

## **Relationship of Fathers' Parenting Style with Secondary School Students' Anti Social Behaviour**

**Uzma Kirn\***

**Muhammad Tahir Khan Farooqi\*\***

**Shazina Zia\*\*\***

### **Abstract**

*The study at hand was aimed to find out relationship between father's parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour. Population of the study consisted of all students of 10<sup>th</sup> grade enrolled in public secondary schools of the Punjab province i.e. session 2015-2016. Multistage random sampling technique was used to select the sample. Sample selected for the study comprised of 390 students (190 male and 200 female). Data were analyzed through SPSS version 20 and MS Excel 2010. Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Buri (1991) was used to measure fathers' parenting style while students' anti-social behaviour was measured using STAB (Sub-Types of Antisocial Behaviour). STAB was originally developed by Burt and Donnellan (2009). To measure fathers' parenting styles and students' antisocial behaviour, mean and standard deviation were calculated. Correlation was computed to measure relationship between above mentioned variables. Results of the study revealed that authoritarian is the most perceived while permissive is the least perceived parenting style among secondary school students. Children of authoritarian as well as permissive fathers are the most antisocial behaviour exhibitors. No significant relationship was found between fathers' authoritative parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour. Fathers should employ authoritative parenting style to deal with children's antisocial behaviour.*

**Keywords:** Parenting style, Authoritative, Authoritarian, Permissive, Anti-social behaviour.

### **Background of the Study**

Parents have been bestowed due respect in Islam. Quran' o Sunnah bequeaths luminous codes in this phenomenon. Hazrat Muhammad (PBUH) said, "No child is born but upon Fitra (as a Muslim). It is her parents who make him a Jew or a Christian or a Polytheist" (The Hadith, n.d). It is historically evident that since the inception of mankind,

---

\* M. Phil Scholar, University of Okara. (kirnuzma53@gmail.com)

\*\* Assistant Professor, University of Okara. E mail: drtahirfarooqi@ue.edu.pk, drtahirfarooqi@hotmail.com (Corresponding Author)

\*\*\* M. Phil Scholar, University of Okara. ziashazina@gmail.com)

the parents remained the major source of training and guidance of their kids. This mode of training and educating to their children is called Parenting style. As Johnson (2012) defined that parenting style are those strategies which one uses in child rearing. Similarly, Akhtar (2012) stated that it is a flexible construct having plethora of techniques accorded by parents to rear their children. It is universal phenomenon that usually fathers are unaware of the effects of their parenting style on children's behaviour. The choice of parenting style heavily influenced the personal experiences of a child, perception of father role, popular beliefs and socioeconomic status of a person (Kopko, 2007).

Parenting style is the mouth word of theorists and practitioners since long time ago. As Baumrind (1966) classified parenting style into three types i.e. authoritarian, permissive and authoritative (Basirion, Majid, & Jelas, 2014). As for as authoritarian parenting style (ATS) is concerned, it is a parents centered approach (Coplan, Hastings, Lagacé-Séguin, & Moulton, 2002) based on belief that parents are the authority and emphasizes on submission and compliance from children (Geeraert, Van den Noortgate, Grietens, & Onghena, 2004). The authoritarian fathers have clear expectations and more control over their children. They do not give explanations for their acts. They use reward and punishment as a disciplinary technique and enforce rules (Baumrind, 1967). They are not responsive to the needs of their children. They do not allow their young ones to take decisions. Resultantly, the children of authoritarian fathers learn early how to please their parents (Burt & Donnellan, 2009). They are highly demanding but not responsive to their children's needs (Hoskins, 2014). Moreover, Darling (1999) reported two categories of authoritarian fathers i.e. authoritarian-directive and autocratic. Autocratic fathers are more intrusive as compared to authoritarian directive ones.

The second type of parenting style is permissive. The permissive father does not disturb his child's activities. He gives them full freedom without any responsibility. He behaves like friend not an authority. He is afraid of imposing limits because his children would dislike him. His only goal is to make his children feel happy (Schaffer, Clark, & Jeglic, 2009).

The third type is Authoritative Parenting Style (APS) which is characterized as high on both demandingness and responsiveness scale (Hoskins, 2014). APS is a child-centered approach and typically identified with concerted cultivation parenting style (Cheadle, 2008). Authoritative fathers encourage their children to take decisions and face the consequences of their choices. They are warm and involve with their children. Baumrind (1991) favoured APS out of the three styles because the best of authoritarian i.e. demandingness and the best of permissive style i.e. responsiveness are both present in this style. APS offers balance between freedom and responsibility as parents give reasons for their acts (Hoeve et al., 2008).

Additionally, Maccoby and Martin (1983) further expanded Baumrinds' (1971) theory by introducing Uninvolved Parenting Style (UPS). Hoskins (2014) argued that

uninvolved fathers are neither responsive nor demanding. Tiller (2002) observed that UPS is least researched parenting style because uninvolved fathers are not cooperative enough to participate in study. Uninvolved fathers remain unaware of their children's activities. Walker and Smreker (2002) claimed that there are many reasons behind this kind of parenting style. Fathers are too busy to give attention, have preferences other than their children, are addicted and cannot pay heed to their children's matters.

It is empirically proved across the globe that parenting style is one out of various factors that develop students' behaviour (Schaffer, Clark, & Jeglic, 2009) which affects students' success or failure at school. As Gillman, (2005) stated that behaviour is as we act or conduct ourselves, especially towards others. Attitude is internal while behaviour is an external expression (Myers, 2004). There are two types of behaviour i.e. pro social and anti-social. Prosocial behaviour is identified with willingly supporting others e.g. saying words of comfort or to help others in achieving their goals (Veenstra, 2008).

On the other hand, anti-social behaviour is defined as violating social norms. It is characterized by harming oneself or others intentionally. Antisocial behaviour can also be categorized in another way i.e. absence of prosocial behaviour and presence of anti-social behaviour. Willoughby, Smitt, and Bryant (2001) stated two categories of antisocial behaviour i.e. covert and overt. Burt and Donnellan (2009) developed a questionnaire named STAB (Sub Types of Antisocial Behaviour) and identified three subtypes of antisocial behaviour i.e. physical aggression, social aggression and rule breaking.

The researchers Azimi, Vaziri, and Kashani (2012) defined aggression as fatal, harmful and unfriendly behaviour that people demonstrate due to disappointment. Rapid increase in the reports of aggressive acts has boosted up its importance so that we may deal with it as a psychological problem (Trenas, Osuna, Olivares, & Cabrera, 2013). Consequences of students' anti-social behaviour are quite destructive because students indulge in harming others, rudeness, verbal abuse etc. (Johnson, 2012). It is a clinically approved behaviour disorder and must be treated like a disease. The major causes of anti-social behaviour include personal experiences, media influence, domestic violence and parenting style etc.

In the light of above mentioned review of relevant studies, it has been concluded that there is significant relationship between fathers' parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour. Authoritarian parenting style has adverse psychological effects on students' behaviour. Children of authoritarian fathers have lack of social knacks and confidence (Barber, Stolz, Olsen, Collins, & Burchinal, 2005). Father's harsh punishment and low level of support lead students towards behavioural problems. As Schaffer, Clark, and Jeglic (2009) claimed that permissive parenting style is positively associated with children behavioural problems because high level of support and low level of

demandingness nurtures socially immature students. They feel hesitation while facing challenges.

While unlimited freedom with no responsibility leads towards irresponsible and disruptive behaviour on the part of the students (Sailor, 2004). Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, and Dornbusch (2006) theorized that the students who are brought up by permissive parenting style are immature, overprotected and easily got under pressure by their fellows. Their academic grades are also poor. Authoritative fathers do not use punishment as a disciplinary technique (Hoeve et al., 2008). Their high level of support and control lead their children to become less dependent and depressed. Resultantly, students usually have better self-esteem and are more cooperative. Maccoby and Martin (1983) also termed authoritative as optimal parenting style. Each parenting style has its benefits and limitations. Many studies have been conducted to find out causes of anti-social behaviour. The study at hand focuses on students' antisocial behaviour by dint of parenting style.

#### *Statement of the Problem*

The study was planned to investigate the relationship of fathers' parenting style with secondary school students' anti social behaviour.

#### *Objectives of the Study*

Objectives of the study were as follows:

1. To explore fathers' parenting styles as perceived by public secondary school students of the Punjab province.
2. To find out antisocial behaviour of secondary school students.
3. To investigate relationship between parenting styles and students' antisocial behaviour.

#### *Research Questions*

Following research questions were formulated to achieve the objectives of the study:

1. Do students enrolled in public secondary schools perceive their fathers' parenting style similar?
2. Do students enrolled in public secondary schools possess same antisocial behaviour?
3. Does there any significant relationship exist between public secondary school students' perception about their fathers' parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour?

### *Delimitations of the Study*

Due to time, resources and financial constraints, this study was delimited to public secondary schools of the Punjab province only and 10<sup>th</sup> grade children from these schools.

### **Methodology**

The study was correlational in nature as the researchers were intended to find out the correlation between fathers' parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour. Data were collected through survey method. According to Louis, Lawrence, and Keith (2007) survey is used to describe the characteristics of a population on certain variables e.g. behaviour etc. When the targeted population is too large to get access, we use survey type study.

Population of the study comprised of all public secondary school students of the Punjab province enrolled in session 2014-2015. There are 6266 secondary schools in the Punjab province having 3387 male schools and 2879 female schools. Total enrolment of secondary school students in Punjab was found to be 3750205 consisting of 2168715 males and 1581390 females (www.schools.gov.pk on April 6, 2016).

Multistage random sampling (fish bowl method) was used to select the sample. It was not feasible for the researcher to approach the whole population due to time and resources constraints, thus the researcher randomly selected three divisions namely, Sahiwal, Faisalabad and Multan. Further, one district was also randomly selected from each division i.e. Okara, Faisalabad and Khanewal respectively.

**Table 1**

*District Wise Division of the Selected Schools*

Sr.no.	Division	District	Schools				Total
			Urban		Rural		
			Male	Female	Male	Female	
1.	Sahiwal	Okara	2	2	2	2	8
2.	Faisalabad	Faisalabad	2	2	2	2	8
3.	Multan	Khanewal	2	2	2	2	8
Total			6	6	6	6	24

District wise distribution of schools is presented in the aforementioned table. Eight schools from each district were taken as the sample of the study. Further, twenty students from each school participated in the study.

**Table 2**

*District Wise Distribution of Participants*

District Name	Sample Size	Responses	Response Rate
Okara	160	160	100%
Faisalabad	160	135	84.4%
Khanewal	160	95	59.38%
Total	480	390	81.3%

Table 2 describes that 480 students were approached to participate in the study whereas 390 students responded. Therefore, the response rate was 81.3%.

*Instrumentation*

To collect data from selected sample of the study, following two types of information were required.

1. Fathers' parenting styles as perceived by students enrolled in public secondary schools of the Punjab province.
2. Students' antisocial behaviour

Data were collected with the help of two questionnaires i.e. PAQ (Parental Authority Questionnaire) and STAB (Sub Types of Antisocial Behaviour). Separate instruments were used to measure both variables. The researcher got the permission to use the instruments. The questionnaires were bi-lingually translated i.e. Urdu & English. Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) developed by Buri (1991) was used to measure parenting styles. Due permission was sought from the owner of the instrument. It was generously granted on 21 Sep, 2015. It consisted of 30 items. Each subset of PAQ comprised of 10 items. Translated version of Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) was tried out on 80 secondary school students of district Sahiwal. Keeping in view the nature of questionnaire, PAQ was filled out by students themselves. The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient was 0.79. After reliability and validity analysis, it was concluded that bilingual version of PAQ proved to be valid and reliable tool to measure parenting styles as perceived by Punjab public secondary school students in Pakistani context.

The second questionnaire was developed by Burt and Donnellan (2009). The permission to use this questionnaire was obtained on Sep 19, 2015. It is a Lickert type close-ended instrument and consisted of 32 items. It has three factors related to antisocial behaviour i.e. physical aggression, social aggression and rule breaking having reliability coefficient 0.86. First part of the instrument was to take demographic information for both parents and children i.e. name and gender of the student, locality of the school etc. These items portrait a clear and sound background of respondents. Translated version of STAB was tested on same sample size as described earlier for pilot study of PAQ. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficient of STAB scale is raised from 0.86 to 0.88 after

deleting five items (1, 2, 4, 6 &13) from STAB scale due to low item-total correlation. The scale actually used in research comprised of 27 items.

#### *Data Collection*

Researchers personally administered both questionnaires in Okara, Faisalabad and Khanewal district.

#### **Data Analysis and Interpretation**

Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 20 and Microsoft Excel 2010 were used to analyze the data.

**Table 3**

#### *Descriptive Statistics on Subsets Fathers' PAQ*

Father's Parenting Style	M	SD
Authoritative	3.21	0.63
Authoritarian	3.29	0.54
Permissive	2.78	0.58

Table 3 shows the mean scores on the subsets of Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) as perceived by students enrolled in public secondary schools of the Punjab province about their fathers' parenting style. Majority of students perceive authoritarian (M=3.29, SD=0.54) parenting style to be most employed by their fathers. Whereas Permissive (M=2.78, SD=0.58) parenting style is the least perceived parenting style.

**Table 4**

#### *Descriptive Statistics on Subsets of STAB*

Subsets of STAB	Mean	SD
Physical Aggression	1.70	0.59
Social Aggression	1.67	0.52
Rule Breaking	1.45	0.41

Table 4 shows mean scores of public secondary school students on subscales of antisocial behaviour. Figures indicate that physical aggression (M=1.70, SD=0.59) is the most exhibited antisocial behaviour by students and rule breaking (M=1.45, SD=0.41) is the least one. Social Aggression (M=1.67, SD=0.52) is the second most exhibited subtype of antisocial behaviour.

**Table 5**

*Correlation between fathers' parenting styles and students' anti-social behaviour*

Respondent	N	Mean	S. D	Correlation(r)	Sig.Value
Parenting Styles	390	3.09	0.42	0.16**	0.001
Children's Antisocial Behaviour	390	1.59	0.43		

N=390, \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01

Table 5 reflects that Pearson Correlation “r” value (0.16\*\*) is significant beyond at significance level  $\alpha=0.01$ . Hence, answer to the research question is that there exists a significant positive relationship between fathers' parenting style and students' anti-social behaviour.

**Table 6**

*Correlation between Subscales of fathers' parenting style and children's anti-social behaviour*

Parenting Style	N	Mean	S. D	Correlation(r)	Sig.value
Authoritative	390	3.21	0.63	0.009	0.08
Authoritarian	390	3.29	0.54	0.11*	0.04
Permissive	390	2.78	0.58	0.15**	0.003

N=390, \*p<0.05, \*\*p<0.01

Table 6 reflects that Pearson Correlation “r” value (0.009) is not significant beyond at significance level  $\alpha=0.05$ . Moreover, Correlation between authoritative parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour is negligible since  $r=0.009 < 0.1$  (Bartz, 1999). Students' antisocial behaviour is significantly correlated with fathers' authoritarian ( $r=.11^*$  &  $p=0.04 < 0.05$ ) and permissive ( $r=.15^{**}$  &  $p=0.003 < 0.01$ ) parenting style. It leads us to conclude that there exists no significant relationship between fathers' authoritative parenting style and students' anti-social behaviour. However, there is a significant relationship between fathers' authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and students' antisocial behaviour.



**Table 7**

*Correlation between Subsets of Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) and Subtypes of Antisocial Behaviour (STAB)*

Factors of Parenting Styles	Factors of Antisocial Behaviour					
	Physical Aggression		Social Aggression		Rule Breaking	
	<i>r</i> - value	Sig.value	<i>r</i> -value	Sig.value	<i>r</i> -value	Sig.value
Authoritative	0.01	0.06	0.05	0.33	0.09	0.07
Authoritarian	0.16**	0.002	0.11*	0.03	0.008	0.88
Permissive	0.211**	0.000	0.06	0.28	0.163**	0.001

N=390, \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$

Table 7 depicts that Pearson  $r$  values of the relationship between authoritative parenting style and all three subsets of STAB scale are negligible ( $r=0.01, 0.05, 0.09 < 0.1$ ) and insignificant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level. Authoritarian parenting style is significantly correlated with physical aggression,  $r=0.16^{**}, p=0.002 < 0.01$  as well as social aggression subscale as  $r=0.11^{*}, p=0.03 < 0.05$ . Permissive parenting style is significantly correlated with physical aggression i.e.  $r=0.211^{**}, p=0.000 < 0.01$ . and rule breaking subscale as  $r=0.163^{**}, p=0.001 < 0.01$ . All other correlations are insignificant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level. Therefore, it is concluded that a positive significant relationship exists between authoritarian parenting style and physical and social aggression subscales. Permissive parenting style is significantly correlated with physical aggression and rule breaking subscales. However, authoritative parenting style is not significantly correlated with any subscale of antisocial behaviour. Moreover, correlations between authoritative parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour are negligible.

## Findings

- 1) A comparison of the mean scores on the subsets of Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) as perceived by students enrolled in public secondary schools of the Punjab province about their fathers' parenting style revealed that majority of students perceive authoritarian ( $M=3.29, SD=0.54$ ) parenting style to be most employed by their fathers. Whereas Permissive ( $M=2.78, SD=0.58$ ) parenting style is the least perceived parenting style. (Table 3)
- 2) Students enrolled in Punjab public secondary schools exhibit more antisocial behaviour in terms of physical aggression ( $M=1.70, SD=0.59$ ) & social aggression ( $M=1.67, SD=0.52$ ) and are less inclined to rule breaking ( $M=1.45, SD=0.41$ ). (Table 4)
- 3) Analysis reflects that Pearson Correlation " $r$ " value ( $0.16^{**}$ ) is significant beyond at significance level  $\alpha=0.01$ . Hence, it is found that there exists a

significant positive relationship between fathers' parenting style and students' anti-social behaviour. (Table 5)

- 4) Pearson Correlation " $r$ " value (0.009) is not significant beyond at significance level  $\alpha=0.01$ . Moreover, correlation between authoritative parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour is negligible since  $r=0.009<0.1$ . Students' antisocial behaviour is significantly correlated with fathers' authoritarian ( $r=.11^*$  &  $p=0.04<0.05$ ) and permissive ( $r=.15^{**}$  &  $p=0.003<0.01$ ) parenting style. It leads us to conclude that there exists no significant relationship between fathers' authoritative parenting style and students' anti-social behaviour. However, there is a significant relationship between fathers' authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and students' antisocial behaviour. (Table 6)
- 5) Pearson  $r$  values of the relationship between authoritative parenting style and all three subsets of STAB scale are negligible ( $r=0.01, 0.05, 0.09<0.1$ ) and insignificant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level. There is a significant correlation between authoritarian parenting style and physical aggression,  $r=0.16^{**}$ ,  $p=0.002<0.01$ . Authoritarian parenting style is also significantly correlated with social aggression subscale as  $r=0.11^*$ ,  $p=0.03<0.05$ . Permissive parenting style is significantly correlated with physical aggression i.e.  $r=0.211^{**}$ ,  $p=0.000<0.01$  and rule breaking subscale as  $r=0.163^{**}$ ,  $p=0.001<0.01$ . All other correlations are insignificant at  $\alpha=0.05$  level. Therefore, it is concluded that a positive significant relationship exists between authoritarian parenting style and physical and social aggression subscales. Permissive parenting style is significantly correlated with physical aggression and rule breaking subscales. However, authoritative parenting style is not significantly correlated with any subscale of antisocial behaviour. Moreover, correlation between authoritative parenting style and students' antisocial behaviour is negligible. (Table 7)

## **Conclusions**

- 1) Authoritarian parenting style is the most perceived fathers' parenting style by secondary school students. (Finding 1)
- 2) Physical aggression is the most exhibited antisocial behaviour while rule breaking is the least possessed behaviour by public secondary school students. (Finding 2)
- 3) Fathers' parenting style contributes significantly to lead students towards antisocial behaviour. Fathers' authoritative parenting style is not related with students' antisocial behaviour but authoritarian as well as permissive parenting style leads the students towards antisocial behaviour. Moreover, fathers' permissive parenting style is more significantly correlated with students' antisocial behaviour than authoritarian parenting style. Authoritarian parenting style is the major reason behind students' possession of physically and socially

aggressive behaviour. Students having permissive fathers are more inclined towards physical aggression and rule breaking. (Finding 3,4,5)

## **Discussion**

The study at hand rectify the results of previous studies (Hoeve et al., 2008; Schaffer et al., 2009) revealing that a significant positive relationship was found between parenting styles and children's antisocial behaviour. A great number of researches are in line with the results of present study at hand that authoritarian parenting style (ATS) is significantly correlated with children's score on physical and social aggression subscales of Sub-Types of Antisocial Behaviour (STAB). Authoritarian parents are highly demanding but it creates negative perfectionism on the part of child. Authoritarian parenting style has adverse psychological effects on children's behaviour. Children of authoritarian parents are dissatisfied, introverted, have adjustment problems with their fellow beings, lack social knacks and confidence (Barber, Stolz, Olsen, Collins, & Burchinal, 2005) and are more disheartened and worried as compared to other children (Milevsky, Schlechter, Netter, & Keehn, 2007). ATS characterized by high level of control sometimes leads children towards the opposite side and children become rebellious (Miller, Benson, & Galbraith, 2001; Sailor, 2004). In its extreme form, when parents accord physical punishment with oral abuse it will lead a child towards suicide in order to get rid of challenging situations (Gershoff, 2002).

Previous researches (Azimi, Vaziri, & Kashani, 2012; Baumrind, 1967; Querido, Warner, & Eyberg, 2002; Sailor, 2004; Santrock, 2007; Schaffer, Clark, & Jeglic, 2009; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts, & Dornbusch, 2006; Mullens, 2004; Wright & Cullen, 2001) rectify the results of present study demonstrating that permissive parenting style is significantly correlated with physical aggression and rule breaking subscales of antisocial behaviour. Children of permissive parents are more antisocial as compared to the children of authoritative or authoritarian parents. The results of study conducted by Schaffer, Clark, and Jeglic (2009) provide empirical evidence for this conclusion. Social skills of the children are fully developed because they are given the opportunities to express themselves. Children begin to overpower their parents because parents want to have friendly relationship at any cost (Azimi, Vaziri, & Kashani 2012). They do not realize the need of showing appropriate behaviour and always want their desires to be fulfilled (Santrock, 2007). Such children consider this world as a laboratory and do not afraid of being indulged in illegal activities (Querido, Warner, & Eyberg, 2002). Schaffer, Clark, and Jeglic (2009) claimed that permissive parenting style is positively associated with behavioural problems. High level of support and low level of demandingness produce such children as are socially immature, self-catered, irresponsible and unconcerned about others' welfare. They feel hesitation while facing challenges. Unlimited freedom with no responsibility leads to the disruptive behaviour on the part of the children (Sailor, 2004).

An important finding made by present study i.e. authoritative parenting style is not significantly correlated with children's antisocial behaviour is in line with the results of previous researches (Berg, 2011; Bronte, Moore, & Carrano, 2006; Choe, Olson, & Sameroff, 2013; Gonzalez, Holbein, & Quilter, 2002; Hoeve et al., 2008; Mensah & Kuranchie, 2013; Milevsky, Schlechter, Klem, & Kehl, 2008; Simons & Conger, 2007; Speirs, Neumeister, Williams, & Cross, 2009; Steinberg & Silk, 2002; Turkel & Tezer, 2008; Van Duijvenvoorde, Zanolie, Rombouts, Raijmakers, & Crone, 2008; Wargo, 2007). Children of authoritative parents usually have better self-esteem and are more cooperative, self-confident, cheerful (Baumrind, 1967), less antisocial, more adjusted with the class fellows (Choe, Olson, & Sameroff, 2013), achievement oriented (Gonzalez, Holbein, & Quilter, 2002), altruistic and contented with their lives as compared to those brought through other parenting styles (Milevsky, Schlechter, Klem, & Kehl, 2008). Children do not suffer from insecurities, low self-esteem and anxiety (Simons & Conger, 2007).

To conclude, fathers' authoritarian parenting style as well as permissive parenting style leads children towards antisocial behaviour. Responsiveness and demandingness are desirable qualities. Authoritative style contains the qualities of both. Permissive style lacks control whereas authoritarian lacks support. We can also say that authoritative parenting style stands between the both extremes. Children must know their limits and parents should be forgiving in case of mistakes. Research studies (Baumrind, 1967; Santrock, 2007) support the above-mentioned results.

### **Recommendations**

- 1) Fathers should deal with children's antisocial behaviour by employing authoritative parenting style.
- 2) Permanent post of psychologist should be announced by the education department in public secondary schools for proper guidance and counseling of students exhibiting antisocial behaviour.
- 3) Social skills training program should be conducted to improve prosocial skills of children.
- 4) It is revealed in the study that fathers mostly used authoritarian parenting style. Hence, Education department should arrange training workshops for both teachers and parents so that they can effectively deal with children suffering from antisocial behaviour and participation of fathers must be ensured in parent teacher meetings.

## **References**

- Akhtar, Z. (2012). The effect of parenting style of parents on the attachment styles of undergraduate students. *Language in India*, 12(1), 555-566.
- Azimi, A. L., Vaziri, S., & Kashani, F. L. (2012). Relationship between maternal parenting style and child's aggressive behaviour. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 69(1), 1276-1281.
- Barber, B. K., Stolz, H. E., Olsen, J. A., Collins, W. A., & Burchinal, M. (2005). Parental support, psychological control, and behavioural control: Assessing relevance across time, culture, and method. *Monographs of the society for research in child development*, 70(4), 1-147. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-5834.2005.00365.x
- Bartz, A. E. (1999). Basic statistical concepts (4 ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Basirion, Z., Majid, R. A., & Jelas, Z. M. (2014). Big five personality factors, perceived parenting styles, and perfectionism among academically gifted students. *Asian Social Science*, 10(4), 8-15. doi: 10.5539/ass.v10n4p8
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behaviour. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1966.tb05416.x
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Childcare practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behaviour. *Genetic psychology monographs*, 75(1), 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental psychology*, 4(1p2), 1-103. doi: 10.1037/h0030372
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95.
- Berg, B. (2011). The effects of parenting styles on a preschool aged child's social emotional development (Master's thesis). The Graduate School, University of Wisconsin-Stout.
- Bronte-Tinkew, J., Moore, K. A., & Carrano, J. (2006). The father-child relationship, parenting styles, and adolescent risk behaviours in intact families. *Journal of Family Issues*, 27(6), 850-881.
- Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of personality assessment*, 57(1), 110-119. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa570113
- Burt, S. A., & Donnellan, M. B. (2009). Development and validation of the Subtypes of Antisocial Behaviour Questionnaire. *Aggressive behaviour*, 35(5), 376-398. doi: 10.1002/ab.20314
- Cheadle, J. E. (2008). Educational investment, family context, and children's math and reading growth from kindergarten through the third grade. *Sociology of Education*, 81(1), 1-31. doi: 10.1177/003804070808100101

- Choe, D. E., Olson, S. L., & Sameroff, A. J. (2013). The interplay of externalizing problems and physical and inductive discipline during childhood. *Developmental psychology*, 49(11), 2029. doi:10.1037/a0032054
- Coplan, R. J., Hastings, P. D., Lagacé-Séguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting*, 2(1), 1-26.
- Darling, N. (1999). Parenting Style and Its Correlates. ERIC Digest. {ED427896 1999-03-00 Parenting Style and Its Correlates. ERIC Digest.} ERIC Development Teamwww.eric.ed.gov}
- Geeraert, L., Van den Noortgate, W., Grietens, H., & Onghena, P. (2004). The effects of early prevention programs for families with young children at risk for physical child abuse and neglect: A meta-analysis. *Child Maltreatment*, 9(3), 277-291. doi:10.1177/1077559504264265
- Gershoff, E. T. (2002). Corporal punishment by parents and associated child behaviours and experiences: a meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological bulletin*, 128(4), 539.
- Gonzalez, A. R., Holbein, M. F. D., & Quilter, S. (2002). High school students' goal orientations and their relationship to perceived parenting styles. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27(3), 450-470.
- Hoeve, M., Blokland, A., Dubas, J. S., Loeber, R., Gerris, J. R., & Van der Laan, P. H. (2008). Trajectories of delinquency and parenting styles. *Journal of abnormal child psychology*, 36(2), 223-235. doi:10.1007/S10802-007-9172-x
- Hoskins, D. H. (2014). Consequences of parenting on adolescent outcomes. *Societies*, 4(3), 506-531. doi:10.3390/soc4030506
- Johnson, E. L. (2012). Parenting Styles, Peer Pressure, and the formation of Antisocial Behaviour. (Bachelor of Arts' Thesis), Retrieved from <http://aquilla.usm.edu/honors-theses/101>
- Kopko, K. (2007). Parenting styles and adolescents. Retrieved Nov, 20, 2011, from <https://www.human.cornell.edu>
- Louis, C., Lawrence, M., & Keith, M. (2007). Research methods in education. New York: Routledge.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. *Handbook of child psychology: formerly Carmichael's Manual of child psychology*/Paul H. Mussen, editor.
- Mensah, M. K., & Kuranchie, A. (2013). Influence of parenting styles on the social development of children. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(3), 123-129. doi:10.5901/ajis.2013.v2n3p123

- Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Netter, S., & Keehn, D. (2007). Maternal and paternal parenting styles in adolescents: Associations with self-esteem, depression and life-satisfaction. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 16(1), 39-47. doi:10.1007/s 10826-006-9066-5
- Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Klem, L., & Kehl, R. (2008). Constellations of maternal and paternal parenting styles in adolescence: Congruity and well-being. *Marriage & Family Review*, 44(1), 81-98. doi:10.1080/01494920802185447
- Miller, B. C., Benson, B., & Galbraith, K. A. (2001). Family relationships and adolescent pregnancy risk: A research synthesis. *Developmental review*, 21(1), 1-38. doi:10.1006/drev.2000.0513
- Mullens, A. D. (2004). The relationship between Juvenile delinquency and family unit structure. (Master's Thesis). The Graduate College of Marshall University. Retrieved from <http://mds.marshall.edu/etd/750>
- Myers, G. D. (2004). Social psychology (7th Ed.) Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Querido, J. G., Warner, T. D., & Eyberg, S. M. (2002). Parenting styles and child behaviour in African American families of preschool children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 31(2), 272-277. doi:10.1207/S15374424JCCP310212
- Sailor, D. H. (2004). *Supporting children in their home, school, and community* (pp. 158-159). Allyn and Bacon.
- Santrock, J. (2007). Life Expectancy: A Topical Approach to Life-Span Development, 128-132. (7<sup>th</sup> Ed). Mc Graw Hill.
- Schaffer, M., Clark, S., & Jeglic, E. L. (2009). The role of empathy and parenting style in the development of antisocial behaviours. *Crime & Delinquency*, 55(4), 586-599. doi:10.1177/0011128708321359
- Schools information. (n.d). Retrieved April 6, 2016, from School Education Department website, <http://schools.punjab.gov.pk>
- Simons, L. G., & Conger, R. D. (2007). Linking mother–father differences in parenting to a typology of family parenting styles and adolescent outcomes. *Journal of Family Issues*, 28(2), 212-241. doi:10.1177/0192513X06294593
- Speirs, Neumeister, K. L., Williams, K. K., & Cross, T. L. (2009). Gifted high-school students' perspectives on the development of Southerland, Edwin H. 1939, Principles of Criminology (3<sup>rd</sup> Ed). Philadelphia Lippincott Perfectionism. *Roeper Review*, 31(4), 198-206.
- Steinberg, L., & Silk, J. S. (2002). Parenting adolescents. *Handbook of parenting*, 1, 103-133. doi:10.1111/1532-7795.00001

- Steinberg, L., Blatt-Eisengart, I., & Cauffman, E. (2006). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful homes: A replication in a sample of serious juvenile offenders. *Journal of research on adolescence*, 16(1), 47-58. doi:10.1111/J.1467- 8624.1991.tboo781.x
- The Hadith, (pp. Sahih Muslim, Book 33, Hadith Number 6426).
- Tiller, A. E. (2002). *The Influence of Parenting Styles on Children's Cognitive Development*. USA: State University AgCenter.
- Trenas, A. F. R., Osuna, M. J. P., Olivares, R. R., & Cabrera, J. H. (2013). Relationship between parenting style and aggression in a Spanish children sample. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 82(1), 529-536. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.06.304
- Türkel, Y. D., & Tezer, E. (2008). Parenting styles and learned resourcefulness of Turkish adolescents. *Adolescence*, 43(169), 143-152.
- Van Duijvenvoorde, A. C., Zanolie, K., Rombouts, S. A., Raijmakers, M. E., & Crone, E. A. (2008). Evaluating the negative or valuing the positive? Neural mechanisms supporting feedback-based learning across development. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 28(38), 9495-9503.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2008). Prosocial and antisocial behaviour in preadolescence: Teachers' and parents' perceptions of the behaviour of girls and boys. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, 32(3), 243-251. doi:10.1177/0165025408089274
- Wargo, E. (2007). Adolescents and risk: Helping young people make better choices. *Research Facts and Findings*, 1-4.
- Willoughby, M., Kupersmidt, J., & Bryant, D. (2001). Overt and covert dimensions of antisocial behaviour in early childhood. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 29(3), 177-187. doi:10.1023/A:1010377329840
- Wright, J. P., & Cullen, F. T. (2001). Parental efficacy and delinquent behaviour: Do control and support matter. *Criminology*, 39(3), 677-704. doi:10.1111/J.1745-9125-2001.tboo937.x