

# Parenting Style as a Determinant of Anti-Social Behaviour of Students in Universities in South East, Nigeria

Celestine Okwudili Eze<sup>1</sup>

## **Abstract**

*The study investigated parenting style as a determinant of antisocial behaviour of students in universities in South East, Nigeria. This study was necessitated by the engagement of university students in some antisocial activities such as breach of school rules and regulations, bad dressing and appearance, destruction of public and school property, fighting and assaults, internet frauds, sexual immorality, examination malpractice, among others. Correlational survey research design was adopted for the study using a sample of 1,250 third year students sampled through multi-stage sampling procedure. Parenting style questionnaire and anti-social behavior questionnaire were used for data collection. Data collected were analyzed using multiple linear regression analysis to answer the research questions and test the null hypotheses. The findings of the study revealed that parenting styles is a significant determinant of students' antisocial behaviour in both federal and state universities. The findings revealed that parenting style correlated significantly with students' antisocial behaviour. One of the implications of these findings is that if these antisocial behaviour are not properly checked, they might lead to more social vices like cultism, armed robbery among others. Thus, it was recommended, among others, that parents should be enlightened through seminars and workshops on the appropriate style of parenting to adopt.*

**Keywords:** *Antisocial behavior, Determinant, Parenting style, South East, Universities*

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

In modern times, there are varieties of behaviour exhibited by adolescents in Nigeria which makes right thinking citizens wonder if our national values have been eroded. It is common to see students bath one another with acid while quarreling over trivial matters. Within the Campus premises, one notices some ugly behaviour like breach of school rules, delinquency, bad dressing and appearance, destruction of public properties, hooliganism, fighting and assault, fraud, sexual immorality, examination malpractice, misappropriation of fund, lying, impersonation, persistent lateness, absenteeism, disruptiveness and academic problems (Obikeze & Obi, 2013). Nigerians cannot forget in a hurry the activities of the Niger Delta militants in the Niger Delta region that

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Educational Foundations, Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka

held sway between 2007-2011 in which a lot of pipelines carrying oil were blown up and expatriate oil company workers and Nigerians alike were kidnapped. This period also witnessed unparalleled arson and vandalism of private and public property and a lot of lives were lost. These atrocities were perpetrated by adolescents as well as children (Nwanneka, Ikediashi & Joseph, 2015).

Currently, the Boko Haram sect started unleashing mayhem in the whole country. The senseless killing going on there makes one wonder if there is a calculated attempt by the sect members to wipe out an entire generation of Nigerians. All these despicable behaviours which are contrary to the norms and values of the society are perpetrated by the youth, many of them undergraduates who have seen the four-walls of the campuses (Nwanneka, Ikediashi & Joseph, 2015).

Behaviour has been defined as the way in which an individual acts or conducts one's life, which includes the way an individual acts towards others and the society in general (Burt, 2012). According to Alberto and Troutman (2003), behaviour is every action by a person that can be seen or heard. In other words, behaviour is both observable and measurable, which might be a range of actions and mannerisms made by individuals, organisms, systems or artificial entities in conjunction with themselves or their environment, which includes the other systems or organisms around as well as the physical environment. In the context of this study, behaviour is defined as the way in which an individual acts towards people, society or object and could also be the way an individual conducts one's life in reference to a phenomenon, an object or person in accordance with the societal rules and regulations.

The term antisocial behaviour means different things to different people. Forming a precise definition of antisocial behaviour seems to be difficult as there are variations with respect to what different communities define as being antisocial which will be based upon perceptions of what they believe to be a problem in that particular local community (Odo, 2013). Definitions vary across contexts and cultural social beliefs and values because new issues can emerge over time (Squires, 2008). According to Okorodudu and Okorodudu (2003), antisocial behaviour is any behaviour that falls short of societal norms, values, beliefs, expectations and is seen as undesirable behaviour within a given society. Blunkett (2013) defined anti-social behaviour as those which blight people's lives, undermine the fabric of society and hold back regeneration. The author went further to say that anti-social behaviour is ubiquitous, and that which differs across cultures and societies and recognized violation of cultural belief.

These antisocial behaviour can be identified as those disruptive acts characterized by covert and overt hostility and intentional aggression towards others. According to Hallahan (2006), antisocial behaviour may be overt, involving aggressive actions against siblings, peers, parents, teachers or other adults or covert, involving aggressive actions against property. Antisocial behaviour can occur among people in the market places, institutions of different categories like schools, banks, judiciary and religious places, among others. In the context of this study, antisocial behaviour refers to the unhealthy behaviour seen among university undergraduates in the campuses that are totally against the rules and regulations of the institution and also against the beliefs and values of the society in general.

Among the youth and adults, anti-social behavior as seen in the universities and beyond could be breach of school rules and regulations, delinquency, bad dressing and appearance, destruction of public properties, hooliganism, fighting and assault, frauds, sexual immorality, examination malpractices, drugs abuse,

impersonation, persistent lateness, absenteeism, disruptiveness, alcohol abuse, stealing, smoking, prostitution, bullying, aggressiveness, rudeness, abusive and insulting languages, vandalism, misappropriation of funds, rape, truancy, murder, suicide, rioting, verbal abuse to the teachers/ lecturers and non-academic staff in the learning environment (Wachikwu&Ibegunam, 2012). Since the behaviour of individuals, according to Bandura (1986) stems from an individual's orientation, it becomes imperative to focus attention on a variable to know if such variable determine the antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students. The variable is parenting styles

A parent is a father or a mother or someone who acts like a father or mother to a minor. They are the caregivers of the offspring in their own species. The most common types of parents are mothers, fathers, step father or mother and grand father or mother. In Africa, parents extend beyond immediate mother and father to include members of the extended family, neighbour and every other person who in one way or the other is involved in the upbringing of the child (Okpako, 2004). The parental care and support which entails behaviour towards the child such as praising, encouraging and affection bonds adolescents to institutions and builds their self-control as students (Barnes, 2002). This parental care and supports is called parenting.

Parenting is the mechanism through which a child learns appropriate and inappropriate behaviour, experiences right and wrong choices in decision making, acquires skills, understands rules and regulations, beliefs and norms of a given community (Perez & Cumsille, 2012). A way of reflection between parent and child relationships is parenting and it is a complex activity that includes many specific attitudes and behaviour that work separately and collectively to influence child outcomes and generate an emotional bond in which the parents' behaviour are expressed (Bibi, Chaudhry, Awan & Tariq, 2013).

Parenting plays a major part in child socialization, providing an early understanding of the self (Latouf & Dunn, 2010). For example, quality of parenting is associated with general adjustment (Lamborn and Groh, 2009) and psychological wellbeing, including a healthy self-esteem and satisfaction with life (Roman, Mwaba, & Lens, 2008). In the context of this study, parenting is the act of parenthood, child upbringing, training and rearing of children which include child education. There are various types of parenting styles, which include authoritarian, authoritative, permissive and neglectful parenting styles (Baumrind, 2005).

Authoritarian parenting is where parents establish the rules and expect that children will follow them without exception. Children have little or no involvement in problem-solving challenges or obstacles (Plotnik & Kouyoumdjian, 2010). Parents expect that children will follow all the rules all the time. If children challenge the rules or ask why such rules are obeyed, they are usually told, "Because I said so." Children are not usually given the reasons for the rules and there is little room for any negotiation. According to Terry (2004), children of authoritarian parents tend to lack social competence in dealing with other children, frequently withdraw from social contact and rarely take their own initiative, look to outside authority to decide what is correct and show anger and antisocial behaviour towards people in authority. Beyers and Goossens (2003), in their study, posited that people from authoritarian parents portray negative behavioural outcome including aggressive behaviour, decreased emotional functioning, depression and lower levels of self-confidence. Although children who grow up with authoritarian parents tend to follow rules much of the time, they may develop self-esteem problems. Sometimes the children become hostile or aggressive as they may focus more on being angry at their parents for the punishment rather than learning how to make decisions and solve problems.

Terry (2004) is then of the opinion that children of authoritarian parenting style often involve in antisocial behaviour in an attempt to sort out peace of mind from outside the house.

The second type of parenting is authoritative parenting style. Here, parents establish rules that children are expected to follow. There are situations where there may be some exceptions to the rule. They often tell children the reasons for the rules and are more willing to consider a child's feelings when setting limits. (Plotnik & Kouyoumdjian, 2010). Authoritative parents tend to use consequences instead of punishments, more of positive consequences to reinforce good behaviour and may be more willing than authoritarian parents to use reward systems and praise. Children raised with authoritative discipline tend to be happy and successful. They are often good at making decisions and evaluating safety risks on their own. They often grow up to be responsible adults who feel comfortable expressing their opinions. According to Terry (2004), children of authoritative parents tend to be more self-reliant, self-controlled, willing to explore and socially responsible. In the same line of thought, Barnes (2002), noted that children of authoritative parents are associated with positive behavioural outcomes including increased competence, autonomy and self-esteem as well as better problem-solving skills, self-reliance, less deviance and better peer relations and may not indulge in antisocial behaviour.

Permissive parenting style is the third type of parenting, where parents do not offer much discipline, but tend to be lenient and may only step in when there is a serious problem. There may be few consequences for misbehaviour because parents have an attitude of "kids will be kids" (Plotnik & Kouyoumdjian, 2010). Permissive parents may take on more of a friend role than a parent role. They may encourage their children to talk with them about their problems but may not discourage a lot of bad behaviour. This may be why children who grow up with permissive parents tend to struggle academically. They exhibit more behavioral problems and antisocial behaviour as they will likely not appreciate authorities and rules. They often have low self-esteem and may report a lot of sadness.

Children of permissive parents tend to be relatively immature, exhibit poor impulse control and difficulty accepting responsibility for their own actions and acting independently (Terry, 2004). Permissive parenting is related to future antisocial behaviour and aggression due to poor supervision, neglect and indifference which play crucial roles in future antisocial behaviour like drugs abuse, alcohol use, school misconduct and emotional, impulsive and nonconforming behaviour (Miller, Diorio & Dudley, 2002). This tends to buttress the fact that children of this parenting style, due to their upbringing definitely will indulge in antisocial behaviour.

Another parenting style is neglectful parenting style where parents tend to be neglectful and often do not meet their children's basic needs and may expect children to raise themselves. Sometimes, this may be due to parents' mental health issues or substance abuse problems (Plotnik & Kouyoumdjian, 2010). They may also lack knowledge about parenting and child development or may feel overwhelmed by life's other problems. Neglectful parents tend to have little knowledge of what their children are doing. There tends to be few rules or expectations, if any. Children may not receive any nurturing or guidance expected from the parents. According to Mounst (2002), with a neglectful parenting style, children tend to look for acceptance in other places and associate with peer groups with similar family backgrounds. Terry (2004) is also of the view that children of neglectful parent lack social competence, overly independent, have difficulty determining right or wrong

behaviour and always experience school problems which includes antisocial behaviour. This quality of parenting affects peer association. A child may try to deviate from values set by parents to emulate that of his peer group.

The prevalence of anti-social behaviour among undergraduate students in universities has increased dramatically over the past decades, along with their negative effects on development (Akpam, 2012). These have health-endangering phenomenon, as well as loss of self-esteem (Chris, 2011). Many researchers have set out to detect what factors lead to this type of behaviour. Even though there has been a lot of research done to detect the factors that are possible contributors to antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities. The interest of the researcher was drawn to investigating parenting styles as a determinant of antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in universities in South East, Nigeria.

### **Statement of the Problem**

In recent years, antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities have been on the increase and have also become common concern of parents, university academic and non-academic staff, the community, education stakeholders and the government in general. This has turned to be a national issue which has attracted the attention of scholars and education stakeholders on how to intervene so as to curb all forms of factors that could be responsible for antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities. In the universities, undergraduate students exhibit some of these antisocial behaviour like breach of school rules and regulations, bad dressing and appearance, destruction of public and school property, fighting and assaults, internet frauds, sexual immorality, examinations malpractices, drugs abuses, persistent lateness and absenteeism from lectures, alcohol abuses, stealing, sexual harassment, truancies, abusive and insulting languages, rioting, vandalism, rape, smoking, prostitution, and verbal abuse of the lecturers and non-academic workers in the universities.

These antisocial behaviours definitely may have serious impact on the students' studies thereby leading to failure or low academic performance. This ugly situation has led to apportioning blames to parents, lecturers, constitutional amendment, national orientation programmes, the school curriculum and programme. It may also be perceived that there is a relationship between students' attitude to life, the environment they were born and the training received at home. It is pertinent to ascertain the extent to which parenting style could influence antisocial behaviour among undergraduate students in universities. It is against this background that the researcher is interested in investigating parenting styles as a determinant of antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in universities in South East, Nigeria.

### **Purpose of the Study**

The general purpose of the study was to determine the parenting style, antisocial behavior of undergraduate students in universities in South East, Nigeria. Specifically the study sought to;

1. Find out the level of antisocial behaviour of students in both federal and state universities.
2. Determine the relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities.

### **Research Questions**

The following research questions were formulated to guide the study,

1. What is the level of antisocial behaviour of students in both federal and state universities in South-East Nigeria?

2. What is the relationship between parenting style and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities in South-East of Nigeria?

### **Hypotheses**

The following null hypotheses were formulated to guide the study and was tested at 0.05 level of significance.

H<sub>01</sub>: There is no significant difference in the mean antisocial behaviour scores of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities in South East Nigeria.

H<sub>02</sub>: There is no significant relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities in South East, Nigeria.

## **II. RESEARCH METHOD**

This study adopted correlational survey research design. In similar studies, Achagh et al. (2020), Eya et al. (2020), Ezema et al. (2019), Gana et al. (2019), Okenyi et al. (2019), Ugwuanyi and Okeke (2020), Ugwuanyi et al. (2020a, b, c, d) have adopted this design. The population of the study comprised all the 60,734 third year students from both federal and state universities in the South-East of Nigeria. The choice of third year students is because they have stayed in the campus for more than two years and at this stage will be able to maintain their stand in terms of attitude to anti-social behaviour. The sample of the study consisted of 1,250 third year undergraduate students drawn from the population. These respondents were drawn from 3 federal and 3 state universities through multi stage sampling procedure. Three stages of selection were used in order to draw the sample for the study. In the first stage, stratified random sampling was used to stratify the universities based on federal and state. From each of the strata (federal and state), three federal: University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Michael Okpara University of Agriculture and Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka and three states universities: Anambra State University, Uli, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki and Enugu State University of Science and Technology were drawn using simple random sampling technique.

Secondly, simple random sampling technique was used to draw four faculties from the universities sample. This was done using balloting method with replacement in order to give every faculty equal chance of being selected. Thirdly, snow ball sampling technique was used to sample third year undergraduate students in the faculties sampled in the second stage. Thus, 500 students from University of Nigeria, Nsukka, 125 students from Michael Okpara University of Agriculture, 185 students from Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, 155 students from Anambra State University, Uli, 125 students from Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki and 160 students from Enugu State University of Science and Technology formed the sample. Parenting Styles Questionnaire (PSQ) and Antisocial Behaviour Questionnaire (ABQ) were used for the collection of the data. Only duly completed copies of the questionnaire returned and were used to answer the research questions and test the null hypothesis. Mean and standard deviation were used to answer research question one while research

question two was answered using Pearson's product moment correlation and simple linear regression analysis was used to test the hypothesis.

### III. RESULTS

**Research Question One:** What is the level of antisocial behaviour of students in both federal and state universities?

**Table 1:** Mean and standard deviation of the antisocial behaviour ratings of students in both federal and state universities

Item Statement	University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Decision
1. I had gotten into trouble due to my rude behaviour in the campus	Federal University	810	1.75	.97	Low Level
	State University	440	1.70	1.01	Low Level
2. I have been rude in a public place so that people complained about my behavior	Federal University	810	1.65	.86	Low Level
	State University	440	1.60	.81	Low Level
3. I had stolen something from the campus	Federal University	810	1.55	.78	Low Level
	State University	440	1.56	.98	Low Level
4. I had set fire, tried to set fire or causing riot to something on purpose	Federal University	810	1.58	.79	Low Level
	State University	440	1.59	.84	Low Level
5. I had hurt or injured my fellow student on purpose	Federal University	810	1.59	.79	Low Level
	State University	440	1.50	.95	Low Level
6. I sold something that does not belong to me or I knew was stolen from the hostel	Federal University	810	1.59	.84	Low Level
	State University	440	1.57	.87	Low Level
7. I had kicked, hit or punched someone else on a purpose with the intention of really hurting them	Federal University	810	1.55	.82	Low Level
	State University	440	1.53	.93	Low Level
8. I had broken into a room in the campus in an attempt to steal something.	Federal University	810	1.58	.79	Low Level
	State University	440	1.51	.83	Low Level

9.	I had hit spat or thrown stones at someone I know in the school	Federal University	810	1.63	.85	Low Level
		State University	440	1.57	.86	Low Level
10.	I had threatened to hurt someone I know in the campus	Federal University	810	1.60	.79	Low Level
		State University	440	1.51	.90	Low Level
11.	I had ignored a lecturer I know on purpose or left them out of things	Federal University	810	1.72	.86	Low Level
		State University	440	1.56	.92	Low Level
12.	In the recent past, I had sold an illegal drug to someone or taken drugs	Federal University	810	1.54	.83	Low Level
		State University	440	1.58	.90	Low Level
13.	I had written things or sprayed paints on property that do not belong to me	Federal University	810	1.62	.84	Low Level
		State University	440	1.55	.81	Low Level
14.	I always say nasty things to people I know, slagged them off or called them names	Federal University	810	1.68	.88	Low Level
		State University	440	1.59	.90	Low Level
15.	I had broken into a car or van parked in the campus trying to steal something out of it.	Federal University	810	1.52	.80	Low Level
		State University	440	1.58	.81	Low Level
Overall Mean		Federal University	810	1.60	.64	Low Level
		State University	440	1.51	.76	Low Level

Table 1 shows that the mean ratings of the students in both federal and state universities to items 1 to 15 which boarder on the various antisocial behaviour among the students are within the mean range of 1.50 to 3.49. This implies as seen from the response that the students in both federal and state universities in South East Nigeria have low level of antisocial behaviour. The overall standard deviations of 0.64 and 0.76 for the students in federal and state un 91 pectively, indicate that the ratings of the students to the items were closer when compared to those in the state universities.

**H<sub>01</sub>:** There is no significant difference in the mean antisocial behaviour scores of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities in South East Nigeria.



**Table 2:** t-test analysis of the difference in the mean antisocial behaviour scores of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities

University	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Df	t-cal	Sig. ( 2-tailed)
Federal	810	1.60	.64			
State	440	1.51	.76	1248	2.042	.041

Table 2 shows that the probability associated with the calculated value of t (2.042) for the difference in the mean antisocial behaviour scores of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities is 0.041. Since the probability value of 0.041 is less than 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, there is a significant difference in the mean antisocial behaviour scores of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities in South East Nigeria in favour of the students in state universities.

**Research Question Two:** What is the relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities?

**Table 3:** Regression analysis of the relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities

Model	University	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	Federal	.344 <sup>a</sup>	.118	.117	9.147
	State	.622	.687	.385	8.939

a. Predictors: (Constant), Parenting styles

Table 3 shows that the correlation coefficient between the parenting styles of students in federal universities and their antisocial behaviour is 0.344 with a coefficient of determination of 0.118 while the correlation coefficient between the parenting styles of students in the state universities is 0.622 with a coefficient of determination of 0.687. This implies that 11.8% variation in antisocial behaviour of students in federal universities can be as a result of their parenting styles while 68.7% variation in the antisocial behaviour of students in state universities is as result of their parental styles. Thus, there is a positive relationship between the parenting styles of students in both federal and state universities and their antisocial behaviour. This implies that the more the parenting style, the more antisocial behaviour manifestations among universities students depending on the particular parenting style adopted. However, the analysis based on the subscales of parenting styles showed that only the authoritarian parenting style correlated negatively with the antisocial behaviour of the students in both federal and state universities while authoritative, permissive and neglectful parenting styles correlated positively. This by implication shows that the better the authoritarian parenting style, the less the

exhibition of antisocial behaviour among the students of both federal and state universities. Besides, the parenting styles of students in state university correlated highly than those of the students in federal university.

**Ho<sub>3</sub>:** There is no significant relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in Federal and State universities in South East Nigeria.

**Table 4:** Regression analysis of the relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities

Model	University	R	R Square	Standardized Beta	T	Sig
1	Federal	.344 <sup>a</sup>	.118			
	State	.622	.687	.324	11.223	.000
b. Predictors: (Constant), Peer pressure						

Table 4 shows that the probability associated with the calculated t (11.223) for the relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in federal and state universities is 0.000. Since the probability value of 0.000 is less than the 0.05 level of significance, the null hypothesis was rejected. Thus, there is a significant positive relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria with the parenting styles of students in state universities correlating significantly positive with their antisocial behaviour than those of the federal universities.

#### IV. DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The findings of the study revealed that students in both federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria have low level of antisocial behaviour. It was also revealed that there is a significant difference in the mean antisocial behaviour scores of undergraduate students in federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria in favour of the students in state universities. From the responses of the students in both federal and state universities, it was found that the students disagreed to the items on exhibition on antisocial behaviour such as getting into trouble due to rude behaviour in the campus, being rude in a public place, stolen something from the campus, set fire/tried to set fire or causing riot to something on purpose, hurt or injured fellow students on purpose, sold things that do not belong to them or stolen from the hostel, kicked/hit or punched someone else on purpose with the intention of really hurting them, broken into a room in the campus in an attempt to steal something, hit, spat or thrown stones at someone I know in the school, threatened to hurt someone I know in the campus, had ignored a lecturer I know on purpose or left them out of things.

These findings are consistent with the findings of Hallahan (2006). According to Hallahan (2006), students of high school exhibit overt antisocial behaviour such as verbal abuse, bullying and hitting, or covert,

involving aggressive actions against property such as theft, vandalism and fire-setting. Covert antisocial behaviour in early childhood may include noncompliance, sneaking, lying or secretly destroying another's property (Hallahan, 2006). Similarly, antisocial behaviour also includes drug and alcohol abuse and high-risk activities involving self and others. Buttressing these findings, Nwanneka, Ikediashi and Akande (2015) found that students in schools engage in antisocial activities such as under-age smoking, alcoholism, pilfering, cultism, rape, prostitution and violence.

The findings of the study showed that there is a positive relationship between the parenting styles of students in both federal and state universities and their antisocial behaviour. This implies that the more the parenting style, the more antisocial behaviour manifestations among the universities students depending on the particular parenting style adopted. However, the analysis based on the subscales of parenting styles showed that only the authoritarian parenting style correlated negatively with the antisocial behaviour of the students in both federal and state universities while authoritative, permissive and neglectful parenting styles correlated positively. This, by implication shows that the better the authoritarian parenting style, the less the exhibition of antisocial behaviour among the students of both federal and state universities. Besides, the parenting styles of students in state universities correlated highly unlike those of the students in federal universities. Further analysis showed that there is a significant positive relationship between parenting styles and antisocial behaviour of undergraduate students in both federal and state universities in South East, Nigeria with the parenting styles of students in state universities correlating significantly positive with their antisocial behaviour than those of the federal universities.

These findings agree with the findings of Okorodudu (2010) and Erinisha (2012). Okorodudu found that parenting styles correlated with adolescents' delinquency with neglectful and permissive parenting styles correlating positively while authoritarian parenting style correlated negatively. Also, Erinisha found that negative parenting styles such as autocratic, permissive and neglectful parenting styles correlated very positively with students' antisocial behaviour. These findings are plausible in the sense that the way parents bring up or relate with their children can determine how they will behave within and outside the home. It then behoves on the parents to adopt the best style of parenting in order to instil good behaviour in their children.

## **V. CONCLUSIONS**

From the findings of the study, the researcher concluded that parenting styles are major determinants of their exhibition of antisocial behaviour in both federal and state universities. It has been established from the outcome of this study that the better the parenting style, the less they exhibit antisocial behaviour. Parenting styles have a significant positive relationship with students' exhibition of antisocial behaviour. With respect to parenting styles, authoritarian parenting style correlated negatively with antisocial behaviour while authoritative, permissive and neglectful correlated positively with antisocial behaviour. Thus, the more the authoritative, permissive and neglectful parenting styles, the more the exhibition of antisocial behaviour by the students in both federal and state universities.

## VI. Recommendations

From the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made by the researcher.

1. Parents should be enlightened through seminars and workshops on the appropriate style of parenting to adopt. Such workshops and seminar should be organized by the school authorities through the intervention of both federal and state governments. This will help the parents to raise their wards in such a manner that they will not engage in antisocial activities.
2. School guidance counsellors should carryout proper guidance of the students on the development of good socio-personal relationships by allowing the students to know the dangers of engaging in antisocial activities.
3. Parents and guardians should show love and care to their children and wards. When there is a need to punish a child for wrongdoing, the punishment must be mild and corrective rather than harsh and punitive.
4. Parents and guardians should provide their children with good example of acceptable behaviours in the society by exhibiting and maintaining acceptable societal values and norms.
5. There should be early detection and immediate correction of repeated lying, cheating, stealing, non-compliance and other disruptive behaviour in children, so that such behaviour will not lead to antisocial behaviour later in life.

## REFERENCES

1. Achagh, W.I., Ezema, Victor S., Ogundele, B.B., Ekele, C.B., Badamasi, A.E., Ashefor, H.A., Okondugba, A.C., Okenyi, E.C., Ibiam, J.U., Otta, F.E., Ifelunni, C.O., Ugwu, G.C., Orji, J.C. & Ugwuanyi, C.S. (2020). Parental Demographic Variables as Determinants of Knowledge of Nutritional Needs of Preschoolers in North Central Zone, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 12(5).
2. Akpam, E. G. (2012) Parental involvement in examination malpractice in primary, secondary and tertiary levels of education: The role of the counsellor. In: ObyNwafor, C. Mordi and N. Nwaka (eds). *Examination Malpractice in Nigeria*,( Lagos: West and Solomon Publishing Coy. Ltd.
3. Alberto, P.A & Troutman, A.C. (2003) Applied behavior analysis for teachers, 9th Edition. Retrieved on 7/9/2016 from <https://www.pearson.com/us/higher-education/product/Alberto-Applied-Behavior-Analysis-for-Teachers-9th-Edition/9780132655972.html>
4. Barnes, W. M. (2002). The relationship between exposure to community violence, depression, and authoritative parenting style. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences & Engineering*, 62(9-B), 4208.
5. Baumrind, D . (2005) Patterns of parental authority and adolescent autonomy. *New Directions for Child and Adolescent Development*,108, 61–69.

6. Beyers, W. & Goosens, L. (2003). Psychological separation and adjustment to university: Moderating effects of gender, age and perceived parenting style. *Journal of Adolescence Research*. Retrieved on 7/8/2016 from <https://biblio.ugent.be/publication/298423>
7. Bibi, F. Chaudhry, A., Awan, E & Tanq. B (2013) Contribution of Parenting Style in life domain of Children. Retrieved on 4/7/2016 from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jhss/papers/Vol12-issue2/M01229195.pdf>
8. Burt, S.A. (2009). Are there meaningful etiological differences within antisocial behavior? Results of a meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.12.004>.
9. Chris, B. (2011) Why is teenage Pregnancy conceptualized as a social Problem? A review of quantitative research from the USA and UK, Culture, Health & Sexuality. *International Journal for Research, Intervention and Care*, 6(3), PP. 255-272.
10. Eya, M.N., Attah, F.O., Nwoji, I.H., Ugwuanyi, C.S., Okeke, C.I.O. & Ekwueme, U.H. (2020). SocioPsychological Factors as Correlates of Students' Performance in Chemistry: Implication for Science and Engineering Education. *International Journal of Mechanical and Production Engineering Research and Development (IJMPERD)*, 10(4), 239–248. <https://doi.org/10.24247/ijmpesdaug202021>
11. Ezema, V.S., Ejiofor, J.N., Orji. J.C., Okenyi, E.C., Achagh, W.I., Ibiam, J.I., Ugwuanyi, C.S., Ilechukwu, L.C., & Nnadi, E.M. (2019). Estimation of the predictive powers of teachers' pedagogical skills on pupils' academic achievement in Christian Religious Studies in South-East, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 11(14), 30-36.
12. Hallahan, C. (2006). Antisocial behaviour. Retrieved June 25, 2011, from <http://www.health of children.com/A/Antisocial-Behaviour.html>.
13. Hallahan F. D (2006). *Exceptional Learners: Introduction to Special Education* (9th Edition). New York. Allyn and Bacon.
14. Latouf, N., & Dunn, M. (2010). Parenting styles affecting the social behaviour of five-year olds. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 20(1), 109–112.
15. Miller, J. M., DiOrio, C., & Dudley, W. (2002). Parenting style and adolescent's reaction to conflict: Is there a relationship. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 31(6), 463-468.
16. Mounts, N. S. (2005). Parental management of peer relationships in context: The role of parenting style. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 16(1), 58-69.
17. Mount M. K, Murray R.B, Steve M.S (2005). Higher-Order Dimensions Of The Big Five Personality Traits And The Big Six Vocational Interest Types. *Pers. Psycho.*, 58: 447– 478.
18. Nwanneka N. Ikediashi & Joseph A. Akande (2015) Anti Social Behaviours among Nigerian adolescents. *Journal of Research & Method in Education (IOSR-JRME)* retrieved on 3/4/2017 from <http://www.iosrjournals.org/iosr-jrme/papers/Vol-5%20Issue-4/Version-1/E05413136.pdf>.
19. Obikeze, N and Obi, I (2013) Alcohol and violence among undergraduate students of Anambra State University. *Research Journal in organizational Psychology and Educational Studies*, 2(1), 2013, 18-24.
20. Okenyi, E. C., Ngwoke, A. N., Ugwu, G. C., Aneke, A. O., Ifelunni, C. O., Ebizie, E. N., Orji, J. C., Ejiofor, J. N., Njoku, O.C., Ezema, V. S., Achagh, W. I., Ibiam, J. U. & Ugwuanyi, C. S. (2019).

- Estimate of the predictive power of parental support and domestic violence on child abuse among primary school pupils in South-East, Nigeria. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 11(14), 23-28.
21. Okorodudu, R. I. and Okorodudu G. N (2003) An Overview of Conduct Problems of the Nigeria Child. World Forum on Childcare and Education, Acapulco- Mexico. Retrieved on 6/5/2016 from <http://www.ied.edu.hk/cric/new/apjted/index.htm>
  22. Okpako, J.E.F. (2004). *Parenting the Nigeria adolescents towards smooth transition to adulthood*: In Nwawoke, C.I. A Bangbuse O. and Mnokola A. (eds) *contemporary issue and researching adolescents*. Ibadan: Onwade Printing Press.
  23. Perez, J. C. & Cumsille, P. (2012) Adolescent temperament and Parental control in the development of the adolescent decision making in a Chilean sample. *Journal of Adolescence*, <https://www.tib.eu/de/suchen/id/BLSE%3ARN312642746/Adolescent-temperament-and-parental-control-in/>
  24. Plotnik, R & Kouyoumdjian, H. (2010). *Introduction to Psychology*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing. Retrieved on 8/9/2016 from <https://www.verywell.com/types-of-parenting-styles-1095045>.
  25. Squires, P. (2008) *ASBO nation: the criminalization of nuisance*. Bristol, UK: Policy Press
  26. Terry, D.J. (2004). Investigating the relationship between parenting styles and deviant behaviours. *Mcnair scholars journal*, Retrieved on 7/9/2016 from <http://www.scholarworks.gvsu.edu/menair/vol8/iss/11>.
  27. Ugwuanyi, C.S. & Okeke, C.I.O. (2020). Determinants of University students' interest in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Education in Nigeria: A case of a structural equation modelling. *International Journal of Mechanical and Production Engineering Research and Development*, 10(3): 6209–6218. <http://dx.doi.org/10.24247/ijmperdjun2020590>
  28. Ugwuanyi, C. S., Okeke C. O., & Ageda T. A., (2020a). Psychological predictors of physics learners' achievement: The moderating influence of gender. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Science*. 15(4), 834-842. DOI: 10.18844/cjes.vvii.4635.
  29. Ugwuanyi, C.S., Okeke, C.I.O. & Njeze, K.C. (2020b). Parenting Style and Parental Support on Learners' Academic Achievement. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 11(3-4): 198-205. <https://doi.org/10.31901/24566764.2020/11.3-4.352> URL: <http://krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSSA/JSSA-11-0-000-20-Web/JSSA-11-0-000-20-Contents/JSSA-11-0-000-20-Contents.htm>
  30. Ugwuanyi, C.S., Okeke, C. I.O., & Ageda, T.A. (2020c). Motivation and Self-efficacy as Predictors of Learners' Academic Achievement. *Journal of Sociology and Social Anthropology*, 11(3-4): 215-222. <https://doi.org/10.31901/24566764.2020/11.3-4.351> URL: <http://krepublishers.com/02-Journals/JSSA/JSSA-11-0-000-20-Web/JSSA-11-0-000-20-Contents/JSSA-11-0-000-20-Contents.htm>
  31. Ugwuanyi, C. S., Okeke, C.I.O. & Asomugha, C.G., (2020d). Prediction of learners' mathematics performance by their emotional intelligence, self-esteem, and self-efficacy. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*. 15(3), 492- 501. <https://doi.org/10.18844/cjes.vvii.4916>
  32. 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.