



Research Paper

Parenting Styles and Self-efficacy as Predictors of Antisocial Behaviours among Adolescents of Geidam Metropolis, Yobe State, North-Eastern Nigeria.

¹Shettima Alhaji Umar; ²Ali Kole; ³Mohammed Lawan Bashayi; ⁴Abdulkarim A. Isa & ⁵Babagana Talba Monguno

¹²³⁴⁵Mai Idris Aloomo Polytechnic Geidam, Yobe state.

Corresponding author: Ali kole Email: kolegursulu@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Antisocial behaviour of adolescence has always been one of the basic problems in many cultures. In spite of the fact that huge amount of budget has been spend by government on correctional institutions to ensure that this issue should be inconsequential, yet the case of antisocial behaviours is still thriving. Besides, the research on the factors contributing to antisocial behaviours has received a negligible consideration, particularly in Nigeria. Hence, this study is imperative which intend to determine the predicting factors to antisocial behaviours among adolescents. The study was conducted in Geidam Town, area of Yobe State, Nigeria. The study was cross-sectional, employed quantitative approach and using survey and correlational research design. The respondents of the study comprise of 339 students (male and female, aged 15 to 18 years old) from two secondary schools. The selection of respondents was used by stratified sampling and simple random sampling techniques. The instruments for data gathering comprise of Parental Authority Questionnaire, General Self-Efficacy Scale and Youth Self Repot. Meanwhile, this study used inferential statistical analyses (t-test, ANOVA and Multiple Linear Regression). The result revealed that, all factors contributed significantly in the explanation of antisocial behaviour with self-efficacy as the main contributor.

KEYWORDS: Paternal Authoritative, Authoritarian, Permissive Parenting Styles, Self-efficacy, Antisocial Behaviours and Adolescents.

Received 10 Dec, 2021; Revised 23 Dec, 2021; Accepted 25 Dec, 2021 © The author(s) 2021.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

Adolescents are those individuals between the age of 10 and 19 brackets who are vulnerable and susceptible to societal and environmental influence. Adolescents faced many changes in their transition 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, criminology, 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 and upbringing (Gottfredson and Hirsch, 1990). Similarly, Patterson (1984) maintained that, 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 are 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 contribute their quotas to the development of the society (Parsa, Yaacob, Redzuan, and Esmaeili, 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 widely believed 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 and Somayeh, 2012). Gana (2014) found that in Geidam metropolis area of Yobe State, North-Eastern part of part of the country, antisocial behaviours exhibited by the adolescents become breeding ground. Nowadays it has become a clear indication that many of the public gathering be it on political, religious, cultural or in any types of communal gathering, antisocial adolescents use this avenue to harm and molest one others. And all these issues came into existence as a result of poor parental monitoring and supervision, poor socioeconomic status of their parents, lack of education of parents and lack of efficient smooth running of communication and understanding between the parents and their children (Ekpo and Ajake 2013; Batool 2013; Razali, Dokuoushkani and Rajendran, 2013).

The main objective of this research was to find out how the paternal parenting styles and Self-Efficacy can influence the behaviours of adolescents to deviate or conform to the norms and values of the society. Specifically, the study seeks to identify the parenting styles that contribute to antisocial behaviours among adolescents. The first parts of this study focused on introduction followed by review of theoretical and empirical literature. The later parts of the study dwelled on methodology, results and discussions, summary and conclusion.

II. THEORETICAL AND EMPIRICAL LITERATURE

From the theoretical perspective, the Theory of social bonding and primary socialization frankly maintained that, no adolescents born criminal or deviants but only the process of socialization and attachment from their primary caregiver were socialised them in such a way (Hirschi, 1969; Oetting and Donnermeyer, 1998). In every human society, parents play a vital role to influence the behaviours of their children to abide by the standard norms and values or to deviate from the rules and regulation are all reliant on the types of parents that he/she groomed to. This is because family is the primary agent of socialization and gatekeeper of children learned behaviours in which has a wider implication to the children behaviours (Oetting and Beavis, 1987).

Parenting styles is the one of the complex determinant tools that can influence children and adolescent to conform or deviate from the socially, morally and legally accepted behaviours of a particular society. According to Baumrind (1967) parenting styles is defined as a normal disparity in parents' rearing toward the socialization of their children and adolescents which lead to yield diverse type of behaviours. Baumrind (as cited in Hart, Newell, & Olsen, 2003) developed extensive theoretical model of in explaining parenting styles. She distinguished three different types of parenting styles based on two parental scopes that is parental responsiveness which is more allied to parental warm and involvement in the nurturing of their children, while parental demandingness which related to active role that parents play in encouraging respect for rules of law and social conventions. On the basis of these two dimensions Baumrind (1967) enumerated three basic types of parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles. Authoritative parents tend to display both high demandingness and responsiveness in the socialization of their children and adolescents. Authoritative parents are highly warmth, responsive and set very reasonable demands on their children which lead to produce law abiding children for the smooth running of the affairs of the society.

Authoritarian parents have high demandingness with lower levels of responsiveness in the process of socialization. This parenting style allows for strong parental command control and strict over their children and adolescents, such kind of parents gives less freedom of speech to their children in the decision making

(Baumrind, 1991). In addition to high control and demand, authoritarian parents show little kind, involvement, warmth, support, or emotional commitment to their children and adolescents. While, it was demonstrated that these type of parents used harsh and corporal punishment in the process of socialization, and it was proved to be as extreme undesirable form of parenting that produce internalizing, externalizing and other related form of antisocial behaviours (Baumrind and Black, 1967). The third type of parenting styles as postulated by Baumrind was permissive parenting style which have inverse views with authoritarian parents in socializing their children. This kind of parents has high levels of responsiveness and low levels of demandingness toward the rearing of their children and adolescents. This is because warmth was exhibited through overindulgence, permissive parents are deficient in monitoring and supervision the affairs of their children, though they are warmth and responsive but unfortunately has low control in which it is expected to lead the children to obstructs them to abide by the norms and values of the society (Baumrind and Black, 1967). In nut shell, authoritative parenting styles are the type of parents that socialise and nurture children and adolescents to tolerate the standard rules and regulation, norms and values to yield positive and productive outcome. While, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles are considered to be the types of parents that characterised by over control and under control, excessive and deficient monitoring and supervision, lenient and over indulgent in the affairs of their children and adolescents which can easily prevail to internalizing and externalizing behavioural problems (Dwairy, Achoui, Farah, and Fayad, 2006).

A substantial body of studies has scrutinised parental influenced on adolescents and children behavioural development. Precisely, distinctions in parenting styles toward child rearing have been linked to a wide range of adolescent's outcome behaviours. While, this behaviours it will be conforming or deviate to the law and order of the society it is seem to be rooted from the parents (Baumrind, 1991; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, and Dornbusch, 1994; Rodriguez, 2010; Alizadeh, Talib, Abdullah and Mansor 2011). Furthermore, there is many variables that influence the behaviours of children such as mass media, school, peer group and working place but Parenting styles which is known as family socialization have been identified as a major predictor and determinant of children and adolescent's behaviours. This is because parents are the gate keeper and entry point of children socialization and its decision has a serious implication to the other agents of socialization. Antisocial behaviours was critically emphasized in parenting context and it was assumed that children and adolescents behaviours were influenced by parents (Baumrind, 1971; Darling and Steinberg, 1993). Earlier research was discovered that parenting styles is a predictor and has significant relationship with children and adolescents antisocial behaviours (Baumrind, 1989). Numerous literatures from diverse parts of the world have revealed that all these forms of aggressive behaviours, personality disorder, internalizing and externalizing behaviours and other related antisocial behaviours it come into existence as a result of parenting styles (Erickson, Sroufe, and Egeland, 1985; McKee, Colletti, Rakow, Jones and Forehand, 2008; Hoeve, Dubas, Gerris, van der Laan and Smeenk, 2011; Yudanagara, 2014). Based on the literatures reviewed above, researcher want to scrutinise how different parenting styles and Self-efficacy can influence adolescent's behaviours in the study area.

Adolescence is considered to be facing many challenges and vicissitudes in the transitional movement from childhood to adulthood that are related to adolescents' perceptions of themselves and their parental life (White and Renk, 2012). An overview of adolescence discloses that during this stage of development, young people are "in an active, purposeful 'flight' away from attachment relationships with parents" (Allen and Land, 1999, p. 319). If parental supervision, nurturing and control is not socialised sensitively it results in increased of antisocial behaviours among adolescents which eventually lead to breaking of rules and regulations of the society (Allen and Land, 1999). Developmental psychologists and other related field of studies have examined antisocial behaviour from many perspectives, including the schools, mass media, working place, peer group and socio economic status of their parents (Gaik, Abdullah, Elias and Uli, 2010; Razali, Dokuouhskani and Rajendran, 2013; Batool Syeda Shahida, 2013). According to Wachikwu and Ibegbunam (2012) delinquency, Rebellious behaviour, aggressive behaviours, violence behaviours, deviance behaviours, mental disorder, personality disorder or conduct disorder are terms tantamount with antisocial behaviours which defined as crimes violated by children and adolescents under the age of eighteen years commonly characterized by violation of existing standard social norms and values. It was also Mayer (2001) defined antisocial behaviours as a frequent violation of socially accepted rules and regulation of the society usually involving violence, destruction of public and private property, aggression, vandalism, rules transgressions, defiance of authority and violation of social norms and other accepted rules of society. Such kind of negative behaviours displayed by adolescents are presently immensely affecting the area of this study.

Antisocial behaviours of children and adolescents are commonly divided into two groups these are: externalizing or disruptive behaviours which characterised by aggressive behaviours, violence behaviours, attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder, substance abuse, conduct problems etc. while, internalizing or emotional behaviours which is also characterised with anxiety, worry, hopelessness and depression (Achenbach, 1991). Internalizing problems are intrapersonal in nature and appear in the form of withdrawal, depression, anxiety, and fearfulness (Achenbach, 1992; Campbell, 1995). Many studies maintained that, internalizing behavioural

problems are often affect individuals themselves more than the others members of society (Caspi, Moffitt, Newman, and Silva, 1996; Biederman et al., 2001). Moreover, externalizing behaviours refers to others group of behaviours such as vandalism, aggression, disruption, delinquency, law breaking, deviance, crime and hyperactivity (Liu, 2004). These type of behaviours is not disturbing the antisocial children only but also harm the entire society at large (Campbell, Shaw, and Gilliom, 2000). As per as this is concern this research will give more emphasise to externalising behaviours of adolescents which is expected to influence by parenting styles via Self-Efficacy.

It is very common to see youths molest, vanquish, depress and harass one another for their senseless mission (Nwanneka, Joseph and Akande, 2015). Currently, the antagonists and aggressive adolescents in the Niger Delta which is in the southern part of the country and Boko Haram sect which known as western education and ideology is taboo are on-going with their destructions and killing of innocents lives in the Northern part of the country, precisely the situation was became worst from the North Eastern region which are the extreme zone of this study (Okoli and Iortyer, 2014). The meaningless killing going on in that region one may assumed whether the sect was intended to kill the entire members of Nigerians specifically the Northerners. All these wicked and senseless behaviours which are opposing to the standard social norms and rules and regulation of the society are majorly committed by the children and adolescents associated with antisocial behaviour as a result of low Self-Efficacy and negative parenting socialization (Nwanneka, et al 2015).

III. METHODOLOGY

The population of this research is 1556 adolescents of 2 Secondary schools of Geidam local government area of Yobe state. Likewise, simple random sampling was employed from the probability sampling type in the choosing of the respondents. Moreover, Cochran (1977) formula were utilised in selection of respondents out of the whole population mentioned of this study from two schools. Hence, the researcher was used simple random sampling, because it is expected to give equal chance to whole population who fulfilled the inclusive criteria. The inclusive criteria of this study are male and female adolescent's age between fifteen to eighteen years who living with his or her father. Self-administered questionnaires were offered to the respondents in collecting the data. However, we were briefly enlightening the main objective of the study and convinced them that the privacy of the respondents cannot be disclosed. Furthermore, the collected data of this study was analysed and processes by the Statistical Package for Social Science IBM-SPSS version 22.

Paternal parenting styles was measured using parental authority questionnaire (PAQ: Buri 1991). This tool is very reliable in measurement and it contained 30 items and this items was divided into 3 subscales and each of the subscales consisted 10 items, the subscales are authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parental authority questionnaires. These subscales were assessed the parenting styles as a predictor of adolescent's antisocial behaviours. Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) is rated by five likert scale ranging from 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= neither agree nor disagree, 4= agree and 5= strongly agree. While, the dependent variable was measured on self-youth report questionnaire by Achenbach (1991) which employed to assess the adolescent's antisocial behaviours toward their interactions with parents. This tool contained of 3 likert scale and has 30 items ranging from 1= untrue, 2= somewhat true and 3= very true or often true.

In line with the objectives of this study, the factors proposed to contribute to adolescent's antisocial behaviours are paternal parenting style (authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles) and self-efficacy. For this purpose, the Regression Model consists of four predicting variables namely; paternal authoritative parenting style (X_1), paternal authoritarian parenting style (X_2), paternal permissive parenting style (X_3) and self-efficacy (X_4). The prediction equation is given by:

$$\hat{Y} = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + e_i \dots\dots\dots (1)$$

Where:

\hat{Y} = antisocial behaviours;

χ_1 = authoritative parenting style;

χ_2 = authoritarian parenting style;

χ_3 = permissive parenting style;

χ_4 = self-efficacy;

ϵ = Random error.

The proposed hypotheses test, which examines the validity of the model, is expressed as follows:

H_0 : $Y = \beta_0 + e_i$

H_A : $Y = b_0 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_4 + e_i$

IV. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The summary of the Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) shown in table 1 illustrates the Multiple Regression model of antisocial behaviours. The results of the Multiple Regression analysis as a whole (authoritative parenting style, authoritarian parenting style, permissive parenting style and self-efficacy) is significant [F (4, 334) = 155.272, $p = .000$]. This indicated that the slope of the estimated Multiple Linear Regression Model line is not equal to zero. Therefore, H_A is accepted. Based on the analysis of the antisocial behaviours model therefore, the mathematical derivative of the regression equation for the antisocial behaviours model is given by:

$$\hat{Y} = 0.154 + (-0.115) X_1 + (0.157) X_2 + (0.185) X_3 + (-0.415) X_4 + \text{Error}$$

Moreover, the result shows that, about 65% ($R^2 = .65$) of variance in antisocial behaviours was explained by all the predictor variables entered into the regression model.

Table 1: Multiple Linear Regression on Antisocial Behaviours

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics			
	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	T	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF	
(Constant)	.154	.105		1.473	.142			
Authoritative Paternal Parenting Style	-.115	.044	-.132	-2.623	.009	.414	2.414	
Authoritarian Paternal Parenting Style	.157	.048	.170	3.253	.001	.383	2.608	
Permissive Paternal Parenting Style	.185	.053	.201	3.510	.001	.320	3.129	
Self-Efficacy	-.415	.039	-.441	-10.633	.000	.608	1.645	

Note: $R^2 = .650$; adjusted $R^2 = .646$; [F (4, 334) = 155.272, $p = .000$]

a. Dependent Variable: Antisocial Behaviours

H_{A1} : Authoritative paternal parenting style significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

The regression analysis reveals that paternal authoritative parenting style is a significant predictor of antisocial behaviours. The result as presented in the Table indicate that, there is significant relationship between paternal authoritative parenting style and antisocial behaviours ($\beta = -.132$, $t = -2.623$, $p < .05$). Therefore, the proposed hypothesis (H_{A1}) which says that paternal authoritative parenting style significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours is accepted. The result of this study is consistent with Rani (2014) who attributed that authoritative parenting styles which have interaction with their children to set a reasonable standard and promote sufficient warm and supervision on the affairs of children have a negative influence with children antisocial behaviours. Similarly, Doinita and Mariab (2015) found that adequate and reasonable children attachment to their biological authoritative parents has a negative contributed to internalizing and externalizing behaviours of children. Moreover, Alizadeh et al., (2011) revealed that authoritative parenting styles which have all the necessary and importance attribute in socializing their young one to abide by the standard rules of society found to be negative significant prediction with internalizing and externalizing behaviours of children. Furthermore, in support of present result Akhter, et al., (2011) and Yudanagara (2014) revealed that authoritative parenting styles have a significant negative contributing factor with children internalizing, externalizing and other related antisocial behaviours. This simply showed that authoritative parents that have all the necessary attribute to socialise children and adolescents to abide by the norms and values of the society which eventually yield desirable outcome as a result of positive socialization by the primary care. Additionally, Moitra et al., (2010) in line with the result of this study in their research of relationship between the fathers and mothers parenting behaviours and the development of adolescent's delinquent's behaviours found that both fathers and mothers authoritative parenting style has a significant negative influence with adolescent's delinquents and antisocial behaviours. Whereas, neglectful and permissive parenting style of fathers and mothers have a strong positive significant contributing with adolescent's delinquents and other related antisocial behaviours. Moreover, Hoeve et al., (2011) attributed a similar finding with the present result which found that socialization of authoritative parents has significant influence with aggression, violence, delinquents and other antisocial behaviours of children and adolescents under the age of 14 to 22 years old.

Findings of other studies are also in consistent the findings of the current study, where authoritative parenting style which give and take verbal communication, mutual understanding and highly warm and responsive in nurturing their children has a vital role to play in socializing children to become law abiding citizen so that they can manage to yield required outcome. In support of this result, Yudanagara et al., (2014)

revealed that children and adolescents who socialized by authoritative parents are less to be found in violence and aggressive behaviours compared counterpart's children that socialized and growth up in neglectful and permissive parents. Similarly, McKee, Colletti, Rakow, Jones and Forehand (2008) found that authoritative parenting styles which characterized by efficient and sensitive supervision and monitoring the affairs of their children have significant negative prediction with children and adolescents' aggression, violence, internalizing and externalizing behaviours problems. From the empirical evidence of above literatures, it is clearly showed that authoritative parenting styles have inverse relationship and it is a predictor of children and adolescents antisocial and other related internalizing and externalizing behaviours.

H_{A2}: Authoritarian paternal parenting style contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

Similarly, the regression model indicated that authoritarian paternal parenting style is a significant predictor of antisocial behaviours. The result presented in the Table indicates that, there is a significant relationship between authoritarian paternal parenting style and antisocial behaviours ($\beta = .170$, $t = 3.253$, $p < .05$), therefore, *H_{A2}* is accepted. This also means that authoritarian paternal parenting style significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours. The result of this study is supported by the study of Rodriguezh (2010) which indicated that paternal parenting styles of authoritarian that associated with maltreatment, corporal and physical punishment and overreaction is the main tool for predicting children abuse, aggression and other internalizing and externalizing behaviours of children and adolescents.

Meanwhile, Rani (2014) advocated that authoritarian parents that characterized by poor children attachment, over controlling and supervision to their children and adolescents is a major contributor to antisocial behaviours and have positive relationship with internalizing and externalizing behaviours. Moreover, Akhter et al., (2011) maintained that authoritarian parenting styles which known to have strike command, over control, harsh and corporal punishment have significantly contributing to adolescent's aggression, violence, conduct disorder and internalizing and externalizing behaviours. Similarly, Alizadeh et al., (2011) attributed that authoritarian parenting styles which have high demanding and inadequate responsiveness in the positive and required affairs of their children have a positive significant influence with children internalizing and externalizing behaviours. These types of parents were contributing personality disorder, conduct disorder, depression, violence, substance abuse, prostitution and drugs abuse are only few to mention as internalizing and externalizing behavioural problems that affect the children as a result of negative parental socialization which obstruct the children to yield functional and productive outcome.

In addition, Moitra and Mukherjee (2010) indicated that children at the age from 11 to 18 were socialized by neglectful and authoritarian parenting styles found to be highly contributing and have positive significant relationship with delinquents, internalizing and externalizing behaviours. Moreover, Hoeve et al., (2011) revealed that neglectful parenting style of fathers have a significant positive relationship and contributing to antisocial and delinquent behaviours of male's adolescents who are under the age of 14 to 22 years. In support of existence similar finding of this study Yudanagara et al., (2014) attributed that children and adolescent's violence and antisocial behaviours have contributed by authoritarian parenting styles and have positive relationship with children antisocial behaviours. Where by the children are not conform to the rules and regulation of the society simply because they are not socialized to obeyed to the societal norms.

Furthermore, Gómez-Ortiz et al., (2016) indicated that negative socialization of neglectful and authoritarian parenting style which considered to be abusive disciplinary practice, psychological aggression, psychological punishment and depression have significant positive influence on children and adolescents bullying, internalizing and externalizing behaviours. Moreover, Batool et al., (2013) found that neglectful parenting style which characterized by psychological depression and anxiety, physical and corporal punishment and over controlling have a high positive significant influence with children and adolescent's aggression and delinquent's behaviours. Similarly, Mckee et al., (2008) advocated that authoritarian parenting style that known to be have over controlling, maltreatment, corporal and physical punishment have a strong significant positive contributing to children and adolescents internalizing and externalizing behaviours.

H_{A3}: Permissive paternal parenting style contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

The result of the regression model as illustrated in the Table supports the hypothesis that there is a significant contribution of permissive parenting style towards antisocial behaviours. The standardized regression coefficient indicated that permissive parenting style is a significant predictor of antisocial behaviours ($\beta = .201$, $t = 3.510$, $p < .05$). Thus, *H_{A3}* is accepted. The result of present study is in agreement with the result of the study by Rani (2014) who indicated that permissive parenting style which considered to have too much freedom and under control and insufficient supervision on the day today affairs of their children contributed to the deviance behaviours of their children and adolescents. Alizadeh et al., (2011) attributed that permissive parenting styles which known to have high responsiveness and low demandingness have a significant positive relationship and contributing to adolescents internalizing and externalizing behaviours.

Moreover, Doinita et al., (2015) found that parenting attachment of permissive that characterized by lenient and insufficient monitoring and supervision to their children are the major determinant of internalizing behaviours. Similarly, Akhter et al., (2011) attributed that permissive parenting styles which have low demandingness such as inefficient monitoring and supervision, under controlling and there is no give and take verbal communication and understanding have found to contribute to children and adolescents antisocial and other internalizing and externalizing behaviours. Furthermore, Hoeve et al., (2011) found that permissive parenting styles that have lenient and indulgent characteristic to the issues of their children have positive influence with antisocial and delinquent behaviours, whereas authoritative parenting have inverse relationship with internalizing and externalizing behaviours of children. Moreover, Moitra and Mukherjee (2010) attributed that permissive parenting styles which characterized by inadequate control, insufficient monitoring and supervision with the affairs of their children and adolescents become a significant predictor of internalizing and externalizing behaviours. In actualising present result, many existing literatures are in consistent that indulgent parenting socialization is very rare to yield functional and productive adolescents who can manage to become law abiding citizen in order to contribute his or her part to the smooth running of the society. Furthermore, Yudanagara et al., (2014) indicated that permissive parenting styles have a significant positive influence with violence, aggression and other related antisocial behaviours of children and adolescents who reached the age of 12 to 19 years old. Similarly, in consonance with this result Batool et al., (2013) found that indulgent and permissive parenting styles which are very forbearance and lenient but less to be demanding in the affairs of their young one have strong positive significant contributing to children and adolescent's antisocial behaviours and also inverse relationship with authoritative parenting styles. Meanwhile, Parent, Forehand, Merchant, Edwards, Conners-Burrow, Long and Jones (2011) indicated that permissive and indulgent parenting style which known to have more freedom and deficient monitoring and weak intensive care to affairs of their children is found to be contributing to destructive and other related internalizing and externalizing behaviours. Based on the above mentioned literatures one can realize that permissive parenting styles is the major predictor of children and adolescent's antisocial behaviours

H_{A4}: Self-efficacy significantly contributes to antisocial behaviours among the respondents.

The regression analysis in the Table has shown a significant relationship between self-efficacy and antisocial behaviours. This means, self-efficacy is a significant predictor of antisocial behaviours ($\beta = -.441$, $t = -10.633$, $p < .05$); thus, *H_{A4}* is accepted. The result certainly reveals that, self-efficacy significantly contributed to antisocial behaviours. This finding indicated that, higher antisocial behaviour is associated with lower self-efficacy among the respondents. This result is consistent with result of the study by Bandura, Caprara, Barbaranelli, Gerbino and Pastorelli (2003) who indicated that self-regulatory efficacy is contributing to psychosocial functioning and prosocial behaviours, and it was found that it has influence the delinquent and antisocial behaviours of children and adolescents (in a negative relationship).

Similarly, Lo, Cheng, Wong, Rochelle and Kwok (2011) found that self-efficacy and self-esteem have a significant, but weak influence on deviance and delinquent behaviours such as vandalism, bullying, verbally and physically attacking parents and teachers and other related internalizing and externalizing behaviours. Moreover, Tam et al., (2013) attributed that high self-efficacy of children and adolescents have a strong and high significant contribution towards internalizing and externalizing behaviours; whereas children with low self-efficacy has a significant and high positive influence with antisocial, internalizing and externalizing behaviours. However, these high and low self-efficacies of children and adolescents is depending on the nature of parents where one is being socialized to. Furthermore, in support of the present result Simons et al., (2005) found that collective self-efficacy has a strong negative predictor with children and adolescent's delinquent and deviance behaviours. This simply means collective effort of authoritative parenting styles and other reasonable community members can encourage and boost the self-efficacy of their children in order to diminish the internalizing and externalizing behavioural problem so that they will be more self-efficacious in which they resist to become law abiding member of the society.

Moreover, Capara et al., (1998) indicated that adolescent's self-regulatory efficacy have a significantly influence and relationship (negative correlation) with delinquent and antisocial conduct of adolescents. Meanwhile, the ingredient of this negative relationship between self-regulatory efficacy and children and adolescent's delinquent and antisocial behaviours came into existence as a result of efficient and reasonable familial communication and understanding between parents and their children. In addition to similar finding of this result. Joshia, Sharma and Mehra (2009) attributed that all measures were made on self-efficacy and adolescents depression it was eventually found that there is a strong significant negative correlation between self-efficacy and adolescent's depression. High self-efficacy plays a vital role in preventing children and adolescents to engage in internalizing and externalizing behaviours.

It was also found from the study of Hamil (2003) that adolescents and children self-efficacy and resilience have a significant (negative relationship) contribution to internalizing and externalizing behaviours,

where by self-efficacious can endure and resilience to yield positive and desirable conform behaviours so that the growing of delinquent, antisocial, deviance and crime will be very minimal in society. In consistent with present result Valle, Huebner and Suldo (2006) indicated that hope and self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents are found to have a significant on internalizing, externalizing and other related antisocial behaviours. Moreover, Davis-Kean, Huesmann, Jager, Collins, Bates and Lansford (2008) found that self-efficacy of children and adolescents have strong negative association with aggression and other related internalizing and externalizing behaviours and also have an inverse relationship with prosocial behaviours. Generally, it is indicated that adolescents and children who could resist violence, bullying, depression, aggression, anxiety, predicament situation and psychological trauma are those who have high self-efficacy that could endure to conform behaviours that abide the norms and values as well as the standard rules of society.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This study examined parenting style and self-efficacy as predictors of antisocial behaviour among adolescents of Geidam Metropolis, North-eastern, Nigeria. The main objective of this research was to find out how the paternal parenting styles and Self-Efficacy can influence the behaviours of adolescents to deviate or conform to the norms and values of the society. Specifically, the study seeks to identify the parenting styles that contribute to antisocial behaviours among adolescents. The study was cross-sectional, employed quantitative approach and using survey and correlational research design. The respondents of the study comprise of 339 students (male and female, aged 15 to 18 years old) from two secondary schools in Geidam. Stratified sampling and simple random sampling techniques was used in the selection of the respondents. The instruments for data gathering comprise of Parental Authority Questionnaire, General Self-Efficacy Scale and Youth Self Report. Meanwhile, this study used inferential statistical analyses (t-test, ANOVA and Multiple Linear Regression). Multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine the contributions of independents variables of paternal parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles) and self-efficacy on antisocial behaviours. The result revealed that, all factors contributed significantly in the explanation of antisocial behaviour with self-efficacy as the main contributor.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT.

This research paper was fully funded by the Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TetFund), Nigeria.



REFERENCES

- [1]. Achenbach, T. M. (1991). Manual for the Child Behaviour Checklist/ 4-18 and 1991 Profile
- [2]. Achenbach, T. M. (1992). Manual for the Child Behaviour Checklist/ 2-3 and 1992 Profile. Burlington: Department of Psychiatry, University of Vermont.
- [3]. Akhter, N., Hanif, R., Tariq, N., & Atta, M. (2011). Parenting styles as predictors of externalizing and internalizing behaviour problems among children. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 26(1), 23-41.
- [4]. Alizadeh, S., Talib, M. B. A., Abdullah, R., & Mansor, M. (2011). Relationship between parenting style and children's behaviour problems. *Asian Social Science*, 7(12), 195.
- [5]. Allen, J. P., & Land, D. (1999). Attachment in adolescence. In J. Cassidy & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications* (pp. 319-331). New York: Guilford.
- [6]. Bandura, A., Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Gerbino, M., & Pastorelli, C. (2003). Role of affective self-regulatory efficacy in diverse spheres of psychosocial functioning. *Child development*, 74(3), 769-78.
- [7]. Batool, S. S. (2013). Lack of adequate parenting: A potential risk factor for aggression among adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28(2), 217.
- [8]. Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices antecedent three patterns of preschool behaviour. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75, 43-83.
- [9]. Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4, 1-103.
- [10]. Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- [11]. Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance abuse: *Journal of Early Adolescents*, 11, 56-95.
- [12]. Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967). Socialization practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38(2), 291-327.
- [13]. Biederman, J., Faraone, S. V., Monuteaux, M., Spencer, T., Bober, M., & Cadogan, E. (2001). Gender effects of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder in adults, revisited. *Biological Psychiatry*, 55, 692-700.
- [14]. Buri J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of personality Assessment*, 57(1), 110-119. Burlington: Department of Psychiatry, University of Vermont.
- [15]. Campbell, S. B. (1995). Behaviour problems in preschool children: A review of recent research. *Journal of Child Psychology and Allied Disciplines*, 36, 113-149.

- [16]. Campbell, S. B., Shaw, D. S., & Gilliom, M. (2000). Early externalizing behaviour problems: Toddlers and pre-schoolers at risk for later maladjustment. *Developmental Psychopathology*, 12(3), 467-88.
- [17]. Caprara, G. V., Scabini, E., Barbaranelli, C., Pastorelli, C., Regalia, C., & Bandura, A. (1998). Impact of adolescents' perceived self-regulatory efficacy on familial communication and antisocial conduct. *European Psychologist*, 3(2), 125-132.
- [18]. Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Newman, D. L., & Silva, P. A. (1996). Behavioural observations at age 3 years predict adult psychiatric disorders: Longitudinal evidence from a birth cohort. In M. E.
- [19]. Cochran, W.G. (1977). *Sampling techniques* (3rd Ed.). New: John Wiley and sons.
- [20]. Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487-496.
- [21]. Davis-Kean, P. E., Huesmann, L. R., Jager, J., Collins, W. A., Bates, J. E., & Lansford, J. E. (2008). Changes in the Relation of Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Behaviours across Development. *Child Development*, 79(5), 1257-1269.
- [22]. Doinita, N.E. & Mariab, N.D. (2015). Attachment and Parenting Styles. *International Conference Education and Psychology Challenges-Teachers for the Knowledge Society-3rd Edition*, Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences 203, 199-204 Available online at www.sciencedirect.com
- [23]. Dwairy, M., Achoui, M., Farah, A., & Fayad, M. (2006). Parenting styles in Arab Societies: A first cross regional research study. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 33, 105-123.
- [24]. Ekpo, T. E., & Ajake, U. E. (2013). Family socio-economic status and delinquency among senior secondary school students in calabar south, cross river state, Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 3(4), 83-88.
- [25]. Erickson, M. F., Sroufe, L. A., & Egeland, B. (1985). The relation between quality of attachment and behavior problems in preschool in a high-risk sample. In J. Bretherton & E. Waters (Eds.), *Child Development Monographs* (pp. 147-66). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- [26]. Gaik, L. P., Abdullah, M. C., Elias, H., & Uli, J. (2010). Development of antisocial behaviour. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 7(C), 383-388.
- [27]. Gana. L.M. (2014). The Effects of Adolescent Substance Abuse on the Socio-Economic Development of Yobe State, Nigeria. Department of Public Administration Mai Idris Aloomo Polytechnic, Geidam, Yobe State, Nigeria. *International journal of innovative research and development* ISSN 2278 – 0211.
- [28]. Hamill, S. K. (2003). Resilience and self-efficacy: The importance of efficacy beliefs and coping mechanisms in resilient adolescents. *Colgate University Journal of the Sciences*, 35(1), 115-146.
- [29]. Hart, C. H., Newell, L. D., & Olsen, S. F. (2003). Parenting skills and social communicative competence in childhood. In Greene, John, Burleson, R. & Brant R. (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills: Mahwah* (pp. 753-797). New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- [30]. Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- [31]. Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Gerris, J. R., van der Laan, P. H., & Smeenk, W. (2011). Maternal and paternal parenting styles: Unique and combined links to adolescent and early adult delinquency. *Journal of adolescence*, 34(5), 813-827.
- [32]. Joshia, H.L., Sharma, M. & Mehra, K.R. (2009). Depression among Adolescents: Role of Self Efficacy and Parenting Styles. *SIS J. Proj Psy. & Ment. Health* 16: 13-17.
- [33]. Liu, J. (2004). Childhood externalizing behaviour: theory and implications. *Journal of Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 17(3), 93-103.
- [34]. Lo, T. W., Cheng, C. H., Wong, D. S., Rochelle, T. L., & Kwok, S. I. (2011). Self-esteem, Self-efficacy and Deviant Behaviour of Young People in Hong Kong. *Advances in Applied Sociology*, 1(01), 48.
- [35]. Mayer, G.R. (2001). Antisocial behaviour: its causes and prevention within our schools. Retrieved July 29, 2011, from <http://www.accessmylibrary.com/article-IG-81565933/antisocial-behaviour-its-cause.html>.
- [36]. McKee, L., Colletti, C., Rakow, A., Jones, D. J., & Forehand, R. (2008). Parenting and child externalizing behaviours: Are the associations specific or diffuse? *Aggression and violent behavior*, 13(3), 201-215.
- [37]. Moitra, T., & Mukherjee, I. (2010). Does parenting behaviour impacts delinquency? A comparative study of delinquents and non-delinquents. *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences*, 5(2), 274-285
- [38]. Nwanneka N. Ikediashi, Joseph A. & Akande, (2015). Antisocial behaviours among Nigerian adolescents. Department Of Primary Education Studies Alvan Ikoku University of Education Owerri, Imo State. Department of Educational Psychology FCT College of Education Zuba Abuja. *Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)* e-ISSN: 2320-7388, p-ISSN: 2320-737X. PP 31-36 www.iosrjournals.org
- [39]. Oetting, E.R., & Beavis, F. (1987). Peer cluster theory, socialization characteristic of adolescent's drugs uses: A path analysis. *Journal of counselling psychology*, 34(2): 205-213
- [40]. Oetting, E.R., Donnermeyer, J.F., & Deffenbacher, J. (1998). Primary socialization theory: The influence of the community on drug use and deviance. *Substance use and misuse*. 33 (8) 1629-1665
- [41]. Okoli, A. C., & Iortyer, P. (2014). Terrorism and humanitarian crisis in Nigeria: Insights from Boko Haram insurgency. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science*, 14(1), 40.
- [42]. Patterson, G. R., & Dishion, T. J. (1984). Contributions of families and peers to delinquency. *Criminology*, 23(1), 63-79.
- [43]. Rani, B. S. (2014). Impact of Parenting Styles on Career Choices of Adolescents. *Journal of Education and Social Policies*, 1(1), 19-22.
- [44]. Razali, A., Dokuoushkani, F., & Rajendran, K. (2013). What does literature say about student at risk? *Psychology and Behavioural Sciences*, 2(2), 51-58.
- [45]. Rodriguez, C. M. (2010). Parent-child aggression: Association with child abuse potential and parenting styles. *Violence and victims*, 25(6), 728-741.
- [46]. Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S., Darling, N., Mounts, N., & Dornbusch, S. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 65, 754-770.
- [47]. Tam, C. L., Chong, A., Kadirvelu, A., & Khoo, Y. T. (2013). Parenting styles and self-efficacy of adolescents: Malaysian scenario. *Global Journal of Human-Social Science Research*, 12(14-A).
- [48]. Valle, M. F., Huebner, E. S., & Suldo, S. M. (2006). An analysis of hope as a psychological strength. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44(5), 393-406.
- [49]. Wachikwu, T. & Ibegunam, J. O. (2012). Psychosocial factors influencing antisocial behaviour among secondary school students in Obio-Akpor Local Area of Rivers State. *International Journal of Educational Development*, 2 (1) 104-113
- [50]. White, R. & Renk, K. (2012). Externalizing behaviour problems during adolescence: An ecological perspective. *Journal of child and family studies*, 21, 158-171.
- [51]. Yudanagara, B. B. H. (2014). The Difference of Violence Behaviour between Male Adolescent Who Have Authoritative and Non Authoritative Parent. *International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research*, 78, 6.