ainworth, Blehan, Waters and Wall, 2015). Mutual understanding, supervision, close monitoring and influence as well as good communication between adolescents and their parents would lead to harmony and eventually make adolescents to comply with laid down authority and would they contribute their quotas to the development of the society (Parsa, Yaacob, Redzuan, Parsa, and Esmaili, 2014). In contrast, adolescents who lack good parental care, that is to say, there is no good understanding and sensitive monitoring and supervision by the parents, there is tendency of such kind of adolescents to engage in violence and other antisocial behaviours (Moitra and Mukherjee, 2010). Previous findings revealed that, antisocial behaviours of adolescents are linked with lack of good orientation, inadequate monitoring and supervision by parents (Wilson, 1987). Tremendous findings confirmed that lack of good parenting, deficient of proper care, insufficient monitoring and supervision of adolescents will easily predispose them to commit delinquent and antisocial behaviours (Barnes, Hoffman, Welter, Farrel and Cheff, 2006). It is also noted that, good parenting upbringing it is in good position to obstruct children and adolescents in all form of externalizing behaviours including substance abuse, prostitutions and other negative behaviours among adolescents.

It is very optimistic that when children enter into adolescence years, they encounter many difficulties and experiences, not only physical, emotional, and cognitive growth, but also need to achieve enormous goals in their expectations. Failure to adjust with these new circumstances might easily predispose individual to commit antisocial behaviours which finally lead to detrimental outcome (Keshavarz Somayeh, 2012). Therefore, there is a need to provide the instrument or tool that can overcome these challenges and unwanted occurrences. As a result of these, it is paramount to give confidence to this tool in order to make adolescents as the responsible members of the society (Keshavarz Somayeh 2012; Cramm, Strating, Roebroeck, and Nieboer, 2013). Self-efficacy is this tool that become more important during adolescent’s period, because it can influence the effort and beliefs of adolescents in order to prevent them to engage in social vices and other related antisocial behaviours (Bandura, Pastorelli, Barbaranelli, and Caprara, 1999; Pajares, and Urdan, 2006; Cramm et al., 2013). The self-efficacy of children were determine by the nature of their parenting style which
eventually determined they are outcome. There are consistent views that adolescents with high self-efficacy can resist to provide positive outcome over given period of time in spite of facing momentous difficulties (Luthar, Cicchetti, and Becker, 2000; Lo, Cheng, Wong, Rochelle, and Kwok, 2011). The adolescents with high self-efficacy are bound to resist and have confidents in mind and can play a vital role to come out with law abiding behaviours. Moreover, adolescent who believes to manage violence, bullying, crises and other delinquent activities is a good example of self-efficacious adolescents who is expected to become a functioning and productive members of society (Bandura, 1991; Luthar et al., 2000; Jaffee et al., 2007). Many scholars are of the same views that self-efficacy, self-control, self-esteem, self-regulation, self-confidents and resilience is not character or natural behaviour, but rather it is a capacity and resistance that one can develop over a given period of time as a result of positive relationship with the parents (Engeland, Carlson, Sroufe, 1993; Luthar, 2003; Rutter, 1999). Therefore, adolescents with high self-efficacy have every tendency to have an ability to face psychological trauma including anxiety, depression and any other internalizing and externalizing behaviours eventually produce desirable outcome.

It has been shown in many research that, the paternal parental involvement and monitoring of adolescents served as a protective means against the development of deviance behaviours among adolescents and strengthen their efficacy in the transitional early life (Patterson, Reid and Dishion, 1992). Similarly Bandura (1995). The also maintained that, self-efficacy of adolescents is depended on the types of parenting styles and method of socialization given by the family. It was asserted that supported and protective socialization produced a self-efficacy and law abiding members of society; whereas undesirable nurturing by the family would easily lead to antisocial behaviours among adolescents and eventually influence other peers to become low self-efficacy adolescents. It was also emphasized that, an adolescents who have low self-efficacy cannot endure the challenges of life to yield desirable outcome; rather than to end up with crime and delinquent behaviours. This is simply because they are not active and have low confidents and capability to face the challenges of life (Schwarzer, 2001). It was also a general belief that confidence, commitment, resistance and exposure of individual determine his or her outcome. The adolescent who believes of his or her capabilities can able to endure challenges would surely become a functioning member of the society. These capabilities and endurance of adolescents came into existence as a result of positive parenting supervision. Rutters (1999) postulated that, negative socialization of parents definitely influenced the behaviours of adolescents to engage in antisocial behaviours.

Self-efficacy is the most important in developing behaviours of adolescents. It is very crucial to study what factors that determine the development of this self-efficacy of adolescents. Positive Parenting was known as the major contributors to adolescent’s self-confidents and self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997a; Tam, Chong, Kadirvelu and Khoo, 2013). It is also known that self-efficacy of children was rooted from their parents. In all traditions’ culture and custom, parents is in the better position to construct and influence the self-efficacy of their children to produce required and productive outcome (Sorkhabi, 2005; Tam et al., 2013). The type of parenting style which provides high responsiveness and high demandingness is tending to build high self-
efficacy in their adolescents. While, other types of parenting styles who choose to build low responsiveness and low demandingness to their younger one has easily lead the adolescents to engage in antisocial behaviours because of the lack of positive parental socialization, and it is very rare for them to become accepted members of society. Psychologists, sociologists, and other behavioural scientists have clearly explained the roles and importance of parents in rearing adolescents’ lives and development (Parke and Buriel, 1998).

Baumrind (1967; 1978; and 1991) classified parent’s based on two (2) different perspectives, that is, responsiveness and demandingness. Likewise, mentioned (3) types of parenting styles such as: authoritative parenting style, which consists of high responsiveness and high demandingness. Secondly, authoritarian parenting style that has low responsiveness and high demandingness, while the last one is permissive parenting style, which also have high responsiveness and low demandingness. The scholar linked these three types to the tremendous developmental outcomes of adolescents and children behaviours. Authoritative parenting style would produce functioning and accepted members of society. Adolescents who undergo such type of parents are less to be found in engaging in antisocial behaviours. The adolescents are very successful in every aspect of life because of good parental upbringing. In contrast, authoritarian and permissive styles are unsuccessful in rearing their children and adolescents; this is because parents deviate from corrected procedure in nurturing the adolescents to become a conformed and productive member of society. Carelessness of parents would easily predispose adolescents to commit crime and other social vices (Moitra and Mukherjee, 2010).). Moreover, Darling and Steinberg (1993), point out that parents should be high or low in demanding or might either high or low in responsive or both in socializing their children and adolescents to become conform or deviate from the law and order of the society.

Despite the fact that, there are numerous law enforcement agencies like juvenile justice system, which comprises of juvenile police, juvenile court and juvenile custodian institutions such as remand homes, approved schools, borstal schools and juvenile prisons that are working day to day in order to dictate, apprehend and imprison antisocial adolescents and other delinquents children in the globe and Nigeria is not in isolation, yet there are tremendous and excessive issues of antisocial behaviours among adolescents (Clinard and Abbott, 1973; Idermaur and Roberts, 2009; and Patric Igbinovia, 2012). However, the present study is designed to investigate and clarifies the paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents of Geidam metropolis, Yobe State in north-eastern part of Nigeria. Adolescents self-efficacy and factors that determine their development are deemed necessary with given evidence that adolescents high self-efficacy is expected to avoid undesirable outcome, and utilize the abilities and competency to become a law abiding and conform members of society. Tremendous factors may contribute to the adolescent’s self-efficacy, even though, the present study focuses on the parenting styles and roles of paternal factor on the relationship between self-efficacy and adolescents antisocial behaviours.
1.2 Statement of Research Problem

It is basic fact that parents are the root causes of adolescents antisocial behaviours and they are socialization has a greater roles on children behaviours (Efobi and Nwokolo, 2014; Animasahun and Aremu, 2015). Undesirable upbringing of parents led adolescents in several antisocial behaviours such as bullying, violence, aggression, personality disorder, substance and drugs abuse, sexual abuse are only few to mention among the externalizing behavioural problem of children and adolescents behaviours as a result of relationship with parents (Uwe, Asuquo and Ekuri, 2008; Lokoyi, 2015). Furthermore, the adolescents are highly engaged in social vices and violence behaviors, it is clear evidence that today most of public gatherings, marriage ceremonies, and Eid celebrations became breeding periods to engaging in substance and drug abuse and other antisocial behaviours in the area of this study (Gana, 2014; Weeraratne, 2015). Above all, contemporary crises of Boko Haram insurgency which is currently ravaging the north-eastern part of the county especially in the region of this research that caused the death of countless lives of innocents citizens are majorly caused by adolescents who lack care and protection by parents (Okoli and Iortyer, 2014; Delia, Barkindo and Jacobson, 2015; Shuaibu, Salleh and Shehu, 2015).

The increasing and widespread of antisocial and externalizing behaviours among adolescents in the globe and indeed Nigeria are source of concern to the right thinking citizens. The dangerous issues of it have occupied central position in the day to day activities of Nigerians (Agbiboa, 2014; Ikediashi and Akande, 2015). Adolescent’s antisocial behaviours and other social vices are drastically affecting the national development on the issues like insecurity of life and property, poverty and hunger, unattractive destination for tourists, unemployment, and low foreign investment. However, most of these disobedience of authority and other violation of law and order was came into existence as a result of parenting styles (Sylvestor, 2014; Ikediashi et al., 2015; Chidiebere, 2016).

Based on the previous research reviewed in this studies particularly in Nigeria were found the direct relationship of parents and their adolescent’s on contribution to antisocial behaviour. Moreover, there is very limited studies on the roles of paternal parenting style and adolescents behaviours, where various studies was found on the direct relationship of both parenting styles in determining children behaviours (Omolola, 2011; Sunday et al., 2014; Animasahun et al., 2015). Therefore, the uniqueness of this study is to find out the relationship between paternal parenting styles and adolescents antisocial behaviors through the mediating effect of self-efficacy. Furthermore, it was discovered that adolescent’s levels of self-efficacy can immensely determine their behaviours (Bandura, 1977; Miller and Dollard, 1941; Bandura, 1986). Where by the adolescents are engaged in all forms of externalizing behaviours because of the low self-efficacy and low level of self-regulation as a result of different parenting styles (Tam, Chong, Kadirvelu and Khoo, 2013).

Conceptually and theoretical it was postulated that, Paternal parenting styles and self-efficacy that could influence antisocial behaviours among adolescents are hardly examine in Geidam Metropolis area of Yobe State in North-eastern Nigeria. Thus, the
The present study was seem to be exceptional and fill the breach in providing the empirical evidence on the mediating effect of self-efficacy on the relationship between paternal authoritative parenting styles, paternal authoritarian parenting style, paternal permissive parenting styles and antisocial behaviours among adolescents of Geidam Metropolis.

Moreover, culturally, traditionally and economically fathers has a crucial roles to play in the affairs of the entire members of the family. Fathers has utmost tendencies to influence the behaviours of their children and entire household. Though most of the studies in Nigeria revealed combined relationship of maternal and paternal in determining the antisocial behaviours of their children (Adeoti, 2010; Omolola, 2011; Omoregie and Abraham, 2009; Efobi and Nwokolo, 2014; Lokoyi, 2015; Animasahun and Aremu, 2015). Beside, some of the fathers were too leniency and indulgence while, some are too harsh and strike in the nurturing of their children. These type of harmful behaviours of fathers came into existence as a result of economic inequality and lack of equal opportunities that exist within the society (Ekpo and Ajake, 2013; Batool 2013; Rajendran, 2013). Hence, it is suggested that parents specifically (authoritarian and permissive parents) in Geidam Metropolis be equipped with suitable knowledge and strategies on the rearing of their adolescents in order to increase the level of self-efficacy so as to abide by the norms and value of the society in order to yield functioning and productive outcome. It was also assumed that the finding of this study it has an important implications to Geidam local Government, Yobe State Ministry of Education and Ministry of Health to propagate and mobilize paramount knowledge to parents on how to socialize children and adolescents authoritatively in order to children strength their self-efficacy to avoid internalizing and externalizing behaviours.

Therefore, this study tries to determine the relationship between paternal parenting styles and adolescents outcome. Past research showed that, many studies were carried out around the world and more are still on-going in a related field of studies (Omolola, 2011; Somayeh, 2012; Sunday et al., 2014; Animasahun et al., 2015). But it is rarely done in Nigeria, particularly the area of this study, that is paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents. Therefore, the main purpose of this study is to scrutinize the effects of paternal parenting styles on adolescents’ antisocial behaviours. Likewise, the study tries to examine the relationship and mediating effects of self-efficacy on the relationship between paternal parenting styles and adolescents antisocial behaviours. Furthermore, the study tries to clearly examine the levels of adolescents’ self-efficacy and paternal parenting styles that contribute to real antisocial behaviours. Moreover, it is better to scrutinise the specific condition under which these effects exist. Examining these issues is another important aspect to this study.

1.3 Research Questions

Based on the research issues stated above, the study attempts to answer the following questions:
1. What are the background of respondents and levels of paternal parenting style, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents?
2. Are there any differences between age, gender and father level of education in relation to antisocial behaviours among adolescents?
3. What are the relationships between paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents?
4. What are the factors contributing to antisocial behaviours among adolescents?
5. What are the mediating effects of self-efficacy on the relationship between paternal parenting styles and antisocial behaviours among adolescents?

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The general objective of the study is to establish relationship between paternal parenting style, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours. Based on this general objective, the specific objectives are as follows:

1. To describe the background of respondents and levels of paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents
2. To identify the differences between ages, gender and level of education in relation to antisocial behaviours among adolescents.
3. To determine the relationships between paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents.
4. To identify the paternal parenting styles and self-efficacy factors that contribute to antisocial behaviours among adolescents.
5. To examine the mediating effect of self-efficacy on the relationship between paternal parenting styles and antisocial behaviours among adolescents.

1.5 Hypotheses

In line with the specific objectives 2, 3, 4 and 5 various hypotheses were conveyed

Objective 2: To identify differences between ages, gender and fathers level of education in relation to antisocial behaviours among adolescents.

Ho1: There is no significant difference between male and female on antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho2: There is no significant difference between age groups of 15 – 16 years and 17 – 18 years on antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho3: There is no significant difference between the respondent’s father’s education levels on antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

Objective 3: To determine the relationships between paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents.

Ho4: There is no significant relationship between authoritative paternal parenting style and antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho5: There is no significant relationship between authoritarian paternal parenting style and antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho6: There is no significant relationship between permissive paternal parenting style and antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho7: There is no significant relationship between self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

Objective 4: To identify the paternal parenting styles and self-efficacy factors that contribute to antisocial behaviours among adolescents.

Ho8: Authoritative paternal parenting style does not significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho9: Authoritarian paternal parenting style does not significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho10: Permissive paternal parenting style does not significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho11: Self-efficacy does not significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

Objective 5: To examine the mediating effect of self-efficacy on the relationship between paternal parenting styles and antisocial behaviours among adolescents.

Ho12: Self-efficacy does not mediates the relationship between authoritative paternal parenting style and antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho13: Self-efficacy does not mediates the relationship between authoritarian paternal parenting style and antisocial behaviours among the respondents.
Ho14: Self-efficacy does not mediates the relationship between permissive paternal parenting style and antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This study would be significant for policy formulations, implementation, monitoring and evaluation. Policies which influence the mode of patterns to desist engaging in deviances and antisocial behaviours can significantly reduce the public major problems attributable to antisocial behaviours among adolescents. It is more important to have an in-depth knowledge and genesis of this positive contributing factor of this variable with the aims of elaborating the means that would heighten the morale of people’s beliefs, confidentiality and suitable adaptation in pursuance of their particular tasks. For adolescents, it is important to have secured and caring parents that are in good position for providing primary sources of experience for the development high self-efficacy.

The study is significant in providing good enlightenment and awareness from the part of government, non-governmental organization and religious clerics to inculcate the knowledge and importance of high self-efficacy among adolescents to determine their desirable outcome. And by knowing this, it is expected to reduce the level of antisocial
behaviours among adolescents. The study would also significantly assist the State Ministry of Health and mental health personnel to overcome the victims of adolescents who suffers from low self-efficacy believes. Moreover, this research considerably assists sociologists, psychologists and other social scientists in utilizing this knowledge in order to assess the required support services that will focus on authoritarian and permissive paternal parenting style toward the development of their children high self-efficacy.

1.7 Theoretical Frame Work

The theory of social learning of Bandura (1977, 1986) served as the grand and umbrella in guiding and integrating the theories of Parenting style (Baumrind, 1991), Self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997) and Social bonding (Hirschi, 1969) of this study. The theories are immensely discussed in relation to antisocial behaviours among adolescents.

1.7.1 Social learning theory

The grand theory that incorporated the entire theories (Hirschi, 1969; Baumrind, 1991; Bandura, 1997) on explaining this study collectively was the social-learning of (Bandura, 1977, 1986). This theory postulated that, children behaviours is based on imitation, modelling, copying and observation of their parents through cognitive influence that make them in the arena of antisocial behaviour. People do model their behaviours after imitate others. Adolescents imitate and learn their behaviours as a result of interaction with their parents that influence them to become low or high in self-efficacy personality which eventually determine their behaviours (Rotter, 1954). The application of social learning theory to understanding and explaining adolescent’s antisocial behaviours was seen on both psychologists (Bandura 1973a; 1973b; Nietzel 1979) and sociologists (Akers 1977; Akers et al., 1979) in the field of social science. A social learning approach in explaining antisocial behaviours of children proposes that, observational learning takes place mostly in three circumstances: in the family environment, widespread subculture and cultural symbols. Among them family have a greater role to play on children conforming or deviating to the law and order of the society (Bandura 1976). Therefore, the causes of antisocial behaviours was originated through the behaviours modelled within parenting styles.

Social learning theory asserted that, parents use to upbringing and rearing their adolescents differently which in turn influence them to have low or high self-efficacy. High Self-efficacy can lead adolescents to become functioning and productive members of society as a result of authoritative parenting style (Bandura, 2001). While, low self-efficacy positively influence children to deviate from the standard norms and values of the society as a result of authoritarian and permissive parenting styles (Fagan et al., 2003). Furthermore, Hirschi (1969) asserted that, antisocial and externalizing behaviours of adolescents in most society came into existence as a result of lack of supervision and monitoring of parents in early development during childhood and adulthood. Where by this situation drive them to become low self-efficacy individual in which they cannot produce a required outcome.
Since parenting styles can influence the mental and emotional functioning of their adolescents promptly to high or low self-efficacy as a result of modelling, observation, imitation and copying which eventually exhibit conforming or deviating behaviours to the norms and values of society (Hirschi, 1969; Baumrind, 1991; Bandura, 1997). Therefore, Social learning theory of Bandura is in good position to integrate and explain the postulations of parenting styles, self-efficacy and social bonding theories in identifying the relationship between paternal parenting style, self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours among adolescents in the study area.

1.7.2 Parenting Styles Theory

The theory of parenting styles was postulated by Diana Baumrind (1967) who classified parent’s based on two categories that is, responsiveness and demandingness, and she went further to enumerate three different types of parenting styles such as authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Each types of parenting styles differs in socialization, supervision and attitudes toward the rearing strategies of their children and adolescents. Two categories of parenting behaviours must be taken into consideration in this study approach of Baumrind (1967, 1971), these are the levels of responsiveness and demandingness that parents utilize in socializing their children and adolescents to become deviating or accepted members of a society. These two categories of parents influence the level of feeling or emotional relationship that occur between them and their adolescents or children and the level of regulation offered by the parents (Maccoby and Marting, 1983). Responsiveness simply refers to the parental receptiveness to the desire and wishes of their children. The level of warmth, support and affection from the parents to adolescents or children is more important in this regard. The parents are in the position to give all the basic needs of life to their children and also praying for them to become accepted and productive members of the society. Kind and friendly approach of parents constantly get associated with functioning outcome of their children and this upbringing will come into existence as a result of secured and sensitive socialization of good parents whose have smooth running of communication and understanding between parents and their younger one (Baumrind, 1991). Demandingness on the other hand, refers to the situation where parents have standard requirements for their adolescents. They want to control every aspect of their children live, while, rule and limit are established by parents in order to influence the behaviours of their children.

One of the important type of parenting style is authoritative which is characterizes by warm, enthusiastic and high level of responsiveness and demandingness. This type of parenting style is assumed to gives the desired and helpful outcomes to the children lives. Authoritative parenting is very cheerful and committed for the right development of their children to abide by the norms and values of society, they are not angered by their children’s mistakes rather they want their children to know the problem behind their mistake and rectify such mistakes with the encouragement of their parents (Baumrind, 1971).
Moreover, authoritarian parenting style is characterized by high demandingness and low responsiveness in rearing their children, the behaviours of such type of parents display strict command and control to their children. They have high disciplinary approach and expect absolute loyalty without enquiry. Such kind of characteristic of parents can immensely affect outcomes of children to engage in deviance and other social vices. This sort of parents are not inculcating the knowledge of warm or receptiveness to their adolescents, rather they have high level of maturity demand from their adolescents in the first place because of their selfishness and intolerant behaviours. Such kind of socialization will definitely lead the children to engage in antisocial behaviours which eventually lead to unfavourable outcomes.

Furthermore, the other type of parents was permissive parenting styles which characterised by high in responsiveness and low in term of demandingness. This type of parents are responsive and warm to their children, but unfortunately they fail on the site of demandingness toward their children’s needs that qualify them to become conformed members of the society. This type of parents are very lenient and would not insist or restrict on their children affairs, they perceived that restriction or disciplines might lead their children not exploring the world and developing scientific creativities. Such kind of upbringing of parents may not pay attention on the site of demand of their children (Baumrind, 1971). And if care is not taken because of these demands and undercontrol, the children would deviate from the standard norms of the society to engage in delinquents and antisocial behaviours.

It is concluded that, different parenting styles would socialise and influence adolescents’ behaviours differently in Baumrind’s postulation. The much more important style of parenting is authoritative which lead to produce conformed, law abiding members of the society. As per as this theory is concerned, it would guide this study in examining the genesis of law abiding and antisocial behaviours among adolescents and children.

1.7.3 Theory of Self-Efficacy

The theory of self-efficacy was proposed by Albert Bandura (1994). Self-efficacy is in the right position to explain the idea of individual possessing a self-regulation, self-monitoring and self-system that give them access to have control over their feelings, actions and thoughts (Bandura, 1986) these self-regulation and self-system provide individual’s sense of believed and strength to influence human behaviours in attaining a particular mission. This theory maintained that, the intellectual process of individual are more important to determine human behaviours, the mental activities or intellectual processes such as perception and memory will help in judgement, problem solving and decision making (Bandura, 1993). Self-efficacy is one of the most important aspect of social cognitive that deals with thought, resistance, and perception and believes that produce required and desirable outcomes. Moreover, because of the vested beliefs, it encourage individuals to comply with the laws and orders of the society (Bandura, 1977; Miller and Dollard, 1941; Bandura, 1986).
This approach is also advocates that self-efficacy is a belief in which individual perceived himself or herself in his or her ability to act in a ways necessary to acquire a particular goals (Bandura, 1991). In the majority of the people with high self-efficacy is expected to succeed in every aspects of live and become the functioning and law abiding members of the society; those with low self-efficacy very rare to succeed in live because of lack of confidence and low self-regulation which eventually lead them to engage in antisocial and other social vices. Self-efficacy of individual is concerned with the level of his or her beliefs in pursuing a particular task. People with high self-efficacy can manage situational challenges to produce accepted outcome while those with low self-efficacy do not (Bandura, 1977).

Moreover, Self-efficacy beliefs can influence people level of motivation, life adaptation, strength of functioning and resilience to endure and resist to manage stress and anxiety (Bandura, 1994). People with high self-efficacy beliefs are developed by four different sources of influence such as mastery experience, seeing individual to manage situational adversities to produce successful outcome. Social persuasion, that people has the endurance and capabilities to succeed in a most given activities. Inferences from somatic and emotional state of symptomatic of self-strengths (Bandura, 1994). People with high self-efficacy has the capability and perseverance effort to manage frustration, adversities and challenges of live in order to robust to produce functioning outcome (Bandura,1991). It is also noted that, there are some factors that are responsible to influence of human behaviours which are environmental, behavioural and personal factors can influence one to develop sense of personal self-efficacy (Crothers, Hughes and Morine, 2011).

The environmental factor refers to the situation where by social environment will influence the behaviours of individual to get involved in certain behaviours because of the interaction within the society (Parraga, 1990). While, personal and behavioural factors try to explain the socialization of individual behaviours based on influence and observation that led to developed level of efficacy. Similarly, Crothers et al., (2011) explained that, environmental factors can affect a person behaviours, he maintained that, there are two types of environment that is social and physical environment. Social environment which consists of family members, peer groups and colleagues are in good position to influence the self-efficacy of individuals more especially the family members that have direct contact with their adolescents and influence level of self-efficacy either high or low depending on the nature of parents. While, the physical environment where one interact with other individual will increase or reduce the level of self-efficacy. The environment and situations provide the framework for influencing level of self-efficacy. Ormod (2006) asserted that, people learn from others based on observations and perception, adolescents learn the behaviours of their families based on observation and adopt the behaviours to determine their outcomes either favourable or unfavourable all depend on the nature of rearing of their parents.

Therefore, self-efficacy theory could guide this study since individual beliefs determine their outcome behaviours. When individual intends and believes that he or she can engage in a particular task, they can definitely lead to a certain outcome either positively or negatively depending on the level of the self-efficacy.
1.7.4 Social Bonding Theory

Social bonding theory was developed by Hirschi (1969). The emphasis of this theory is that, antisocial and externalizing behaviours are learned behaviours as a result of interaction with parents. Moreover, Glueck (1950) maintained that, lack of proper care attachment and affection by the parents to their children and adolescents were some of the major aspect that lead to antisocial behaviours. Though Hirschi (1969) was one of the first that explained and discovered this theory on how parental rearing contributes to antisocial behaviours among adolescent. Hirschi’s emphasised that, antisocial and delinquent behaviours of children and adolescents in every society came into existence as a result of lack of positive attachment to parents in early development during childhood and adulthood. Affirmative nurturing of parents to their children such as proper care and supervision, monitoring and understanding will make such children to abide by the norms and values of the society and eventually become productive members of the society. Hirschi went further and stated that, all these forms of juvenile delinquency and antisocial behaviours of children were rooted from the parents as a result of lack of proper care and socialization primarily from the family.

Hirschi (1969) explained that, the significant of formulating the social bonding theory is the attachment of children to their care-giving parents, and that was considered a more paramount and number one key of socialization in life. However, many parents paid a little attention to the child’s attachment which eventually lead to antisocial and other deviant behaviours (Gottfredson and Hirschi, 1990). It is generally agreed that, lack of control of parents over their children render the children to deviate from the norms and standard rules of the society. Gottfredson and Hirsch (1990) also maintained that, parents are the genesis of the deviation and any social vices of their children; this is because parents are the root causes of everything regarding their children behaviours. The negative socialization of parents and lack of good parental rearing would make children to have low self-efficacy, external locus of control and low resilience which can easily drive them to engage in poor school performance, violence, anxiety and many more antisocial and delinquent behaviours. Low self-efficacy, low self-regulation and low self-monitor due to poor parental orientation trigger adolescents to engage in big criminal activities in near future (Hirschi, 1969).

According to Hirschi, all children and adolescents are innocent in the first place, unfortunately they gradually learn and become antisocial as a result of lack of proper care and nurturing by the parents and these learned behaviours make them to behave in such ways. He went further and stated that antisocial behaviours of children are product of lack of proper care and socialization as well as negative parental attachment by their care-givers, these negative parental socialization is characterize by less warmth, lack of mutual communication and understanding, lack of proper care and supervision are few to mention that contribute immensely to the negative outcomes of children. This theory asserted that, parents should be nurturing, effective and sensitive in giving care to their children so that will rise their self-efficacy in order to adopt the norms and expected rules which eventually lead to produce functioning members of the society.
Social bonding theory seemed to be in harmony with the primary socialization theory discovered by (Oetting and Deffenbacher 1998). This theory was similar to social bonding theory of Hirschi by the notion that, normative deviant behaviours including antisocial and delinquent behaviours are learned social behaviours as a result of interaction with the primary socialization sources, specifically the family. Primary socialization theory maintained that, every culture or society in any given period of time established specific primary sources of socialization. In every society, culture and at any point in time, the sources of socialization of children is the same that is the family. This is for the fact that family is the entry point and gatekeeper of children sources of behaviours; these behaviours may be favourable or unfavourable was depending on the nature of parents (Oetting and Beavis, 1987). Furthermore, Oetting (1998) maintained that, secondary socialization sources like mass media, school, peer groups and working places are important in influencing adolescents’ behaviours to become conformed or deviants but their effects are strongly accompanied by the influence of primary sources which is the family.

This primary sources of socialization gradually develop but each level of development must be and will be appropriate and effective to primary socialization sources that provide the opportunities of bonding and that serve as a sources for transmission of societal cultural skills and norms (Oetting and Donnermeyer, 1998). Similarly Oetting (1998), maintained that, one of the most paramount sources of socialization of children is family, but gradually when children attained some stages they will proceed to secondary agents of socialization like peer groups, schools, mass media and working places which serve as sources of socializing the children either to a positive or negative outcome. But the most important agent of teaching children behaviours is the family in particular. Therefore, family is the gatekeeper and entry point of acquiring behaviours in adolescents. Many family tried their all possible best to socializing their children to the right faith and prevent them from going into wrongly-motivated direction. While, some of the families are exempted to the norms and standard rules of the society, they harass and beat their children, they encourage to engage in deviance, fight frequently and even teach their adolescents how to violate the rules and regulation of the society (Oetting and Donnermeyer, 1998).

This theory is of utmost importance to guide this study since children and adolescents’ behaviours would be influenced and determined by their own parents.
1.8 Conceptual Framework

The main importance of conceptual framework is to explain the relationship of the variables of the study as shown in figure 1.2 in the next page. The conceptual framework of this research was derived from the aforementioned theories. The conceptual framework shows the relationship between independent variable of paternal parenting styles, mediating variable of self-efficacy and the prediction or outcome variable of antisocial behaviours among adolescents. And it also shows the relationship between antecedent variable of demographic background of respondents and outcome variable of antisocial behaviours among adolescents.
Figure 1.2: Conceptual framework for the study

Parenting styles theory emphasized on the vital roles of self-efficacy development of their adolescent in order to yield a positive beliefs, adaptation and resistance to become productive members of society. Even though, the adolescents who socialized by family with different paternal parenting styles should be differs in the level of self-efficacy. This is due the fact that different rearing of adolescents would produce different types of behaviours depending on the nature of parents (Baumrind, 1967). Adolescents should develop favourable behaviours that can confidently face the challenges of live to produce required outcome when their parents socialise them to abide by the norms and standard rules of society. The mutual understanding between parents and adolescents in paternal authoritative parenting style was prevented children to engage in antisocial behaviours because of required upbringing which would increase the level of self-efficacy and beliefs to adolescents to face the challenges of live in order to yield a desirable outcome (Punamaki, Qouter and El-sarra, 2007).

In contrast, adolescents with authoritarian and permissive parents have low self-efficacy which can easily render to risk factors which eventually lead to antisocial behaviours, and this antisocial was either internalizing or externalizing behaviours that manifest in the characteristic of adolescents. However, all these harmful behaviours of children was came in to existence as a result of undesirable upbringing of parents (Baumrind, 1971).

1.9 Conceptual and Operational Definitions

In providing the framework of the study, various conceptual and operational definition are needed to address so that it exposed the reader to understand the study.
(1) Paternal Parenting styles:

**Conceptual definition**
Paternal Parenting styles can be defined as a process where fathers raise their children and adolescents differently with the hope of producing different behavioural outcome (Slicker, Patton and Fuller, 2004)

**Operational definition**
Paternal Parenting styles refers to the respondents scores on the three (3) subscales of the parental authority questionnaire which developed by Buri, (1991). High scores of any subscale lead to the high in authoritarian, permissive and authoritative parenting styles.

(2) Self-efficacy

**Conceptual definition**
Self-efficacy is simply refers to the individuals beliefs about his or her abilities to perform or engage in particular behaviour in order to produce functioning outcome (Bandura, 1994).

**Operational definition**
Self-efficacy is refers to the respondents scores on the general self-efficacy questionnaire developed by Schwarzer (2003). High scores is indicated high self-efficacy.

(3) Adolescents

**Conceptual definition**
Adolescents according to Oxford Advanced learner’s Dictionary (2004) defined an adolescents as a person who is in the stage of transitional development from childhood in to an adulthood. Adolescents is a young person between the ages of 13 to 18 years.

**Operational definition**
Adolescents in this research are young men and females between the 15 to 18 years of ages.

(4) Antisocial behaviours

**Conceptual definition**
Antisocial behaviours also known as conduct disorder or personality disorder refers to the delinquency or crime which committed by young person under the age of eighteen years and below usually characterized by violation of law and order, rules and regulation and deviation from existing social norms and values (Ikediashi and Akande,2015).
Operational definition
Antisocial behaviours is refers to the behaviours of children and adolescents that are not abide by the norms and values of society. These types of behaviors are delinquent behaviours, aggressive behaviours, violence behaviours, substance abuse and bullying. In this study antisocial behaviours of respondent’s intended to scores on youth self-report of externalizing behaviours construct and was developed by Achenbach (1991).

1.10 Limitations

There are some scopes and limitations of this present study. One of the limitation of the study is that, the research was conducted on the paternal parenting styles. The second scope of this study was limited to the schools adolescents between the age ranges of 15 to 18 years old who are living with their biological fathers. The third limitation of the study is that, the research was carried out on the students of Government Secondary School Geidam and Government Science and Technical College Geidam, Yobe State, Nigeria. This is because the finding of the study cannot be generalized to all secondary schools children in Nigeria. Furthermore, the other limitation of the present study was not used confounding variables. This is due to the fact that, the study is the correlational research where by cannot control by the confounding variables. For example, several factors may be confounding variables of this study like peer group, mass media, school, maternal parenting styles etc. can influence children and adolescents to become conforms or deviate to the norms and values of society depending on the nature of self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents.

Thus, all these was being obstructed to be a part of this present study. Finally, the present study was demarcated its boundary of study to perceived paternal parenting styles, self-efficacy, and antisocial behaviours among adolescents of Geidam metropolis, Yobe state North-Eastern Nigeria. In fact, the factors responsible for the causes of antisocial behaviours among children and adolescents are very many but this present study was limited to only paternal parenting styles and low self-efficacy. Further future study should make their consideration on other factors that may likely lead to or prevent from antisocial behaviours of children and adolescents such as maternal parenting styles, school, peer group and mass media etc.

1.11 Summary

The present chapter explained and describes the introductory part of the study, statement of the research problems, research questions and objectives of the study. Hence, it is followed by hypotheses of the research, significance of the study as well as the theoretical explanation and conceptual framework of the research. Furthermore, the chapter briefly defined conceptual and operational key terms of the study and lastly stated the limitations of the study. The subsequent chapter of this study reviews the related literatures to this study.
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