



doi 10.5281/zenodo.10539215

Vol. 07 Issue 01 Jan - 2024

Manuscript ID: #01193

Parental Monitoring and Parenting Styles as Predictors of Deviant Behaviour among Undergraduate Students

Chinawa, Francis Chukwuemeka

Department of Psychology Godfrey Okoye University, Thinkers Corner Enugu Email: chinawafrancis2020@gmail.com
Omeje, Obiageli

Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) Email: obyomeje@yahoo.com

Anike, Raphael Ugwu

Department of Psychology Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) Email: anikeugwu@yahoo.com

Ekwo Jude Chukwudi

Department of Psychology Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) Email: jude.ekwo@esut.edu.ng

Douglas, John Ufuoma

Department of Psychology Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) Email: douglasufuoma@gmail.com

Nwodo Theodora Onyinyechi

Department of Psychology Enugu State University of Science and Technology Email: theodoranwodo44@gmail.com

Okolo Jane ifeoma

Department of Psychology Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) Email: janeifeoma7@gmail.com

Corresponding Author: douglasufuoma@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study investigated parental conflict and parenting style as predictors of undergraduate students, one hundred and fifty-six (156) undergraduate students with mean age of 19.16 and SD of 1.895 were drawn using multi-stage (cluster, simple random: by balloting and purposive) sampling techniques as participants from Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu. Deviant Behaviour Variety Scale (DBVS; Sanches et al., 2016), Baumrid (1971) Parental care scale and Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale (CPIC) (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992) were used for data collection, a correlational design was adopted, while multiple hierarchical linear regression using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 27 software was used for data analysis. Finding shows that parental conflict (self-blame $St\beta = -.009$ and $t = -.037$, conflict properties $St\beta = -.095$ and $t = -.394$ and threat $St\beta = .301$ and $t = 1.159$ at $p < .05$) did not predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate student, Parenting style (authoritarian parenting $St\beta = .425$ and $t = 1.861$, permissiveness parenting $St\beta = .019$ and $t = .100$ and authoritative parenting $St\beta = -.098$ and $t = -.433$ at $p < .05$) did not predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate student. Hence, clinical psychologist and care givers should derive a means to handle the onset of deviant behaviour

KEYWORDS

Parental monitoring, parenting styles, deviant behaviour, undergraduate students.



This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License.

INTRODUCTION

It is concerning to see the rise of deviant behaviour among adolescents in recent times which most times manifest in adulthood. It's a global issue that requires immediate attention. This kind of behaviour not only hinders the educational, social, and personal development of young individuals but can also lead to long-term impairment in their social and personal lives (Shey&Lukong, 2018). Deviant behaviour is a term used to describe actions that are considered inappropriate or atypical within a particular social group (Pérez-Acosta, 2008; Aitana et al., 2022); this can include behaviour that goes against societal norms or violates the rights of others. In other words, it refers to actions that deviate significantly from what is considered acceptable within a given community or culture (World Health Organization, 2018). Studies have shown that deviant behaviour typically starts in early adolescence and is associated with an increased likelihood of criminal justice involvement and premature death (Dube et al., 2003; Valdebenito et al., 2015), psychiatric disorders (Hughes et al., 2017), adjustment difficulties at work and in the family, and interpersonal problems (Berry et al., 2007; Aitana et al., 2022). This highlights the importance of early intervention and prevention efforts to address deviant behaviours before they escalate and lead to more serious consequences. Hence the need to study parental monitoring and parenting styles as predictors of deviant behaviour among undergraduate students.

Different cultures might view certain behaviours as deviant while others do not. Idris et al. (2017) defined deviance as any behaviour that goes against the established standards, rules, beliefs, and norms of a society. What is considered deviant can vary depending on the cultural context. The way society categorises certain actions as deviant is based on its collective views and perceptions. Dullas et al. (2021) cited Torrente and Vazsonyi's (2012) definition of deviance as a structure of behaviour that goes against accepted norms and can even be seen as a reflection of unbalanced mental processes. Deviant actions are believed to undermine a person's ability to realize their true potential and can hinder their moral behaviour and sense of identity control. Deviant behaviour can be seen as unacceptable because it can prevent individuals from functioning effectively within society and behaving as good members of their community. When someone's actions are considered deviant, it can be challenging for them to maintain positive relationships with others and to participate fully in social activities. This is why it's crucial to understand how different cultures perceive deviance, as well as the potential psychological and social consequences of engaging in deviant behaviour.

Empirical research has demonstrated that there can be several factors that are positively correlated with deviant behaviour. For example, studies have shown that official crime records can be an indicator of deviant behaviour (Farrington et al., 2013). Additionally, low self-control is positively correlated with deviant behaviour (Vazsonyi et al., 2006). Other factors that have been linked to deviant behaviour include substance and alcohol abuse (Mason et al., 2007), and psychological distress (Wiesner et al., 2005). These findings highlight the importance of understanding the underlying factors that contribute to deviant behaviour, as well as the potential consequences of engaging in such behaviour. Hence there is need to investigate parental contribution.

According to Kusekwa (2017), parental conflict can be described as visible expressions of dissatisfaction and contentious behaviour that occur between a husband and wife. This can include open arguments, quarrels, and disagreements that can be witnessed by other family members in the home. It's important for parents to be aware of the impact that their conflicts can have on their children and to work towards finding peaceful solutions to any issues that arise. It's important to note that when one partner commits hostile acts against the other, such as physical violence, verbal abuse, or threats, this can also be considered a form of parental conflict. These types of disruptions are often

visible to other family members living in the home and can have a significant impact on children's mental and emotional well-being. It's crucial for parents to seek help and find ways to manage conflicts in a constructive and peaceful manner to ensure a safe and healthy home environment for everyone. Bhagat (2016) has described parental conflict as exchanges between parents that are filled with negative comments, criticism, threats, and intense outbursts of anger. In some cases, this may not necessarily involve physical fighting, but it can be displayed in the way parents respond to each other's questions or instructions. It's essential for parents to recognize and address these behaviours to prevent the negative impact that parental conflict can have on children's mental and emotional health. Seeking help and finding effective ways to manage conflicts can go a long way in creating a healthy and supportive home environment for everyone.

Unfortunately, conflicts between parents can cause friction and strain their relationship. Sometimes, these conflicts can lead to the use of hurtful language, name-calling, or even physical violence, which is never acceptable. It's important to address these issues and find healthy ways to resolve conflicts in any relationship. It's important to remember that when children witness conflicts within their home, they often analyse the situation and consider how it may impact them. If they perceive that the conflict will have negative consequences for them, they may try to understand why the conflict arose and may even assign blame to those involved. This can be a difficult and stressful situation for children, and parents need to communicate openly and address any concerns that their children may have.

Parsa et al. (2014) have suggested that parental conflicts can have a direct or indirect impact on adolescent behaviour. Direct impact can occur when children model the negative or positive conflict patterns that they witness in their parents' interactions at home, including how they respond to stress or difficult situations. It's crucial for parents to be mindful of their behaviour and communication style when in the presence of their children, as this can have a lasting impact on their children's behaviour and relationships in the future. By setting a positive example and working towards peaceful resolutions to conflicts, parents can help create a healthy and supportive environment for their children to thrive. Another variable to consider is parenting styles.

Parenting can be defined as a deliberate set of actions aimed at promoting the survival and development of children. It's a two-way process that involves interaction between a child and their parent (Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Rajan & Rema, 2022). Parenting involves exhibiting warm and affectionate behaviour towards infants and is a continuous process of nurturing and supporting a child's growth and development. It's important for parents to provide a safe and supportive environment for their children and to engage in positive and constructive interactions to promote healthy development and well-being. Parenting has a significant impact on the overall development of children and adolescents, as well as their relationship with their parents (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Rajan & Rema, 2022). The parenting style adopted by a parent can have a lasting impact on a child's emotional, social, and cognitive development. Positive and supportive parenting can foster healthy relationships and promote positive behaviours, while negative parenting styles can have adverse effects on a child's mental health and well-being. It's important for parents to be aware of the impact their parenting style can have on their children and to work towards creating a nurturing and supportive environment that promotes healthy development and positive relationships.

The perception of parenting style refers to the adult's opinion and understanding of their parents' child-rearing practices, which can shape their overall view of their upbringing. Parenting styles have been conceptualized in terms of two underlying dimensions: demandingness and responsiveness (Hughes et al., 2005; Rajan & Rema, 2022). Demandingness refers to the level of control and

discipline parents exert over their children, while responsiveness refers to the degree to which parents are emotionally supportive and available to their children's needs. These dimensions can be combined to form distinct parenting styles, including authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and uninvolved. Understanding one's own perception of their parents' parenting style can provide insights into one's own parenting practices and help individuals make conscious decisions about how they want to raise their own children.

Baumrind's categorization of parenting styles based on levels of control has been widely used to conceptualize parenting styles (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Crittenden, Dallos, Landini&Kozłowska, 2014; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Baumrind identified three distinct parenting styles: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. Authoritarian parents are characterized as having high levels of control and discipline, with little emphasis on emotional support and responsiveness. Authoritative parents, on the other hand, have high levels of control and discipline but also prioritize emotional support and responsiveness. Permissive parents, in contrast, have low levels of control and discipline and prioritize emotional support over control. Understanding these parenting styles can help individuals identify and evaluate their own parenting practices and work towards creating a nurturing and supportive environment for their children's development and well-being.

The theory of planned behaviour, developed by Ajzen (1991), is often used as a theoretical framework to understand the relationship between beliefs and behaviour. The theory suggests that an individual's attitude towards a behavior, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control all shape their behavioural intentions and ultimately their behaviour. This means that an individual's perception of a parenting style as undesirable can lead to deviant behaviour and their ability to adapt to their social environment depends on their individual beliefs and attitudes. By understanding the underlying factors that influence behaviour, individuals can work towards making conscious decisions and taking actions that align with their values and goals, including their parenting practices. This can lead to a more positive and fulfilling experience for both the parent and child, ultimately contributing to overall family well-being.

It's worth noting that there is a lack of research in Nigeria that examines the impact of institutional parental styles and conflicts on adolescent behaviour, particularly about their upbringing and family background. As a result, there is a need for further investigation to better understand the potential factors that contribute to deviant behaviour among adolescents in Nigeria. This study aims to address this gap by testing several hypotheses related to the impact of parental styles and conflicts on adolescent behaviour. By identifying the underlying factors that contribute to deviant behaviours, this study can inform interventions and policies aimed at promoting healthy development and well-being among Nigerian undergraduate students. Hence these hypotheses were tested:

Parental conflict (self-blame, conflict and threat) will significantly predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate student

Parental style (authoritarian, permissiveness and authoritative) will significantly predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate student

Participants

One hundred and fifty-six (156) undergraduate students with mean age of 19.16 and SD of 1.895 were drawn using multi-stage (cluster, simple random: by balloting and purposive) sampling techniques as participants from Enugu State University of Science and Technology, Enugu. The students were cluster according to their faculties, simple random: by balloting was used to pick the faculties, while purposive: a criterion selection-based sampling technique was used to draw participants from Applied natural sciences thirty-six (36), from Management sciences thirty-three (33), from Environmental

sciences thirty (30), from Engineering twenty (20) and Law twenty-six (26). Inclusive criterion: undergraduate student within the age of adolescent from the selected faculties. Exclusive criterion: undergraduate student above adolescent age, staff, postgraduate, sand-winch, part-time students.

Instrument

Three sets of instruments were used for the study; namely

1. Deviant Behaviour Variety Scale (DBVS; Sanches et al., 2016)
2. Baumrid (1971) Parental care scale
3. Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale (CPIC) (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992)

Deviant Behavior Variety Scale (DBVS; Sanches et al., 2016)

Deviant Behavior Variety Scale (DBVS; Sanches et al., 2016) is a self-report scale that includes both illegal behaviour, like driving a motorbike or a car without having a driver's license, and rule-breaking behavior that is not illegal, such as lying to adults or truancy without parental consent. It consists of 19 items answered using a dichotomous scale (yes/no) about whether the participants performed any of the 19 deviant behaviors during the previous year (12-month DBV). The overall score for deviant behaviors is obtained by the sum up of affirmative answers. Evidences of Factorial Validity: A one-factor structure model was tested using CFA. The loadings were higher than .40 (ranging from .46 to .93) and the general model indicated a good model fit through adequate goodness-of-fit indices (χ^2 sb/df = 2.16, $p < 0.001$; CFI = .98; RMSEA = .05, [.04-.05]; TLI = .97). Evidences of Convergent Validity: Convergent validity was assessed using Spearman's correlations. The strongest association was between deviant behaviour with deviant behavior over a lifetime. In addition, the total score on psychopathy was also related to higher antisocial behavior, followed by the interpersonal dimension of psychopathy, the behavioural dimension, and finally, the emotional dimension. All correlations were positive and statistically significant, and in almost all cases ranging from moderate to large effect sizes (from $r = .77$ to $r = .36$). The only exception was found for the emotional dimension of psychopathy ($r = .23$). A pilot conducted by the researcher with 50 students for Caritas university with the aid of purposive sampling techniques, yielded a Cronbach alpha of .614

Baumrind (1971) Parental care scale

Parental care scale (PCS) the 20-item instrument designed to measure styles of parenting. YES or NO response is expected from each statement in the questionnaire. The statement were categorized into 3 groups of parenting styles (Authoritarian style, permissive style and authoritative style), and each participant gets scores in all the styles of parenting, and the style with the highest score becomes dominant. The scale was administered individually after establishing adequate rapport with the participant. Baumrind (1970) provided the original psychometric properties for American samples while Tumasí&Ankrah (2002) provided the properties for African samples. The norms are as follows; males authoritarian style=7.87, permissive style= 13.57, and Authoritative style= 7.40, female authoritarian style 7.72, permissive style =12.82 and authoritative authoritative= 7.48, and male and female are authoritative style =7.80, permissive style=7.44. Baumrind (1971) reported an internal consistency alpha coefficient of .86 on the reliability while Omoluabi (2002) obtained a concurrent validity coefficient of .73 by correlating FCS and IFR (Hufson, 1982). The norms scores were the basis for interpretation of the score of the participants, the scores higher than the norms indicates the dominance of the particular parenting style. A pilot conducted by the researcher with 50 students for

Caritas University with the aid of purposive sampling techniques, yielded a Cronbach alpha of .628 on authoritarian, .677 on permissiveness and .627 on authoritative parenting respectively.

Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale (CPIC)

The Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale (CPIC) is a 49-item self-report measure designed for children and young people, with a 3-point Likert scale (1 = 'True', 2 = 'Sort of True', 3 = 'False'), to assess their views of parental conflict and adjustment. The original version of the CPIC assessed here includes subscales aimed at assessing frequency, intensity, resolution, content, perceived threat, coping efficacy, self-blame, triangulation and stability. Originally, the measure was comprised of nine subscales: frequency, intensity, resolution, content, perceived threat, coping efficacy, self-blame, triangulation and stability. The developers derived three broad-factor scales using Exploratory Factor Analysis and Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

Three factor analytically derived subscales (Conflict Properties, Threat, Self-Blame) were assessed in the original paper (Grych et al., 1992). Alpha coefficients were computed, and each subscale demonstrated good internal consistency across samples, with all value greater than 0.70. Test-retest correlations over two weeks obtained for a small sample of children ($n = 44$) were measured for the three factor analytically derived subscales: Conflict Properties = 0.70; Threat = 0.68; and Self-Blame = 0.76. In the original paper (Grych et al., 1992), the developers evaluated CPIC against two well-established measures of parent-reported inter-parental conflict, the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) and the O'Leary Porter Scale (OPS; Porter & O'Leary, 1980). Since CTS and OPS assess the frequency and intensity of marital discord. The developers reported that the scale was significantly related to the OPS and the CTS, and that the Pearson coefficients were moderate ($r = 0.30$ and $r = 0.39$ respectively). CPIC's validity was also evaluated by examining whether children's perceptions of conflict were related to children's adjustment. Correlations were computed between the CPIC subscales and the Aggression and Depression subscales of the Child Behaviour Checklist (a 113-item parent report measure designed to assess behavioural and emotional problems in children), teacher/peer report of externalizing behaviour, teacher/peer report of internalizing behaviour, and the Children's Depression Inventory.

The authors reported that the Conflict Properties subscale was moderately correlated with externalizing behaviours (Aggression subscale from CBCL, boys $r = 0.30$ girls $r = 0.26$; teacher/peer report of externalizing behaviour, boys $r = 0.20$ girls $r = 0.27$). The Threat subscale was reported to be correlated with internalizing behaviours (CDI boys $r = 0.50$, $p < 0.05$; girls $r = 0.41$, $p < 0.05$). Similarly, the Self-Blame subscale was reported to be correlated with internalizing behaviours (CDI boys $r = 0.57$, $p < 0.05$; girls $r = 0.32$, $p < 0.05$). A pilot conducted by the researcher with 50 students for Caritas university with the aid of purposive sampling techniques, yielded a Cronbach alpha of .821 on Self-Blame, of .755 on Threat subscale and .688 on Threat subscale dimensions of perceived interparental conflict scale

Procedures

Undergraduate students were drawn as participants from four faculties in Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) using multi-stage sampling (cluster, simple random: by balloting, and purposive) techniques for this study. The students were clustered according to their faculties, simple random: by balloting was used to pick the faculties while purposive sampling techniques was used to draw students from the selected faculties. The researcher employed the research assistants whom are faculties' executives from the selected faculties to help distribute and retrieve the questionnaire. One hundred and sixty-four (164) questionnaires were sent out, one hundred and sixty-

one (161) were returned. Among the returning once, three (3) bears multiple initials and the other two (2) were not properly responded to, which make the numbers properly responded to be one hundred and fifty-six (156), which was used for data analysis.

Design/statistic

A correlational design was adopted based on the researcher is looking for the interaction between parental conflict and parental style on deviant behaviour among undergraduate student. Thus, the statistical test used for data analysis is multiple hierarchical linear regression using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 25 software.

Result

Table I: descriptive statistics

S/N	Variables	M	S.D	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1.	Deviant behaviour	4.2000	2.42686	1	-.009	.170	.139	.380	-.055	-.243	-.152	-.082
2.	Self-blame	13.1000	4.15518	1		.296	.550	-.245	-.033	.338	.014	-.160
3.	Conflict properties	14.6000	3.96189		1		.508	.235	-.035	-.155	-.057	-.041
4.	Threat	36.5667	4.87558			1		-.228	-.055	.119	.082	-.350
5.	Authoritarian parenting	3.9667	1.69143				1		-.092	-.463	-.153	.066
6.	Permissiveness parenting	2.6000	1.19193					1		.224	.081	.244
7.	Authoritative parenting	5.2333	1.13512						1		-.026	.286
8.	Gender	1.7667	.43018								1	-.162
9.	Age	19.1667	1.89525									1.000

Table I above shows that parental conflict (self-blame $r = -.009$, conflict properties $r = .170$ and threat $r = .139$) did not relate with deviant behaviour among undergraduate student, this implies that parental conflict is not a factor that can help to determine the presence of deviant behaviour among university student. Authoritarian parenting $r = .380$ dimension of parenting style positively related with deviant behaviour, this indicate an increase in authoritarian parenting will lead to an increase in deviant behaviour. Authoritative parenting $r = -.243$ dimension of parenting style negatively related with deviant behaviour, this means that increase in authoritative parenting will cause a decrease in deviant behaviour. While permissiveness parenting $r = -.055$ parenting style did not relate with deviant behaviour.

Table II: regression statistics

Model	R	R ²	UnStβ	Stβ	t	Sig.
1	.208	.043				.081
Self-blame			-.005	-.009	-.037	.971
Conflict properties			-.058	-.095	-.394	.697
Threat			.150	.301	1.159	.258
1	.239	.057				.029
Authoritarian parenting			.609	.425	1.861	.076
Permissiveness parenting			.039	.019	.100	.921
Authoritative parenting			-.210	-.098	-.433	.669

Gender	-.719	-.127	-.641	.528
Age	.001	.001	.004	.997

Dependent variable= deviant behaviour, at $p < .05$. r = relationship, r^2 = relationship square, $UnSt\beta$ = unstandardized beta, $St\beta$ = standardised beta, sig.= significant.

Table II above shows that parental conflict (self-blame $St\beta = -.009$ and $t = -.037$, conflict properties $St\beta = -.095$ and $t = -.394$ and threat $St\beta = .301$ and $t = 1.159$ at $p < .05$) did not predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate student, this implies that perceived parental conflict cannot bring about deviant behaviour among university student. Parental conflict jointly did not relate to deviant behaviour at $r = .208$ and they contributed 4.3% variation to the dependent variable, parental conflict jointly failed to predict deviant behaviour sig.= .081 at $p < .05$.

Parenting style (authoritarian parenting $St\beta = .425$ and $t = 1.861$, permissiveness parenting $St\beta = .019$ and $t = .100$ and authoritative parenting $St\beta = -.098$ and $t = -.433$ at $p < .05$) did not predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate student, this means that the different parenting styles are not strong factors that contribute to deviant behaviour. Parenting style shows to be jointly related to deviant behaviour at $r = .239$ and they contributed 5.7% variance to deviant behaviour, parenting styles jointly predicted deviant behaviour at sig.= .029 at $p < .05$.

Discussion

The first hypothesis, which stated that parental conflict (including self-blame, conflict properties, and threats) would independently and jointly predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate students, was not confirmed by the study. While parental conflict can have a significant impact on children's behaviour, this study did not find a significant relationship between parental conflict and deviant behaviour among undergraduate students in Nigeria. However, it's important to note that this does not discount the potential impact of parental conflict on adolescent behaviour in other contexts or populations. The result obtained shows that the different dimensions of parental conflict not a major contributor to deviant behaviour among undergraduate students, it means that deviant behaviour is not as a result of perceived conflict between parents. The result obtained is not consistent with the findings of Iheka (2023), who suggested that deviant behaviour among students can be attributed to perceived conflict within the family structure. According to Iheka, this perceived conflict can lead to negative interpretations and ultimately result in deviant behaviour.

The result from this study indicated that parental conflict contributed a very insignificant variation to the occurrence of deviant behaviour, and also shows no relationship. This means that both variables are incompatible factors, and that the presence of one cannot cause the presence of the other. Many factors might have caused the no predicting result, these can be personality trait, social support, emotional intelligence and other factors that was not investigated by the researcher. This shows that student from a conflict home most not possesses deviant behaviour.

The second hypothesis tested which state that parenting style (authoritarian parenting, permissiveness parenting and authoritative parenting) will independently and jointly predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate student was not confirmed. Parenting styles only jointly predicted deviant behaviour, but failed to independently predict deviant behaviour, this indicated that the different dimensions of parenting styles cannot independently cause the occurrence of deviant behaviour. The result obtained was not in line with the work of Ihejiene (2014) which stressed that different dimensions of parenting styles can cause or lead to deviant behaviour. Ihejiene further postulated that the different parenting styles can contribute to deviant behaviour in one way or the other. The result obtained indicated that

parenting styles can only jointly contribute or caused the occurrence of deviant behaviour, but cannot independently necessitate deviant behaviour among undergraduate students. Exhibiting or expressing deviant behaviour might be as a result of the different dimensions of parenting styles, rather other factors that can cause it occurrence. The result shows that parenting styles jointly correlated with deviant behaviour, and jointly predicted deviant behaviour, it indicated that parenting styles is not a major player to determine deviant behaviour independently. The findings also indicated that authoritative parenting style negatively correlated with deviant behaviour, this implies that increase in this dimension of parenting will cause a decrease in deviant behaviour among undergraduate students.

Implication of the findings

The theory of planned behaviour (Ajzen, 1991) which was adopted as theoretical framework was in congruity with the findings because it is an approach that links one's belief and behaviour. The theory states that attitude toward behaviour, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control, together shape an individual's behavioural intentions and behaviours. This implies that the individual's tendency to perceive a parenting style as undesirable leads to deviant behaviour he or she experience, and the ability to adjust to social environment solemnly depend on the individual. The student chooses to form his or her own behaviour by themselves from situation that happens around them. Student planned to behaviour what favour and grant or gives them gratification. Even when they pass through a better parental up-bringing, they can still choose a behaviour they plan to adopt.

The findings indicated that parental conflict and parenting styles did not independent predict deviant behaviour, this implies that the different dimensions of both criterion variables cannot independently cause the occurrence of deviant behaviour. But the findings indicated that authoritative parenting negatively correlated with deviant behaviour, and parenting styles jointly predicted deviant behaviour. Hence, parents should be encouraged to adopt more of authoritative parenting, because this will cause the decrease in deviant behaviour. If it's possible, parent should tailor the different parenting styles together so as to help sharpening their children and for deviant behaviour to reduce. Also, clinical psychologist and care givers should derive a means to handle the onset of deviant behaviour.

Limitations of the study

Many factors worked against this study, one of such is the population sampled. Sampling one institution during academic activities worked against the study. The number of participants would have increased assuming more than one institution was sampled

This research was carried out during the exam period and this factor also reduced the number of participants. Most students were involved in the examination process or preparing to begin their exams, which discouraged some of them citing tight schedules.

The sampling techniques adopted may have also worked against this study, more schools would have been sampled assuming non-probability sampling techniques were adopted.

Suggestion for further study

Future researchers should consider sampling participants from more than one institution to increase the number of participants.

Secondly, future researchers should consider carrying out this study when students are not writing or about to write exams, to give room for more participants.

Summary and conclusion

Based on the study's findings, it appears that both parental conflict and parenting styles did not predict deviant behaviour among undergraduate students. However, it's worth noting that authoritative parenting style was found to have a negative correlation with deviant behaviour. Therefore, it may be beneficial for parents to consider adopting more of an authoritative parenting style as it was associated with a decrease in deviant behaviour.

References

- Aitana G, Lidón V., & Miguel B. (2022). Psychometric Properties of the Deviant Behavior Variety Scale in Young Spanish Adults. *Psicothema*, 34(2) 308-315 doi: 10.7334/psicothema2021.317
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behaviour. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Baumrind, D. (1966). *Effects of Authoritative Parental Control on Child Behaviour*. Retrieved from: <http://persweb.wabash.edu/facstaff/hortonr/articles%20for%20class/baumrind.pdf>
- Baumrind D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*. 4:1–103. doi: 10.1037/h0030372.
- Baumrind D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance abuse. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 11:56–95. doi: 10.1177/02724316911111004.
- Berry, K., Barrowclough, C., & Wearden, A. (2007). A review of the role of adult attachment style in psychosis: Unexplored issues and questions for further research. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 27(4), 458-475. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2006.09.006>
- Bhagat, P. (2016). Comparative study of emotional maturity of secondary school students in relation to academic achievement. *International Journal of Recent Scientific Research*, 2(6), 1437–1444.
- Border, R., Corley, R. P., Brown, S. A., Hewitt, J. K., Hopfer, C. J., McWilliams, S. K., Shriver, C. L., Stallings, M., Wall, T. L., Woodward, K. E., & Rhee, S. H. (2018). Independent predictors of mortality in adolescents ascertained for conduct disorder and substance use problems, their siblings and community controls. *Addiction*, 113(11), 2107-2115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.14366>
- Crittenden, P. M., Dallos, R., Landini, A., & Kozłowska, K. (2014). *Attachment and family therapy*. London, United Kingdom: McGraw-Hill.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: an integrative model. *Psychol. Bull.* 113, 487–496. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487
- Dube, S. R., Felitti, V. J., Dong, M., Chapman, D. P., Giles, W. H., & Anda, R. F. (2003). Childhood abuse, neglect, and household dysfunction and the risk of illicit drug use: The adverse childhood experiences study. *Pediatrics*, 111(3), 564-572. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.111.3.564>
- Dullas, A. R., Yncierito, K. D., Labiano, M. A., & Marcelo, J. C. (2021). Determinants of a Variety of Deviant Behaviors: An Analysis of Family Satisfaction, Personality Traits, and Their Relationship to

Deviant Behaviors Among Filipino Adolescents. *Frontiers in psychology*, 12, 645126. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.645126>

Grych, J.H., Seid, M., & Fincham, F.D. (1992). Assessing marital conflict from the child's perspective: The Children's Perception of Interparental Conflict Scale. *Child Development*, 63(3), 558–572.

Hughes, K., Bellis, M. A., Hardcastle, K. A., Sethi, D., Butchart, A., Mikton, C., Jones, L., & Dunne, M. P. (2017). The effect of multiple adverse childhood experiences on health: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Public Health*, 2(8), e356-e366. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667\(17\)30118-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(17)30118-4)

Hughes S. O. Power T. G. Fisher J. O, et al. (2005) Revisiting a neglected construct: Parenting styles in a child-feeding context. *Appetite*.44:83–92.

Idris M. N., Abdullah O., & Zulkarnian L. (2017). Exploring the relationship between personality factors and workplace deviant behavior among Pekanbaru city civil service. *Performance* 24 1–12. 10.20884/1.performance.2017.24.1.309

Kusekwa, Z. (2017). *The effects of interparental conflict on preadolescent behaviour: the case of primary schools in Dar Es Salaam and Coast Region*. [Unpublished Master of Social Work Thesis]. The Open University of Tanzania.

Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). “Socialization in the context of the family: parent-child interaction”, in *Handbook of Child Psychology Socialization, Personality, and Social Development*, Vol. 4, eds. E. M. Hetherington and P. H. Mussen (New York, NY: Wiley), 1–101

Mason, W. A., Hitchings, J. E., McMahon, R. J., & Spoth, R. L. (2007). A test of three alternative hypotheses regarding the effects of early delinquency on adolescent psychosocial functioning and substance involvement. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 35(5), 831-843.

Parsa, N., Yaacob, S., Redzuanb, M., Parsa, P., & Parsa, B. (2014). Effects of inter-parental conflict on college student's self-efficacy in Hamadan, Iran. *Procedia - Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 152(2014), 241 – 245. <https://doi.org/doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.187>

Pérez-Acosta, A. M. (2008). VandenBos, GR (Ed.) (2007). APA Dictionary of Psychology. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología*, 40(2), 381-384

Rajan, O. Rema M.K et al. (2022), Influence of Perceived Parenting Style on Self Esteem Among adolescents. *Int J Recent Sci Res.* 13(04), 932-935. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.24327/ijrsr.2022.1304.0202>

Sanches C., Gouveia-Pereira M., Maroco J., Gomes H., Roncon F. (2016). Deviant behavior variety scale: development and validation with some sample Portuguese adolescents. *Psychology: Research and Review* 29 1–8. 10.1186/s41155-016-0035-7

Shey, P & Lukong, E. T. (2018). Dynamics of Deviant Behaviour on the Academic Participation of Early Adolescents, Limbe Sub-Division, South West Region of Cameroon. *International Journal of Trend in Scientific Research and Development*. 2. 475-495. 10.31142/ijtsrd9417.

Torrente G., & Vazsonyi A. T. (2012). Adolescence and Social Deviance. *Anales de Psicología* 28 639–642. 10.6018/analeps.28.3.155931

Valdebenito, S., Ttofi, M., & Eisner, M. (2015). Prevalence rates of drug use among school bullies and victims: A systematic review and meta-analysis of cross-sectional studies. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 23, 137-146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.05.004>

Vazsonyi, A. T., Cleveland, H. H., & Wiebe, R. (2006). Does the effect of impulsivity on delinquency vary by neighborhood disadvantage? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33, 511-541. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093854806287318>

Wiesner, M., Kim, H. K., & Capaldi, D. M. (2005). Developmental trajectories of offending: Validation and prediction to young adult alcohol use, drug use, and depressive symptoms. *Development and Psychopathology*, 17(1), 251.

World Health Organization (2018). *International classification of diseases for mortality and morbidity statistics (11th Revision)*. <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en>
<https://www.who.int/standards/classifications/classification-of-disease>