PARENTING STYLES AND SOCIAL-EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN IN ABUJA, NIGERIA

Abosede Eniola Adeyemi

(B.Sc (Hons) Chem., PG.D. Edu., MMP., M.Ed (Early Childhood))

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

Of

Masters of Philosophy

School of Humanities and Social Sciences,

University of Strathclyde, Glasgow

Declaration of Author's Rights

This thesis is the author's original research. It has been composed by the author and has not been previously submitted for examination leading to the award of a degree.

The copyright of this thesis belongs to the author under the terms of the United Kingdom Copyright Acts as qualified by the University of Strathclyde Regulation 3.55.1. Due acknowledgement must also be made of the use of any material contained in, or derived from, this thesis.

Signed: ..…………………… Date: ……………………………..

ABSTRACT

Social-emotional competence is an important contributor to many areas of children's development. Parenting styles are known to influence social-emotional competence, but the extent of this influence has received little attention among researchers in Nigeria. This study examines the range of parenting styles that are in practice in Nigeria and the effects of socio-economic status on parenting styles. It then examines the influence of parenting styles on social-emotional competence. To achieve these aims, 100 parents of children from five schools in Abuja, Nigeria were asked to complete the Parenting Style Dimension Questionnaire. Five teachers, each from one of the five schools also completed Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire for 25 children of ages between 4 and 5yrs. Correlation analysis and linear regression models were used for the analysis of parenting styles and social-emotional competence. The results show that the authoritative parenting style is predominantly used, followed by authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Mixed-parenting style was also identified. Findings of this study show no significant relationship between parental level of education and parenting style, but they identify a definite relationship between occupational status and parenting style. The results also show that parenting styles are significantly related to some of the domains of social-emotional competence. Authoritative, authoritarian and extreme permissive parenting styles are related to pro-social behaviour. Authoritative, permissive, authoritative-permissive are related to hyperactivity behaviour. The results indicate that parenting styles have an influence on some of the domains of social-emotional competence. These findings also continue to lend support to the suggestion that authoritarian parenting may have different implications for Nigeria children compared to those from the western culture. This simply implies that culture plays a vital role in styles of parenting, which in turn affects social-emotional competence. Implications and directions for future research on the study of parenting styles and social-emotional competence are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background to the Study

Social competence in pre-school children can be defined as their ability to participate in social interactions, attain social goals, maintain positive relationships and be accepted by peers (Rubin, Bukowski, & Parker, 2006). On the other hand, emotional competence in pre-school children has to do with their ability to regulate and express emotions according to societal expectations, as well as their ability to understand the causes and consequences of their emotions and that of others (Saarni, Campos, Camras & Witherington, 2008).

Social and emotional competences are interwoven in their definitions. Social-emotional competence simply means the ability to manage one's emotion in conjunction with successful interpersonal relationships during interaction in a social gathering (Denham, 2006, 2007; Denham, Wyatt, Bassett, Echeverria & Knox, 2009; Denham et al., 2003; Saarni, 1990). It also refers to an awareness of other people's emotions while at the same time regulating and expressing successfully, according to societal expectations. Children who have positive social-emotional competence are characterised as having pro-social behaviour. They are liked and popular amongst peers and can interact efficiently (Nsamenang, 2011). They can also regulate, understand and express emotions in a friendly way. For a child to be socially competent, he must be emotionally stable.

According to Denham, Bailey and Zinser (2011), a child with social-emotional competence interacts positively with peers and manages his or her emotions as well as others', which arise from daily challenges of the pre-school environment. This gives him or her, the opportunity to develop pro-social behaviour such as sharing, caring, cooperating and helping peers and adults.

As the social-emotional competence of a child increases, communication skills also improve through interaction with others. In the same way, delays have negative implications for children's interaction with peers and their school success (Denham, 2006; Winsler, Diaz, Atencio, McCarthy & Chabay, 2000). Kaiser,

Hancock, Cai, Foster and Hester (2000) state that children who are social-emotionally incompetent achieve lower academic performance.

Grantham-McGregor et al. (2007) suggested that there are few national statistical records or reports on child development in developing countries. For example, there are no published studies that identify the level of social-emotional incompetence among Nigerian children, and this suggests a gap in the social-emotional competence of children in the Nigerian context. However, some studies indicate high levels of bullying and aggression among Nigerian adolescents. This may be an indication of delay in attainment of social-emotional competence (Omolola, 2011; Uwe, Asuquo & Ekuri, 2008).

From the ecological perspective, which is an interactionist tradition, the child is viewed from four domains: the biological child, the family, the school and the larger society. These domains interact dynamically and have influence, one on the other within the multilevel system. For example, the child and the family interact in the social context, which in turn has effect on their social-emotional competence. Also, the differences in the socio-economic status of the socio-cultural systems affect the family and this indirectly influences the developing child. Moreover, Saarinen, Ruoppila and Korkiakangas (1994) as cited in Härkönen, 2007, commented that ecological theory is also known as socialisation theory since the ecological theory emphasises that a developing child will gradually grow into a full-fledged member of the society.

Socialisation is the process by which a child, as a biological being transforms into a social being. It starts from the biological child who develops within the family context. Socialisation also encompasses the child's education within the school system and then inculcates in the child cultural values and norms of the society.

In Nigeria, although other people; apart from parents, may serve as agents of socialisation, parents are the primary players in the social development of children. The role of parents in the development of social–emotional competence of children is vital and cannot be overlooked because of their social responsibility to the children. Parents are the first teachers the children encounter in life and parenting enables children to socialise while following the rules of the community as taught by their parents.

Socialisation can also be described as bi-directional since all children have their own innate personality traits/characteristics, which in turn may respond to parents' behaviour. This indicates that parents and children have influence on each other. It can therefore be surmised that socialisation starts from infancy through the process of social learning, interactions, attachment, scaffolding, quality relationship and culturisation.

In Nigeria, children are regarded as a vital part of the family unit. A traditional nuclear family in Nigeria consists of a father and mother (who are married) and their children. It is believed that having and raising children is necessary for procreation and continuity according to the norms of the traditional society and culture. Children cannot be defined as one single 'object'. They are holistic beings that cannot be compartmentalised (Nsamenang, 2006). The progress of children depends on their emotional, social, cognitive and motor development, all of which need to work together to achieve success (Saarni, 2011; Nsamenang, 2006).

Parents raise and nurture children according to the societal norms and values. Their attitude and behaviour towards a child are referred to as the parenting style. There are different strategies that parents use to raise their children. Parenting style dimensions are: parental responsiveness and parental demandingness (Baumrind, 1991a; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). The dimensions of parenting styles have been used to classify parenting styles into four types: authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent permissive and neglecting permissive (Baumrind, 1991a; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Educational and developmental psychologists have become interested in the effect of different parenting styles on child development. Several studies on parenting styles have provided background knowledge on how they influence the social-emotional competence of the child (Baumrind, 1967, 1971, & 1991a; Denham et al., 2001; Denham et al., 2003; Nixon, 2012). These recognised styles of parenting have different effects on cognitive and social-emotional competence of children (Baumrind, 2013; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Baumrind & Sorkhabi, 2009; Baumrind, Larzelere, & Owens, 2010; Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, & Roberts, 1987; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch & Darling, 1992; Sorkhabi, 2005). The authoritative parenting style has been known to be positively related to social-emotional

competence while authoritarian and permissive parenting styles are often related to lower social-emotional competence and developmental outcomes (Baumrind, 2013; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn & Dornbusch, 1991; Kaufmann et al., 2000; Nixon, 2012).

However, further research has revealed contradictory findings on the influence of parenting styles on child developmental outcomes (Chao, 1994, 2001). Several studies have questioned the validity of the results from western culture and its application in other cultural backgrounds. For example, studies conducted between African-American and Asian-American adolescents show that there was no evidence of positive influence of authoritative parenting on academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1991; Mc-Bride-Change & Chang, 1998). In addition, Chao (2001) suggested that Asian-American adolescents from authoritative families were not better off in school than those from authoritarian families.

Studies in Chinese culture have shown that Baumrind's typology of parenting styles did not sufficiently explain parental values between the Asian and Asian-American parenting styles (Chao, 1994; Wu et al., 2002; Xu et al., 2005). In addition, Nsamenang (2011) suggests that child development should be studied in the cultural settings in order to understand the unique and general developmental pathways. Nigerian styles of parenting may be similar to other non-western cultures. However, differences in the socio-economic factors, political structures and societal expectation of each culture may have an influence on parenting styles and child developmental outcome.

Moreover, Nguyen and Cheung (2009) suggest that both authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles are in use in almost every culture. Culture is a major factor in parenting styles because parents can be influenced by their societal goals, values and beliefs (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 2005; Coplan, Hastings, Lagace-Seguin, & Moulton, 2002; Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Indeed, scholars have found that parenting styles have different meanings in different cultural groups and might affect children's developmental outcome (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Spera, 2005). Cross-cultural researchers (Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978) have also argued that parenting styles are different from one culture

to another depending on the values and goals of the particular culture. This indicates that parenting styles are determined by the values, goals and expectations of each culture. Darling and Steinberg (1993) observe that parenting styles can be understood by studying them from the socio-cultural context of the family.

It has been suggested that socio-economic status has different influence on parenting styles (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; McLoyds, 1990; Sorkhabi, 2005). While socio-economic status and child development have been extensively studied, the effect socio-economic factors have on parenting style have not been broadly examined. It then becomes important to study the extent of the relationship between parenting styles and the socio-economic status of parents.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

Emotional competence is crucial to the ability of children to interact and form relationships (Denham, 2007; Denham et al., 2003; Denham et al., 2009; Saarni, 1990). Children that demonstrate mastery of social-emotional competence i.e. appropriate emotions in a strategic manner, apply their knowledge about emotions and their expression to relationships with others. By so doing, they can negotiate interpersonal exchanges and regulate their emotional experiences (Saarni, 1990, 2008).

Contemporary studies (Baumrind, 2013; Denham, 1989; Denham et al., 2009; Saarni, 2011) show that social-emotional competence plays a vital role in the developmental outcome of pre-school children. Children's social-emotional competence begins to flourish at age four to five years during pre-school years, and this makes it possible to study their social-emotional competence (Denham & Couchoud, 1990; Pahl & Barrett, 2007). The important outcome of positive social-emotional competence is the successful social interaction with peers and others (Pahl & Barrett, 2007). Goleman (1995) points out that success in life is dependent on several intelligence factors as well as on emotional regulation. According to Goleman (1995 p. 20), cognitive capacity contributes to only 20% of life success while the remainder is made up of social-emotional competence. According to a government research in the UK, (Gutman & Schoon, 2013), a positive social-

emotional competence is the most important factor in determining success, character and happiness.

Educational and developmental psychologists have emphasised the importance of social-emotional competence in cognitive development in pre-schoolers (Denham, Zinsser, & Brown, 2012). Parker, Summerfeldt, Hogan & Majeski (2004) examined the relationship between social-emotional competence and academic achievement. The results show that social-emotional competences were strong predictors of academic success. Similarly, Parker and Bradley (2003) in their study found that emotional competence is a significant predictor of academic success. This implies that the development of social-emotional competence helps in cognitive development. This may be due to neurological connections among the developmental domains, and it may be concluded that they are all interwoven (Evangelou, Sylva, Wild, Glenny & Kyriacou, 2009).

In developed countries, school educators and policy makers place emphasis on social-emotional competence in school curriculum (Pahl & Barrett, 2007). These studies: Growing Up in Scotland (Bradshaw & Tipping, 2010); Positive Behaviour in the Early Years (Dunlop et al., 2008); Growing Up in Ireland (Nixon, 2012) and Early Years Learning and Development (Evangelou et al., 2009) all pointed out that social-emotional competence is an important tool for developmental and successful outcome in life. While the value of social-emotional competence has been well established in developed countries, in Nigeria, which is a developing country, parents tend to vigorously pursue academic excellence for their children while neglecting social-emotional competence (Tenibiaje, 2010). Additionally, Ogundokun and Adeyemo (2010) reported that the desire of every parent is for their children to attain a high level of academic achievement. Also, Akinsola (2011) stated that Nigerian parents tended to emphasise respect and obedience to seniors and believe that children are to be seen and not heard. Expressing greetings, as well as imbibing respectful gestures along with prompt obedience to elders and persons in authority are the major keys for social acceptance and success in Nigeria (Harkness, Super, Barry, Zeitlin & Long, 2009). Although, some studies (Aremu, Tella & Tella, 2006; Ho, 1989; Pahl & Barrett, 2007) conducted in both western and African cultures also confirm that parents and school educators put more emphasis on the acquisition of

knowledge rather than the children's social-emotional competence. However, as earlier mentioned, social-emotional competence has been known to play a vital role in preparing children towards coping with life challenges while contributing to their academic success (Denham et al., 2001).

Tunde-Ayinmode and Adegunloye (2011) pointed out that it would be rewarding for educators and psychologists to concentrate on parenting styles as this could affect the emotional well-being of children and adolescents, particularly those with behavioural disorders. Moreover, Abdullahi (2009) in a review of literature on emotional development of university students suggests that the Government should introduce emotional development skills in Nigerian schools. It is not clear if parents and educational policy makers in Nigeria are aware of the importance of social-emotional competence on the general well-being of pre-school children. As earlier indicated, the pre-school age is a sensitive period in any child's development. It is therefore necessary to study parenting styles and social-emotional competence of pre-schoolers.

Researchers have examined parenting styles in Nigeria, but most studies have focused on parenting styles in relation to diverse child outcome variables such as self-identity (Adejuwon, 2005a), externalising behaviour (Adejuwon, 2005b, 2014), academic achievements (Fakeye, 2008), sexual behaviour (Abu & Akerele, 2006; Akinsola, 2010a), antisocial behaviour (Okonkwo, 2009; Okorodudu, 2010; Uwe, Asuquo & Ekuri, 2008) cultural activities (Odubote, 2008; Adejuwon, 2005a, 2014), social anxiety (Akinsola & Udoaka, 2012; Amoran, Onadeko & Adeniyi, 2005b,); social change (Emmanuel, Akinyemi & Nimotalai., 2012) and conduct behaviour (Tunde-Ayinmode & Adegunloye, 2011). Nevertheless, studies on parenting styles targeting children in Abuja, a major metropolitan city and seat of the Federal Government of Nigeria are rare and little is known about parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence in Nigeria as a whole.

The knowledge of parenting styles and the understanding of social-emotional competence in children from western societies has been well established and documented. Schultz, Izard, Ackerman and Youngstom (2001) and Ermisch (2008) identified the importance of the social competence of children on the society. While this has been clearly recognised and their potential usefulness in formulating social

8

policies in developed economies are well appreciated, the extent of their relevance and applicability in developing countries like Nigeria has not been fully explored. There is therefore a need to study parenting styles and social-emotional competence of pre-school children in this region.

1.3. Purpose of the Study

1. The study aims to examine the range of parenting styles common among parents in Abuja, Nigeria.

2. This research also aims at determining how parenting styles might vary with socio-economic status such as occupation and education of parents in Abuja, Nigeria.

3. In addition, a major goal is to identify how parenting styles could influence social-emotional competences of children aged between four and five years old in Abuja, Nigeria as perceived by teachers.

1.4. Research Questions

In order to achieve the aims of this study, the following research questions will be considered.

1. What are the parenting styles in practice among parents of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria?

2. Is there a relationship between socio-economic status and parenting styles in Abuja, Nigeria?

3. Is there a relationship between parenting styles and teachers' perceptions of social-emotional competence of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria?

1.5. Relevance of Study

This study will contribute to the body of knowledge specifically in the field of educational and developmental psychology with respect to parenting styles in Abuja, Nigeria. Secondly, this study will provide background knowledge for counsellors and teachers on the relationship between parenting styles and the children's social-emotional competence in Abuja, Nigeria. It is also expected to provide insight into the relevance of parenting styles to the social-emotional competence of children. In

addition, it will contribute to the positive expansion of knowledge in the area of social-emotional competence of pre-school children and serve as an important reference material for future researchers in the field. Again, the study will provide parents with better understanding of child development in light of their parenting styles so that they can fully understand the implications of these styles on social-emotional competence of their children. Finally, it will also fill the gap in knowledge of the essential consideration as to whether the western position on social-emotional competence is applicable to Abuja, Nigeria or not, and to what extent that applicability is dependent on socio-economic status.

1.6. Research Overview

This study is divided into six (6) chapters:

Chapter one comprises the background to the study, statement of the research problem, objectives of the research, significance of the study, research questions and the research overview.

Chapter two contains the theoretical framework, conceptual definitions and literature review of parenting styles and social-emotional competence.

Chapter three describes the research methodology, which comprises the research design and philosophical approach. It also deals with permissions and other ethical considerations, population studies, participants' recruitment, instruments used for the study, demographic variables of the parents, procedures of data collection and data analysis.

Chapter four provides the main results of this study, which includes; answers to research questions, correlations between variables and regression analysis.

Chapter five includes the discussion of the major findings and limitations of the study.

Chapter six subsequently provides summary of the study, contribution to knowledge for both researchers and educators who have interest in parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence for pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria, suggestions for future research, significance of the study and general conclusions.

CHAPTER TWO
THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1.   Introduction

This chapter primarily focuses on defining the main concepts of the study and explains the relevance and interrelatedness of fundamental issues around child development as well as the theoretical underpinning on which the study is based. This is important in order to understand the complexity of human development and factors that affect children's social-emotional competence. Attempts will also be made to explain social-emotional competence and review relevant literature on parenting styles. In addition, factors affecting parenting styles and the influence of parenting styles on social-emotional competence will be reviewed. The literature search strategy involves the consideration of literature from America, the United Kingdom, Australia, Africa and the Middle East. The literature in this field dates back to the 1920s. However, the focus of the review will be from the 1990s to the present.

2.2.   Developmental Issues in Child Development

Child development is the continuous growth and gradual change in the cognitive, physical and social-emotional development from birth to adolescence (McDevitt & Ormrodu, 2013). According to Berk (2009), child development includes all changes that humans experience through the lifespan. Bronfenbrenner (1979, p. 27) defines child development as "the process through which the growing person acquires a more extended, differentiated and valid conception of the ecological environment, and becomes motivated and able to engage in activities that reveal the properties of, sustain, or restructure that environment at levels of similar or greater complexity in form and content". The similarities in the definitions of child development are basically changes that occur during a child's growth. However, the latter defines child development in more detail by including the activities and knowledge gained during development within the socio-cultural environment. This development also includes all changes which are common to children and how the environment in which the developing child resides can make a difference in the rate of development.

Development is a concept which covers all aspects of the individual's cognitive, physical, social and emotional domains (Nsamenang, 2006). These domains are not really distinct; rather, they combine in a holistic way to produce the active and developing child. In the African context, child development can be defined as a process of acquiring knowledge and skills to equip the child for social and functional responsibilities and playing suitable roles in the family and community (Nsamenang, 2006). This implies that development can also be defined according to cultural values and norms.

There are three main issues in child development which attract developmental psychologists (Masten, 2006; McDevitt & Ormrodu, 2013). This informs why child development experts attempt to clarify changes that occur during early years through various theories and other research evidences. The first issue is the effects of nature versus nurture on the development of a child. The second issue is universality versus diversity and the third issue is qualitative versus quantitative changes. Figure 2.2-1 below reflects how the second and third issues as well as others can be described in the context of nature versus nurture. Therefore, the growth and acquisition of social-emotional skills and abilities can be seen either as a continuous or discontinuous process.

The nature versus nurture issue describes two opposing views on the key factors that influence child development. Nature consists of genetic characteristics. This hereditary factor can be defined as one's nature, and it is based on the biological transmission of traits and characteristics from one generation to another. Genetics is a factor in intelligence and in the origin of personality traits such as fearfulness, sociability, shyness, empathy and happiness. Developmentalists (Freud, 1923; Gesell, 1928) believe that child development is basically influenced by nature. These scholars, who focus on biological factors believe that children can either have a positive or negative social-emotional competence (Lightfoot, Cole & Cole, 2013; Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011; Schaffer, 2011). Nurture includes the environmental factors that affect the child's development. These are the external factors which influence the development of the child according to their genetic codes (Nsamenang, 1992). The theorists believe that the social and physical environments primarily affect child development. Nurture may influence a child's developmental outcome in

12

different ways i.e. in intellectual, physical, emotional and social domains, through interaction and quality relationships with adults and peers (Bronfenbrenner, 2006; Evangelou et al., 2009; Vygotsky, 1978). Moreover, some developmental theorists propose that nature and nurture are interwoven dynamically in the life of a developing child (Rutter, 2007; Sameroff, 2009, 2010; Spencer, et al., 2009). Sameroff (2009) suggested that the child as an active being contributes to his own development through the choices of friends and activities which in turn affect their natural behaviour. He admits that heredity might have a strong influence in determining child behaviour. However, the genetic factor is meaningless without interference from the environment. In support of this view, Lipsitt (1990) comments that the unfolding innate abilities depend on the qualities of the environment in which the child lives, learn and grow. Similarly, Nsamenang (1992) maintains that the child as a social being is made up of genetic codes. They are also shaped by experiences with the other environmental factors such as learning, history and cultural transformation (social change). This indicates that as nature contributes to social-emotional competence, parents also help through nurturing; providing quality parent-child interaction and other activities such as training, modeling, guidance, counseling and playing with the child. This implies that heredity shapes development by providing innate characteristics which would depend on the child's level of activity and interaction with the social environment. It is noteworthy that nature (genetic factors) and nurture (environmental factors) or a combination of both can predict children's development.

There are varying viewpoints on whether child development is universal or unique to a specific child. The universal view is that children are social beings and their experiences affect all other domains of the body. Some theorists suggest that maturation and shared genes contribute to the universality of development. They emphasise that every child has some skills that are universal despite environmental differences (Gesell, 1928). However, the diversity viewpoint suggests that there would be diversity at the level of activity and response borne from experiences with people. By inference, the universality approach leans towards the conclusion that the social-emotional competence of a child is determined naturally and diversity indicates that different experiences resulting from the environment will affect

children's social-emotional competence. Development seems to be universal in the area of physical development, because every child has a physical growth and is different in terms of cognitive and social-emotional development (Berk, 2009).

In addition, theorists also point out that children's individuality can be influenced by parent's historical background and family relationships (Bornstein, 2002, 2006; Bornstein & Lansford, 2010). Others view culture as an important origin of diversity. For example, children are different in the way they acquire social-emotional competence based on their cultural norms and values (Edwards, Guzman, Brown & Kumru, 2006; Rogoff, 1990, 2003). In a sense, the diversity viewpoint expects that the natural social-emotional competence of a child might be subject to environmental influences. These include peer interaction, parenting style, school teachers, culture and neighbourhood. Therefore, the developmental changes that occur in every child are known to reflect universality while individual development change is known to reflect diversity.

Furthermore, some theorists believe that the growth and acquisition of social-emotional skills and abilities can be seen as either a continuous or discontinuous process (Erikson, 1968; Lightfoot, Cole & Cole, 2013; Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011). This implies that some aspects of development can be noticed while others cannot be seen during growth. Developmentalists, who believe in a process of continuous series of developments, focus on quantitative change, which is a gradual accumulation of small changes in development (Bandura, 1977, 1989; Watson, 1928). They believe that a child can only acquire skills over a period of time. They also believe that development is a discontinuous process which comprises of different series of major changes in development (Erikson, 1968; Freud, 1923). They argue that the qualitative changes that the child undergoes at each new stage of development changes his experience about his environment and the way the environment impacts him. Nevertheless, some contemporary theorists recognise the importance of both qualitative and quantitative changes in child development (Sameroff, 1994, 2009, 2010; Vygotsky, 1978). Thus, development can be seen as outcomes which can either be continuous or discontinuous or both, shifting from universality to diversity.

Moreover, some scholars believe that children are active beings and have active roles in their own development during interaction with parents by expressing themselves and reciprocating affection (Bandura, 1996). Another view is that children are passive and have no proactive roles in shaping their development (Watson, 1928). This viewpoint argues that children's behaviour and development are subject wholly to external or environmental influences. It seems to underscore the view that nurture plays a stronger role over nature in the development of the child. If the passive view is right, parents and teachers will naturally play a major role in shaping the behaviour of the child. Reigel (1978) has developed four categories of the passive-active model: passive person-passive environment; passive person-active environment; active person-passive environment; active person-active environment. This implies that the relationship between the child and the environment can be classified into these categories.

Some interactionists (Belsky & Fearon, 2002; Bronfenbrenner, 2005) believe that the relationship between the parent and the child is bi-directional while developmental psychopathologists (Sameroff, 2010) add that the relationship between the parent and the child is dynamic, including everyday activity in the family. Other theorists (Ainsworth, 1973; Ainsworth & Bell, 1972; Bowlby, 1982) focus on the sensitive relationship within the family emotional attachment. This can be sustained through quality parent-child relationships which focus on the emotional climate in the home.

Another school of thought, social constructivism, stresses guidance through interaction by inculcating the culture. This focuses on the interaction between the child, culture and parent. The theorists (Vygotsky, 1978; Rogoff, 2003) believe that a child can be guided with the assistance of an adult within a cultural context. This implies that social-emotional competence can be nurtured through the cultural values of the society. Furthermore, interactional and transactional developmentalists believe that the development of a child occurs in a multiple complex system which occurs over time. They believe that for a child to be successfully inculcated into the society there must be a successful interaction and relationship among the child, the parents and other environmental factors (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Sameroff, 2010). It should be noted that constructive parent-child interaction

could facilitate the development of stable social-emotional competence which may have a positive influence on the child's interaction with peers and response to discipline. This implies that social-emotional competence is a product of both the child and his experience.

The diagram below (Figure 2.2-1) shows the different schools of thought. Both nature and nurture are vital in child development and their contributions are active as well as interactive. The child's experience during social interaction in the environment creates both the universal human nature as well as the individual and social diversity. In addition, it shows the qualitative and quantitative aspects of child development. It also reveals different types of social interaction between the parent and the child which can be determined by: the quality of relationship, sensitive relationship (emotional attachment) and social construct. Finally, it also shows the theorist's belief about a child as either an active or a passive social being. In summary, the influence of both nature and nurture in the developmental process are active, interactive and transactional.

Figure 2.2-1: Diagram summarising all the schools of thought in Child Development.

2.3. Theoretical Considerations of Factors that Influence Children's Social and Emotional Development

Scholars share different views on the development of children's social-emotional competence. Their perspectives focus on different domains of development and have different points of view on nature versus nurture, universal versus diversity and qualitative versus quantitative change. They are discussed in detail in the following sections.

2.3.1. Psychodynamic Theories

A Freudian view of child's development suggests that a child's early life experiences are dictated by parental and other influences which eventually shape their social and emotional development. Psychodynamic theorists believe that children development is about biological drives which are consequent upon the innate personality of a child.

Sigmund Freud is believed to be the founder of psychoanalysis. Freud (1923) proposed that humans are controlled by drives and conflicts which they are not consciously aware of but which change their personality through their experiences in life. The psychoanalyst however, proposes that a child's basic needs are biological, which invariably causes conflict with parental and societal desires (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). In addition, the child's ability to confront the conflicts between biological drives and social expectation is what determines the ability to relate with others. The theory also notes that failure to successfully negotiate each psychosexual stage would give rise to disorders in adulthood. Although Freud's view on developmental stages is discontinued process, it was the first to emphasise the influence of early parent-child relationship on child development.

Psychoanalysis has contributed to research into the understanding of social-emotional development, including parenting styles, parent-child attachment, emotional disturbance and adolescent identity (Berk, 2009). Its position on children's early experience is important because it reflects the developmental outcome later in life. Freud believes that children's social-emotional competence is shaped by the way parents manage their desires. This implies that parental nurturing is important to a

child's social-emotional competence. Therefore, as nature affects the child, nurture too has its contribution to the child's development through their early interaction with parents.

Nevertheless, Freud's theory has been criticised because children have not been studied directly. Another criticism is that it is not supported by empirical evidence because of lack of suitable substitutes for things such as unconscious processes, which cannot be measured. In addition, there is no evidence that the elements of the psychosocial stages predict personality later in life (Crews, 1996). It is noteworthy that the theory does not take culture into consideration; the sample size is small and is only based on the western culture and may not be applicable in the non-western cultures.

Erikson's contribution expands on Freud's theory to include social and cultural influences on development. He stated that people are socially developing constantly throughout life. Erikson (1968) highlights the importance of style of parenting to the child's development. The progress of the developmental stages he describes could be shaped by the style of parenting the child is exposed to. According to Erikson, the way a child resolves conflict is affected by the measure of authority used by the parent and the assumption of independence by the child. He believes that it is necessary to master each stage of emotional development before moving on to the next. If there was quality relationship with the parent, the child would learn to trust and feel secure. Security is an emotional state and this experience reflects in the relationship with other people.

However, if a stage was skipped by not positively resolving the emotional conflict, it would have a negative effect on social-emotional competence. For instance, at the pre-school age, children take initiatives by exploring their environment. When they are encouraged, they develop initiative, which is enhanced through social interaction. On the other hand, when parents make a high demand on children, they develop a sense of guilt and this may be detrimental to their social-emotional competence.

Erikson's theory contributes to children's development in three ways. Firstly, he states that significant changes occur throughout their life span. Secondly, he emphasises the importance of developing social-emotional competence which

includes self-esteem, and forming a secure relationship with others. Thirdly, its developmental stages indicate the dynamic process of nature, nurture and self-esteem.

Despite this, Crain (2011) maintains that one of the limitations of Erikson's theory is that his position on child development is not detailed. The emotional state is narrowly explained and the relationship between different domains of development such as cognitive, social, physical and emotional growth is not really appreciated. According to Crain (2011), Erikson's theory was based on a small sample in which he used the observation method. He noted that the study was centred on few observations of men and not children, whereas the stages might be different in children. Finally, Erikson's theory was criticised for not considering people from non-western cultures. For example, some cultures do not encourage self-assertiveness in children in order to protect them from a dangerous neighbourhood (Morelli & Rothbaum, 2007).

In summary, Erikson's views on developmental stages are continuous processes throughout the lifespan rather than during adolescence as Freud proposed. This implies that Erikson believes in the systematic development of children and that their social-emotional competence is based on individual differences.

2.3.2. Behaviourism and Social Learning Theory

Other schools of thought also have different perspectives which influence the understanding of child development. Within the Behaviourism and Social Learning Theory, Watson (1928) believes that the environment (nurture) can shape a child's development without the influence of nature. Behaviourism entirely changed the study of children's behaviour by shifting from the belief that development is influenced by nature as against nurture. Watson opines that child development is a continuous process, which involves a gradual development of social-emotional competence with age and quality of relationship. Furthermore, Watson (1928) maintains that children are neither good nor bad; however, the external environment, including parents can influence them. Like John Locke, he believes that a child's mind is in *tabula rasa* form (empty and clean); this makes it easy for them to change in whatever way their parents want. However, this position is too rigid, assuming that

children are passive. Thus, Watson believes that parents have a significant role to play in shaping the lives of their children. This means that the parenting style used on children reflect in their development.

The limitation in this school of thought is their refusal to recognise a child as an individual. This theory is similar to an African believe which recognises that a child can be seen but is not to be heard (Akinsola, 2011). They believe that a child's voice is not to be heard; that the child should not be given autonomy and the child should be able to respect and obey authority (Akinsola, 2011).

A more permissive approach was introduced by combining Watson and Freud's ideas on the effects of parent-child relationships. Skinner (1971) extends on the work of Watson by arguing that development is reflected because of operant conditioning of children who are shaped passively by reinforcement and punishment. This theory emphasises the active role of the child in allowing the consequences of his actions to determine his behaviour. The role of children is active rather than passive because children behave based on their environment. This implies that child development can be influenced by the way parents treat their children, by rewarding acceptable behaviour and punishing unacceptable conduct.

Contrary to Freud's view on the role of internal forces and personal experience of the child within the environment, Social Learning Theory recognises the role of the environment in shaping social-emotional competence of children. Bandura (1977, 1996) proposes that children learn in a natural social environment through observation and imitation of other people's behaviour in order to develop beyond stimulus and response behaviour. This theory argues that a child's social-emotional competence is affected by the behaviour and actions of parents, peers and others in the immediate environment. This implies that continuous interaction with people would eventually shape their behaviour. However, Bandura differs from Watson who is of the belief that children are not passive beings. He believes that universally, children are active beings and they have an influence on the environment that influences their development. This theory suggests that adults such as parents and teachers serve as role models and children learn by imitating them and that parents can be determinants of the social-emotional competence of children (Steinberg, 2008).

Social Learning Theory has contributed to studies on the social-emotional competence of children in many ways. It has also helped in understanding how a developing child could form emotional attachments and abides by the moral rules of a society (Berk, 2009; Parke & Clark-Stewart, 2011). Development occurs through learning and developmental change, which is a gradual and continuous process.

2.3.3. Vygotsky's Theory

Modern theories highlight the role of biological forces while others emphasise environmental influences and cognitive impact on social-emotional development of children. Vygotsky (1978) has the same view as Piaget (1967). The only difference is that Piaget emphasises more on child's cognitive development. Vygotsky's theory highlights the role and importance of positive or negative influences of teachers, parents and other adults in social-emotional competence. In addition, Rogoff and Morelli (1989) suggest that child development can best be understood from the socio-cultural context in which it occurs.

Vygotsky's theory argues that the cognitive functioning of a child has its roots in social and communicative interactions with an adult. He states that children can acquire successful competence through social interaction with an adult. Vygotsky recognises the role of nurture in the development of social-emotional competence and combines the role of culture with child's development. He states that culture is being inculcated into the child during interaction with an adult. This implies that children can learn through the adult guardian.

Cultural diversity reflects in children's attitudes to duties, beliefs and behaviour, which develop in culturally specific ways – this is called scaffolding. Thus, socio-cultural researchers argue that nature and nurture shape child development by indirect interaction with culture (Greenfield, Keller, Fuligni, & Maynard, 2003; Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978). It is through culture that both biological and environmental factors interact. Vygotsky's idea provides an important role for parents in the development of a child's social-emotional competence. It helps us recognise the importance of parents who are the first teachers of a child as influence on children's social-emotional competence. This theory has also made a great impact on how children learn from adults.

The implication of Vygotsky's theory however, is that through adult guidance; a child may believe whatever is going on in the society. For example, a child brought up in an authoritarian society would accept discipline as protective measure and care (Baumrind, 1972; Chao, 1994; Rohner & Pettengill, 1985).

2.3.4. Attachment Theory and Emotional Development

Bowlby (1969) borrowed his idea from Freudian theory and states that human beings have an instinctive drive which is as strong as any other basic human need such as hunger, thirst or warmth. This attachment is with one significant person who is the mother. Bowlby first developed attachment theory and later collaborated with Ainsworth (1973) to continue the research. Bowlby (1969) and Ainsworth (1973) emphasise how a person's emotional well-being and behavioural problems could be linked to early childhood. They argue that maternal warmth and affection at infancy and early years are essential for social-emotional competence just as vitamins and proteins are suitable for human physical development (Bowlby, 1969).

Attachment theory has contributed to the concept of early experience of children. It simply means an emotional relationship which develops between parent and child. It starts from the child having a secure relationship with their primary caregiver. In support of this view, Denham, Wyatt, Bassett, Echeverria and Know (2009) state that the ability of both parents and children to form a close relationship with others helps in the development of social-emotional competence throughout life. The theory also describes the importance to emotional development of positive social interaction in early life.

Attachment theory emphasises the role of parents or caregivers in providing a comfortable and secure environment for children and the importance of relationships as they develop (McElwain & Volling, 2004). Fagot (1997) observes that toddlers who had quality secure attachment to their mothers respond positively towards their peers than toddlers with insecure attachments. The lack of attachment between the parents and the child will be detrimental to the social-emotional competence. This implies that positive attachment promotes social-emotional competence.

Some scholars however, believe that apart from biological parents, other caregivers could also form an emotional attachment with the child. For example, in

Nigeria, particularly, relatives, siblings, peers, friends, nursery and caregivers are involved in the care of children. In view of this, there is an African proverb which suggests thus: "It takes a village to raise a child" (Berk, 2009, p. 15). This implies that non-western cultures are basically collectivist, where children can be entrusted into the hands of other people in the community. Nevertheless, Emmanuel, Akinyemi and Nimotalai (2012) argue that civilization has influenced child rearing pattern in Nigeria where some children are left in the hands of a housemaid. Due to the child's experience with different caregivers, the study of child development becomes complex. In spite this however, parents still have a pre-eminent role in the life of a child.

This theory indicates how children get attached to parents. Emotions deduced from nature and nurture show universality and diversity and exhibit qualitative and quantitative changes. This implies that children have a natural tendency to be securely attached to their parents and express emotions. Parents in turn relate with them responsively. The positive experience of the child with the environment through quality interaction can also give the child a positive relationship with people and encourage social-emotional competence. Evangelou et al. (2009) and Sylva, Melhuish, Sammons, Siraj-Blatchford and Taggart (2004, 2008, & 2012) suggest that the quality of parent-child relationship in the home learning environment is important for child development. Hence, social-emotional competence can be universal, although not all children can be socially competent due to individual uniqueness caused by secure or insecure attachment.

2.3.5. The Bronfenbrenner Theory

Bronfenbrenner (1979) derives his ideas from both environmental theorists and biological theorists. Although social-learning theorists such as Bandura (1989) argue that both the environment and the child influence each other, they have not really described the development of the child in an environment in full detail. Bronfenbrenner was the first environmentalist who believed that the child's development could be well understood in a natural environment. He envisions the environment as a series of complex structural levels and shares the socio-cultural perspective which states that a child's development could occur primarily through

interaction with culture and social environmental influences (Vygotsky, 1978; Rogoff, 2003). However, while other schools of thought describe the situation in brief, Bronfenbrenner (2005) explains in detail the interactive process that occurs between the child and home environment and other factors that can affect the parent and its cultural context. It should however, be noted that Bronfenbrenner is not the main origin of all these ideas. He combines Freud's idea, which has been discussed earlier and Kurt's Lewis formula with other theorists, also, as mentioned earlier (Härkönen, 2003a, 2007).

Bronfenbrenner is an environmentalist who has interest in the interaction between the child and the environment. Although, he is aware of the effect of interaction within and between different environmental levels in the macro-system, he later recognises the ontogeny of the child and his interaction with the environment.

Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1986, 1998 & 2005) suggests that both direct and indirect environmental factors have bearings on the developmental outcome of the child. As shown in Figure 2.3-2, he viewed development as taking place within a series of different social ecosystems: microsystems, mesosystems, exosystems and macrosystems.

In the microsystem, the child is subject to the influence of immediate contact institutions such as the family, peers and the school (Härkönen, 2003a). Other examples comprise of the neighbourhood and the religious settings (Penn, 2005). The next level is the mesosystem where the components of the microsystem interact with each other. In the exosystem, this comprises the social settings; although the child plays no direct role but remains subject to the influence of those systems. The macrosystem is the fourth level, which represents the larger cultural, ideological or governmental policy in the society in which the child grows. Cultural and socio-economic aspects of the Nigerian society affect the nature of the different systems described by Bronfenbrenner as shown in Figure 2.3-1. Additionally, both Figure 2.3-1 and Figure 2.3-2 show the different types of interaction that take place within different environmental levels. These social systems are described below:

Figure 2.3-1: Adopted from Bronfenbrenner Ecological Models

The diagram in Figure 2.3-1 highlights the key elements of the current study. This is similar to the use of Bronfenbrenner's theory as seen in Evangelou et al. (2009) study, where the basic elements of their study were highlighted. To buttress this view, Härkönen (2007) suggests that it is important to study the theory and describe them according to the researcher's own model. The diagram in Figure 2.3-2 below indicates how the child as an individual interacts with other different levels of the social system and this represents how the literature review of this study is structured. According to Bronfenbrenner (2005), the process of interaction between the child and the environment is centred on the child's development. At the first environmental level, the microsystem, the child is subject to the influence of immediate contact institutions such as the family and the school. Here, the influence

of environmental factors changes over time as the child develops. At the pre-school age for example, parents are the most influential factors while siblings, teachers and peers become more important at childhood and adolescence. The child is at the centre of the system and the parent-child relationship occurs at this stage. The home is the child's first environment and the child's experience with the members of the family (especially the parents) determines the level of social-emotional competence acquired. The parents in the environment do not only influence the child, but the child also influences the parent's behaviour due to biological traits such as temperament, habits, experiences and physical features. Other factors outside this level also influence the child. The diagram in Figure 2.3-*2* below shows the relationship and interaction between the child and the environment and how the environment interacts with each other.

Figure 2.3-2: Adopted from Bronfenbreinner Ecological Model

The next level is the mesosystem where the components of the microsystem interact with one another. The mesosystem explains all the activities of the child in the home environment and their overlap with the child's school environment. It also demonstrates the relationship between the family and peer group experiences. The home environment is the most influential and includes family background, values, beliefs and parenting styles. Bronfenbrenner further argues that a child's development depends on the quality of relationships and the interaction received

from parents and others such as siblings, peers and teachers. For instance, children who have quality relationship with their parents are inclined to be socially competent; they enjoy the company of peers and are accepted during childhood and adolescence (Baumrind, 1991a, 1991b, & 1991c; Denham et al., 2003).

The third environmental layer of Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory is the exosystem, which describes the life of the child after home. According to him, the child has no direct link with this environment but the environment indirectly influences the child. The environment includes the socio-economic background (parent's occupation, parental education), which may influence a child's social-emotional competence within the home and school environment. This implies that the differences in the socio-economic status of parents in the exosystem might affect styles of parenting, which indirectly affect child development. It is worthwhile to note that this level may be more applicable to the white-collar job or government official/civil servant.

However, this may not be totally applicable to cultural settings like Nigeria, where the child may have direct contact with the parents' occupation, particularly if the parent is self-employed or unemployed. Parents sometimes make their children available for child labour and use the proceeds to cater for the whole larger family. Although there are human rights provisions preventing children from working at pre-school age, this law is not really adhered to in most developing countries like Nigeria. From the researchers' observation, Bronfenbrenner's theory may not be applicable in all socio-economic settings at this level as perceived by some scholars. In support of this view, Nsamenang (2009) suggests that a theory should be propounded according to the African context in order to get more understanding on child development.

The child's culture is the fourth environmental layer and it is of importance to the development of the social-emotional competence of the child. It is referred to as the macro-system. Culture includes social background, cultural norms and laws of the society. This system is wide as it involves the values placed on children and how they should be regarded, their responsibilities and the goals they need to attain. The norms and values of each culture differ from one to another and could influence the child's development. This allows the child to behave according to societal

expectation, and believe the parents' styles of discipline. For instance, a child from an authoritarian home will accept it as a form of parental care and protection (Baumrind, 1972; Chao, 1994; Rohner & Pettengill, 1985). Another child from a culture, which does not permit authoritarianism, will perceive it as punitive or abusive and this may be detrimental to development (Rudy & Grusec, 2006). In addition, there might be changes in the styles of parenting, or in the economic, political and cultural situation of the country due to modernisation, and this could bring about changes in the socialisation goals as shown in the cases of Nigeria and China (Emmanuel et al., 2012; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2008). These studies have shown a dramatic change which has affected cultural settings, due to social change to the western culture.

Bronfenbrenner's chronosystem is also relevant when considering the dramatic changes in attitude towards parents' views of their styles of parenting in the African society. This can be described as a drastic change in development over time due to evolution. In this regard, his theory has proved important in different ecological systems. In addition, western cultural values may have an effect on the way parents view styles of parenting due to globalization (Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2008).

This theory has been extended to bio-ecological theory which takes into consideration the interaction of the child as a biological being with the environment (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). Several researchers, (Bronfenbrenner, 1986; Bronfenbrenner & Crouter, 1983; Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Rogoff, 1990; Vygotsky, 1978) have argued that the connection and interaction which developing children have with the environment promotes or undermines the child's social-emotional competence. Figure 2.3-3 shows the interactive connection between the environment and the child. One of the major contributions of ecological theory is its illustration of the importance and views of other fields of study (Härkönen, 2003a, 2007; Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011). Researchers have used this theory to model statistical, correlational and regression studies. Psychologists and educationists have use the inclusion of family context to find out the relationship between parenting and child development (Berk, 2009). Furthermore, the addition of neighbourhood, parental education, parental

occupation and cultural contexts integrates the work of anthropologists, sociologists and economists (McLoyds, 1990; Rogoff, 2003; Whiting & Edward, 1988; Whiting & Whiting, 1975). Another contribution of ecological theory is the recognition of multiple social systems that influence children's social-emotional development. However, despite its contributions, little is known about the transactional activity that happens between the child and the environment in day-to-day activities. Sameroff added additional dimension to interactions that occur between the child and the environment which is, change over time.

Figure 2.3-3: Interactional model of development

      adopted from Sameroff (2010)

Moreover, as shown in Figure 2.3-4, some theorists believe that the bi-directional interactive relationship of the child and the environment within the social system changes into transactional activities (Sameroff, 2010). Over time, this becomes a complex system which can be described as a web fibres system (Berk, 2009). It is important to note that development of social-emotional competence is not constant; it changes due to children's different experiences and cognitive development.

Developmentalists (Cicchetti & Cohen, 1995; Cummings, Davies & Campbell, 2000; Frosch & Johnson-Laird, 2011; Hastings, 2006; Sameroff, 2000) have shown that child developmental outcomes are probabilistic rather than deterministic. This is because the transactional relationships that occur within a multiple social system become more complex over time in day-to-day activities. Sameroff and Chandler (1975) argue that the child's current condition is the result of a series of bi-directional interactions between parent and the child embedded in several different ecologies. In addition, they also believe that nature and nurture are important for developmental outcome and the contribution of both are not only active, but also

interactive and dynamic transactional. This model recognises the importance of the child's role in shaping the environment in which they live. This is due to the different types of relationships that exist among children, family and social contexts. Thus, the dynamic relationships in day-to-day activities within different layers of ecological systems may lead to social change and directly or indirectly affect the children's social-emotional competence. Sameroff's transactional model as shown in Figure 2.3-4 suggests that there is a continuous dynamic interplay between the child's behaviour, the caregiver's response and the environmental variables which affect developmental outcomes of the child. These also have an impact on both the child and the parent.

**Figure 2.3-4: Transactional model of development
adopted from Sameroff (2010)**

This does not mean that social-emotional competence cannot be studied. Studies have documented a broad range of children's experiences and related them to the quality of social-emotional competence. For instance, children's experience of emotional climate within the home will influence social-emotional competence. Children living in a warm or punitive environment might manifest high or low social-emotional competence as the case may be (Hastings, 2006). Children are social creatures as well as biological beings and social environments are contexts within which development takes place. Individual differences in social-emotional competence are the results of both nature-genetic (personality formed by innate abilities) and nurture-environment (socialisation by parents, peers and culture).

In summary, each theory focuses on different domains of development. The psychoanalytic perspective focuses on social and emotional development, while

Vygotsky's theory emphasises changes in the thinking ability of the child through social interaction and guidance. Behavioural, social-learning theory, ecological system theory and dynamic system theory stress many aspects of developmental outcomes. Every theory has added its own quota to child development. However, the transactional model is difficult to assess. The research is supported by a qualitative approach which is an observational method in a natural setting. This can only give causality of a developmental outcome and not a definite result (Sameroff, 2009).

Several researchers have shown interest in the influence of environmental factors on children's social-emotional competence. The effect of these factors on social-emotional competence of children is well appreciated (Ermish, 2008). Environmental factors consist of the family, neighbourhood, school, cultural setting and the role of parents; which cannot be overemphasised. Dynamic system theory supports the view that child development should be studied in the developmental contexts of individual, family, community and socio-cultural settings. The influence of both nature and nurture cannot be overlooked and their contributions are active, interactive and transactional. This implies that social-emotional competence is a product of both the child and his experience. It is evident that one theory is not adequate to explain child development. There are multiple complex bi-directional environmental factors that occur during interaction.

However, the way in which these factors affect each other and the social-emotional competence of the child have received less attention in Nigeria. In order to have a proper understanding of the relevant areas in social-emotional competence, the concepts of social-emotional competence and its development as well as the various stages of social-emotional competence will be discussed in the next section.

2.4. Social Competence

Several authors have sought to define or measure social competence (Halberstadt, Denham & Dunsmore, 2001). For example, social competence at the pre-school age involves pro-social behaviour, listening to adults, empathy, sharing, helping others and maintaining positive relationships with peers. A socially competent pre-school child will be different from a socially competent adolescent. The social competence of an adolescent may require more skills such as having high self-esteem, identity

formation, confidence, self-motivation, problem solving, effective communication, emotional and behavioural regulation and peer relation skills (Caldarella & Merrell, 1997). This means that social competence could be described based on the age of a child and cultural values, or measured based on what the researcher sets out to discover. During the pre-school period, their world expands beyond the family and progresses into school (Rohner, 1990).

Some researchers (Howes & James, 2002; Rose-Krasnor & Denham, 2008) define social competence as various types of behaviour, which involve successful adaptation with an appropriate behaviour during interactions with other people. Additionally, social competence deals with the ability to interact effectively within a social group in a social context (Waters & Sroufe, 1983; Zigler, 1973). Rubin et al., (1998, p. 645) explains social competence as "the ability to achieve personal goals in social interaction while simultaneously maintaining positive relationships with others over time and across situations". Topping (1998) describes social competence as the ability to combine emotional feeling with thinking and behaviour in order to achieve social goals and outcomes which are valued in the cultural setting. Social competence is also seen as the possession of and the ability to use a set of required skills to interact with others productively (Campbell, 1995). These skills include the ability to receive, interpret and act on messages from others in ways that are generally considered appropriate in a group. The similarities in these definitions relate to successful social interactions among peers. This implies that a socially competent child has the ability to achieve personal and social goals and they are able to successfully develop and maintain relationships during social interaction in a social setting.

The development of social competence in children is of great importance. In order to successfully navigate their way through life, manage success and cope with disappointments, children need to acquire social skills early. Studies have identified direct links between the failure to achieve the basic minimum set of social skills by children and a whole range of dysfunctional adult behaviours (Campbell, 1995; Denham et al., 2003). A child's personality is shaped as he grows older and learns new social behaviour.

Caldarella and Merrel (1997) and Denham, Von Salisch, Olthof, Kachanoff, and Caverly (2002) have identified a number of behaviours and skills that contribute to social competence. These include emotional and behavioural self-regulation, self-awareness, self-confidence, peer-relation skills, social skills, effective communication and group problem solving and conflict resolution skills. Together, these skills will allow an individual to initiate and maintain satisfying social interactions or discontinue unsatisfying behaviour. Traits of social competence are seen in the earliest social interactions of pre-school children (Hastings, 2006) as they start to spend more time with age peers through pre-school and informal social activities. According to Hasting (2006), at this young age, social competence is manifested in empathy and pro-social behaviour, sharing, cooperation, maintaining positive relationships with others and learning to follow rules. Some other indicators of social competence at pre-school age include learning to engage others, effective social interaction, getting along well during play, resolving differences through pro-social rather than aggressive means, being able to function independently and adapting behaviour according to societal expectation (Hasting, 2006). A socially competent child will display most of these qualities. However, this is not to say that they cannot be upset in a conflict situation with peers (Hasting, 2006).

During the pre-school age, children spend most of the day with their peers at school (Omoluabi, 2002). Thus, social competence is important to the emotional well-being of children and has far reaching implications for the society as a whole. Rubin et al. (2006) and Saarni (2011) propose that emotional competence is important to the development of social competence. This thus implies that both are interrelated.

2.5. Emotional Competence

Emotions involve subjective responses to changes in the environment and are reflected in changes in physiological factors such as heart rate, hormonal surge and related observable physical effects (Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011). Such subjective reactions are communicated to others directly or indirectly in ways that can be observed and interpreted (Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011). Emotions could also be referred to as self-motivated actions used to control one's ability to deal with changes

in the environment that impact on the person (Berk, 2009). Thus, emotional competence involves the "ability to effectively regulate one's emotions to accomplish one's goal" (Squires, Bricker & Twombly, 2003, p. 3). It is also the ability to show positive emotion, awareness of people's emotion and ability to manage self-emotion in order to achieve personal goals. Emotional competence is vital for children's growth because the ability to understand emotions shows that they are in control of their mind and this has an influence on their personal well-being and social relationships. Emotions are important because they provide social information to other people and can affect the behaviour of others. Children's emotions can be trained by the way they are socialised. This is important because it fundamentally determines how emotionally stable the child becomes in adulthood.

Emotion can be classified into primary and secondary. Primary emotion reflects feelings of fear, joy, interest, sadness and other reactions to the basic needs of a child (Ekman, 1992; Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011). These are displayed early in life and do not require self-assessment or questioning on the part of the child. They are the basic elements used during social interaction. Secondary emotions tend to be seen in children in their second year and have elements of self-awareness and some appreciation of the reactions and feelings of others. Expressions of secondary emotions include pride, shame, embarrassment and feelings for others (Lewis, 1998**;** Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011; Saarni, Campos, Camras & Witherington, 2008). Their appearance shows that children's emotional lives are strongly connected to the development of their self-awareness. The achievement in this area is related to experience with the family and the emotional coaching they receive from their parents. Emotional competence is thus the ability of children to express, regulate and have knowledge about primary and secondary emotions. By implication, every child experiences primary emotions such as anger, fear, sadness and happiness. However, they react to these emotions in different ways due to differences in temperament and according to societal expectation.

Denham et al. (2003) identified the three components of emotional competence in children as mentioned earlier. These components were linked with social competence in pre-school children and are long-term predictors for attaining desirable social skills. Children who control their emotion (such as anger), display

positive emotion (such as happiness) do have good relationships with their peers. They are also perceived by their teachers as being socially competent and get higher scores on the social competence scale (Eisenberg, Liew & Pidada, 2004). However, children who cannot regulate their emotion, specifically anger, are disliked and rejected by their peers (Eisenberg et al., 2004).

Denham et al. (2003) carried out a longitudinal study among 143 pre-schoolers on the relationship between the three components of emotional competence on the one hand, and social competence. Sociometric likability and teacher ratings were used to assess the contributions of emotional expressiveness, emotion regulation and emotion knowledge to social competence. They found that children's emotional expressiveness predicted emotional regulation and emotional knowledge, and emotional regulation was linked to social competence. It can be deduced that emotional competence contributes to social competence. Children develop understanding of the concept of emotion early in life because they learn about emotions within the family settings through which they secure emotional understanding and setting for emotion communication. In this way, the emotional climate of the family influences three vital aspects of emotional competence. This implies that emotional competence can be influenced by the quality of interaction within the home environment.

Emotional expressiveness refers to the ability of children to show their emotions – positive or negative. Displays of positive emotions can serve as catalysts for forming friendships and ease integration into a group setting just as negative emotions can create barriers to social interaction and children who express their emotions enjoy better pro-social relationships with their peers (Denham, 2006; Denham & Couchoud, 1990; Rubin et al., 2006).

On the other hand, emotional knowledge is the ability to recognise others' emotions. It is understandable that children who are able to understand positive or negative emotions on the faces of, or through the behaviour of their peers are more likely to react in an appropriate way to sustain existing relationships or promote new friendships. Therefore, development of emotional knowledge is an important element in achieving social competence.

The third aspect is emotional regulation, which is the ability to control the various elements of one's emotions, with the objective of achieving a goal. This tends to involve managing, monitoring, assessing and evaluating the level and duration of specific emotional signs. Emotional regulation actions in young pre-school children involve self-regulation (Denham, 2010). Fox and Calkins (2003) show that emotional regulation is an important indication of the abilities of children to adjust later in life.

Studies have also shown that children that are better able to express their emotions in ways that are acceptable to others are less aggressive in school, more liked by their peers, respond positively to adults and show higher social competence skills (Eisenberg, Valiente & Eggum, 2010; Gilliom, Shaw, Beck, Schonberg & Lukon, 2002). Other studies have shown that emotional competence is a good indicator of various social adjustments which comprise pro-social behaviour among school children (Denham et al., 2003) and empathy (Ciarrochi, Chan, & Caputi, 2000). However, children who are either emotionally under or over-controlled tend to be socially incompetent.

Other studies have found the link between emotional expressiveness, emotional knowledge and pro-social and peer interaction (Denham, 1986; Denham & Couchoud, 1990; Denham & McKinley, 1993). When there is a delay in emotional regulation, children might develop behavioural problems and aggressive behaviour in later childhood (Denham et al., 2009). Understanding emotion is a function of social competence in pre-school. Furthermore, the prediction of individual differences in pre-schoolers' emotional competence is based on the abilities in emotional expressiveness, emotional regulation and emotional knowledge. Teachers and peer measurement of social competence can also be predicted in individual differences in these three aspects of emotional competence (Denham et al., 2003).

2.6.   Social-Emotional Competence: Importance and Development

Developmentalists have highlighted the relationship between emotional and social competences. The development of both in children is the key element in their integration into the society. Social-emotional competence is the "ability to understand, manage and express the social and emotional aspects of one's life in

ways that enable the successful management of life tasks such as learning, forming relationships, solving everyday problems and adapting to the complex demands of growth and development" (Elias et al., 1997, p .2). Accordingly, social-emotional competence can be defined as the ability of children to have pro-social behaviour (cooperation, helpfulness, friendliness) and be involved in self-regulation (thinking before acting, problem solving, and managing emotions) in a socially acceptable manner (Goodman, 2001). Denham (2006) argues that the development of social competence during early years affects the general well-being of the child throughout their life span. He adds that children gain experiences that enhance positive reciprocal relationships and self-confidence through socialisation. These experiences affect their future endeavours in ways which may be difficult to change (Farrar, Goldfield & Moore, 2007). Children's positive relationships have therefore been linked with high self-esteem, emotional knowledge and emotional regulation. For example, studies on early schooling suggest that children's positive relationships with teachers and peers are linked with school success (Raver & Knitze, 2002; Raver & Zigler, 2004). In addition, positive social-emotional competence is an important foundation for positive cognitive development throughout childhood and into later life (Hertzman, 2004; Moore, 2006; Sosna & Mastergeorge, 2005; Eisenberg, Valiente & Eggum, 2010). Positive social skills have been linked to general quality of life, happiness, high self-esteem, responsiveness and respect from parents (Danielson & Phelps, 2003).

Studies have mentioned the relationship between social-emotional competence and early school success (Denham, 2006; Denham et al., 2003; Denham et al., 2009). These confirm that social-emotional skill is the key foundation for early school success (Raver, 2002; Stipek, 2006). Furthermore, children's social-emotional competence includes the ability to interact positively with peers and teachers, promote intimate attachment relationships, emotional experience, emotional knowledge and emotional regulation. The combination of developmental domains such as social and emotional competence is important both in its own right and because it affects other domains of development, specifically numeracy, language, early literacy and communication skills (Cohen, Onunaku, Clothier & Poppe, 2005; Denham, 2006; Evangelou et al., 2009). Hence, Denham (2006) proposes that social-

emotional competence could be used as a scale for children's progress and programme achievement.

The importance of social-emotional competence in the developmental outcome of children cannot be over-looked. It is interconnected with other domains of development and they influence one another. Boivin and Beguin (1989) as well as Hymel, Rubin, Rowden and Lemare (1990) show that social-emotional competent children are more assertive, have greater self-efficacy and perform better in school. In the same vein, Rimm-Kauffman, Piata and Cox (2000) emphasise the importance of children's self-regulation and social-emotional competence as fundamental for future academic success. This suggests a positive relationship between the indicators of social-emotional competence and academic success in children. Denham et al. (1990) also note that social-emotional competent children are more popular, widely accepted and liked by their peers.

Moreover, Parker and Asher (1993) show that children who are socially competent are happier than those who are not. Gazelle and Ladd (2003) also reveal that they experience fewer emotional and behavioural problems and are less likely to engage in anti-social behaviour (Lochman, Barry & Pardini, 2003). The understanding of social-emotional competence is useful to protect the child from negative environmental influences and assist them to reach their maximum potential.

At this point, it is important to understand some general principles of human development. Development simply means the process by which children grow to acquire and learn how to use social-emotional skills (Hasting, 2006). Children's development of social-emotional competence could be shaped by a number of factors. Development is a function of time, which means that it occurs over time (Schaffer, 2011). Therefore, the acquisition and development of social-emotional skills can be seen as either a continuous or discontinuous process (Parke & Clarke-Stewart, 2011). Researchers note that the acquisition of more mature competences show a process of building upon past abilities instead of sudden changes in the forms of behaviour reflecting social competence. Therefore, development of social-emotional competence in children is a manifestation of change in the context of stability (Bronfenbrenner, 1989). As children develop, they change and tend to be stable at the pre-school age and any other factor in the transition process such as

physical changes, interaction with people, school, neighbourhood and cultural settings affect the children's developmental outcome.

Nevertheless, children are active agents who, to some extent, control and shape the direction of their own developmental stages (Bell, 1968; Kuczynski, 2003). Sameroff (2009) explain that children explore and understand their environment by themselves during the stages of development through interaction with other people. Parents help children to develop social responsibility through positive response to children's questions on social behavioural problems. These social skills would be transferred among peers during interaction, therefore affecting acceptance or rejection. The children's social-emotional competence is constantly changing as a result of mutual influence throughout the developmental process. Moreover, how well a child is socially and emotionally competent at any given time is the result of a wide range of factors including genetic predisposition, temperament, personality, parents, siblings, peers, teachers and quality of neighbourhood (Sameroff, 2000). Sameroff (2010) also believes that the study of human development is complex and behaviour changes over time due to certain experiences. Slater and Bremner (2011) add that child development is complex and multi-faceted and cannot be determined by mere observation. Therefore, it can be deduced that a child's developmental outcome cannot be determined by only observation of parenting or teaching styles with children's behaviour- questionnaires or interviews can also be used in gaining understanding about children's social-emotional competence (Zimmerman, Copeland, Laurel, Shope & Dielman, 1997). This implies that aside from the observation method, questionnaire can also be used to examine children's social-emotional competence.

Furthermore, according to Slater and Bremner (2011), child development can be studied in different ways. This would depend on the way the researcher views the developmental world of the child and how they can understand it. Human development cannot be predicted as children grow and change over time. In support of this, Sameroff's Transactional Model provides more understanding on bi-directional causal processes in social development of children. In the words of Sameroff (1975, p. 281), "the child alters his environment and in turn is altered by

the changed world he has created." In other words, children also have the inherent ability to create their own world.

2.7. The Bio-ecology of Children's Social-Emotional Competence

Educational and developmental psychologists have shown interest in the developing child. For example, researchers may decide to focus on the child and some immediate environmental factors that influence the child. The term bio-ecology simply means the biological factors of the child in addition to the environmental factors that shape the developmental outcome of a child. From an ecological perspective, the social-emotional competence of children is influenced by personal characteristics and experiences in the social environment. As children influence the social environment, their social-emotional competence is also influenced by other environmental factors such as parents, siblings, teachers, peers and the cultural settings.

2.7.1. Child Characteristics

The substantial contribution of genetic factors or external influence to social-emotional competence cannot be disregarded. This is because children as an active being have the opportunity to develop their own social-emotional competence through interaction with nature and social environment. Child characteristics (temperament, age, gender) play important roles in child developmental process as they interact with some environmental factors (Fox, 1998; Denham et al., 2009). Figure 2.3-2 shows that different layers of the ecosystem surround the child and they are influenced by these environmental factors. The child's ability to express and manage emotions according to societal expectation and the ability to be aware of other peoples' emotion helps the child to be accepted by peers during social interaction. The extent to which children manifest these characteristics also depends on the child's developmental age and gender. Children's social-emotional competence develops through a process that is associated with their personalities (Fox, 1998; Denham et al., 2009). This implies that social-emotional competence changes as children grow and develop in their characters.

According to Allport (1961, p. 34), "temperament is the characteristic phenomena of an individual's emotional stimulation, his customary strength and speed of response, the quality of his prevailing mood which are regarded as dependent upon constitutional make-up and therefore, largely hereditary in origin". Temperament refers to differences in individual style of behaviour which are related to affective activity and attention that can be noticed from early childhood. And it can also be referred to as different traits of individual personality such as extrovert and introvert. Thomas et al. (1963) proposed nine dimensions of temperament structure including; activity level, approach/withdrawal, adaptability, mood, threshold, intensity, distractibility, rhythmicity and attention span/persistence. The dimensions of temperament are the innate ability of children and this is what creates individual differences. In addition, negative emotions are also indicators of child temperament (Kochanska, 1994; Thomas, 1984). The traits of negative emotion comprises of anger, nervousness, frustration, fear, irritability and sadness. Research shows that children with negative emotions are at risk of developing emotional and behavioural difficulties (Brody, Stoneman & Burke, 1987; Eisenberg, Fabes & Murphy, 1996; Eisenberg et al., 1997). A child's ability to maintain this trait will depend on his experience and relationship with the environment.

It should be noted that emotional expressiveness and emotional regulation are the basic forms of temperament. Studies have shown the link between temperament and social-emotional competence; there is therefore considerable overlap between the domains of temperament and emotional competence (Denham et al., 2009). Temperament is biologically based and is centred on the ability of an individual child to express specific emotions in a certain unique way (Fox, 1998). Nevertheless, the environment can also change the personality of children in both positive and negative temperamental tendencies (Fox, 1998).

Temperament has been known to play an important role in the social-emotional competence of pre-school children (Denham et al., 2009; Nixon, 2012; Rothbart & Bates, 2006). Temperament and other personality traits help in understanding how individual children respond to emotions and how they form relationships. Many studies have shown direct relationships between temperament and a wide range of social-emotional developmental issues. Children's social-

emotional competence and school adjustment has been related to the difference between easy and difficult temperament (Eisenberg, Fabes, Guthrie & Reiser, 2000; Rothbart & Bates, 2006; Thomas, 1977). Thomas (1977) states that temperament affects development through the 'goodness of fit' or match with the environment of the child. Eisenberg et al. (1993) also maintain that positive temperament such as low reactivity and self-regulation seem to be related to pro-social behaviour and social competence. Although children may have inborn characteristics, how these develop as well as the development of their personality in social-emotional relationship is nevertheless interactive. How other people interact with them is actually what develops their personality (Rutter, 1987). This implies that though children may have their own characteristics, the role of the environment is important in developing their personality.

Moreover, social-emotional competence does not occur in a vacuum, the child and the environment influence each other through interaction. Children, due to their innate ability and socially influenced traits such as temperament, habits, experiences and physical features also have an impact on parents (Bell & Calkins, 2000). It should, however, be noted that studies on the effect of family background on children's development emphasise the importance of the relationship between family settings and child characteristics (McElwain & Volling, 2004; Rubin & Mills, 1991; Thomas, 1984).

2.7.2. Family Relationship

The family setting has also been recognised as one of the most important factors that determine social-emotional competence in a child. Variations in the emotional climate and the type of relationship in the family have an influence on social-emotional competence. As noted, children's social-emotional competence does not occur in a vacuum. It emerges in the context of the family. Parents are the primary sources of development of social-emotional competence of children. The socialisation process and the quality of relationships between the parent and child can be used to predict children's social-emotional competence (Baumrind, Larzelere & Owens, 2010; Danielson & Phelps, 2003). It is well documented that social-emotional competence in pre-schoolers emerges during parent-child relationships.

Studies have shown that styles of parenting, which involve punitive, anger, harsh, and uninvolved parental behaviour are related to children's aggression (Campbell, Pierce, Moore, Marakovitz & Newby, 1996; Crockenberg & Litman, 1990). As mentioned earlier, parent-child relationship is an important environmental factor influencing children's social-emotional competence. This implies that the type of social rules parents teach and the type of conversation they have with their children helps in the development of social and emotional competence.

Gottman, Katz and Hooven (1996) observe that the family emotional climate also helps to shape the development of social-emotional competence. Thus, parents and children who talk about their emotional experience and that of others enhance the development of social competence. The emotional climate of the home environment includes parents' response to the child's emotion and how emotion is expressed in the family (Denham, 1998; Eisenberg, Cumberland & Spinrad, 1998). This implies that the nature of conversation in the home through emotional coaching reflects in the children's behaviour and the way they communicate with others during conflict. Likewise, parents' expression of positive emotion also affects children's social-emotional competence. Parents are the role models for the children in the socialisation of emotion. Children whose parents are responsive to them are known to possess positive emotion. On the other hand, children with negative emotions are brought up in families which do not encourage children to express their emotions (Denham, 1998; Eisenberg et al., 1998; Fabes, Leonard, Kupanoff & Martin, 2001; Fagot, 1997; Halberstadt & Eabo, 2002). Fabes et al. (2001) conducted a study among pre-schoolers. The results showed that children with negative emotions during play with peers had parents who were punitive and responded harshly with negative emotions at home. It was also found that teachers perceive these children as low in social competence.

In addition to being models to the child, parents also inculcate their cultural beliefs, values and norms in the socialisation of emotion through repeated activities which in turn influence children's development. Some studies (Chang, Schwartz, Dodge & McBride-Chang, 2003; Cheah & Rubin, 2003, Chen, 2010; Edwards, 2010; Spinrad et al., 2007) show that parents play a dominant role in the development of children, specifically with mothers having the most influence on the child.

Furthermore, Cheah and Rubin (2003) state that Chinese mothers in urban areas emphasise the importance of social skills, particularly sharing, control of emotion among peers and helping others. They also underscore shyness, which they perceive as a form of respect and obedience to adults (Chen, Chang, He & Liu, 2005).

Also, it is important to note that sibling's relationships have an influence on children's social-emotional competence. Children who spend more time with their siblings have been associated with increased self-esteem and social-emotional competence among peers.

Furthermore, the involvement of parents in the choice of friends and school has great effect on a child's development. Studies have shown that parents have an influence on their children's lives through the choice of their school, neighbourhood, friends, secure attachment, environment and quality parent-child relationship (Sylva, Melhuish, Sammons, Siraj-Blatchford & Taggart, 2004).

Again, studies have found a relationship between parent-child relationship and positive interaction among peers. These studies also reveal that children who are securely attached to their parents at infancy have positive social competence and positive relationship with peers at pre-school (MacDonald & Parke, 1984). In addition, the provision of a home-learning environment also influences children's development. For example, Sylva et al. (2004, p. 2), in a longitudinal study on the Effective Provision of Pre-school Education (EPPE) project, claim that "for all children, the quality of the home-learning environment is more important for the intellectual and social development than parental occupation, education or income. What parents do is more important than who parents are". Furthermore, MacDonald and Parke (1984) conducted an observational study of three to four year old children who were asked to rate the children's popularity when playing with peers in the pre-school. It was discovered that children who experienced a positive home environment, where their fathers actively engaged with them and there was positive communication with their mothers had a good relationship with their peers in the nursery. This indicates that the good experience that a child has at home with the parents creates confidence, which leads to positive social-emotional competence at school. Gutman and Feinstein (2007) also suggest that children who experience emotional relationships with their mother in a warm environment display positive

developmental outcomes, irrespective of parental educational status and income level. The researchers also found out that harmonious family environment with emotional support and maternal involvement in school activity can promote social-emotional competence and academic achievement among school age children. The quality of the parent-child relationship is as important for children's developmental outcome as parents' socio-economic status. This implies that the quality time that the parents spend with the child at home affect the social-emotional competence of the child.

In the same vein, Spinrad et al. (2007) examined the relationship between maternal supportive parenting with effortful control and internalising or externalising problems and social competence of 18 month old toddlers. The sample consisted of 256, and a year later, 230 children. Mothers' responses to their toddlers' negative emotions were assessed using the Coping with Toddlers' Negative Emotions Scale to observe parental sensitivity. They found that maternal supportive parenting and toddlers' effortful regulation was associated with the quality of social effectiveness which assisted the development of social competence. By inference, mothers have more influence on the behaviour of pre-schoolers. It should be noted that the presence or absence of fathers has a strong and direct bearing on the progress of a child (Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002; Tamis-LeMonda, Shannon, Cabrera & Lamb, 2004; Tamis-LeMonda, et al., 2008).

In contrast, children who experience poor relationship as a result of family conflicts and stress are at greater risk of impairment in social competence. Several studies (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992; Kopp, 1989; Patterson, Reid & Dishion, 1992; Thompson, 1994; Wakschlag & Hans, 1999) have shown that children's social-emotional competence can be influenced by both the child's temperament and parental responsiveness and demands. In particular, children who show lower levels of emotional competence and more emotional and behavioural difficulties are most often found in families where parents display negative emotions, lack emotional coaching or are often engaged in conflict (Cummings & Davies, 1994; Denham et al., 2000; Eisenberg et al., 1998; Gottman et al., 1996). This implies that the role of the family is important for the children's social-emotional competence.

2.7.3. School Influence on Social-Emotional Competence

Studies have shown that the school environment has an influence on children's social-emotional competence (Sylva, 1994; Weare & Gray, 2003). Since school and home are believed to overlap, Denham (1998) states that besides parents, teachers also play an important role in shaping children's social-emotional competence. For instance, Vygotsky's theory suggests that teachers also serve as socialising agents by providing supportive scaffolding which stimulates the development of social-emotional competence and leads to a greater sense of confidence.

In addition, a caring school community does not only support academic excellence, it also helps develop pro-social behaviour in the classroom. The school encourages quality teacher-parent relationship and this promotes children's development, which enhances self-esteem and cooperation with peers and adults. Perhaps, this explains why Sylva (1994) in reviewed evidence, confirms that the school has an influence on children's development. It should be noted that peer relationships in a school environment are important in the development of social-emotional competence. Children's positive experience with peers makes them more secure within their group, bringing about high self-esteem and positive social-emotional competence. As children grow, they learn how to manage their emotions and interact effectively among peers and this makes them more acceptable and popular in the school. Nevertheless, Weare and Gray (2003) in a research report conducted on developing children's emotional and social competence in London, UK commented that problematic peer relationship could be detrimental to children's social-emotional competence.

Quality teacher-child relationship is also known to play a vital role in the development of children's social-emotional competence. Teachers are believed to help in creating a positive emotional classroom environment which helps in the development of positive social-emotional competence. A positive school environment provides a warm relationship between the teacher and the child and this in turn enhances children autonomy and encourages cooperation, positive expectations and pro-social behaviour (Weare & Gray, 2003). Evidence abounds that quality pre-school life has a close link with better children's intellectual and social development. It has also been discovered that teachers with high qualification and

warm relationships enhance children's developmental outcome. This explains why many scholars of child development believe that children perform better in schools where they rate both educational and social development as equally vital. This implies that school policy affects children directly or indirectly.

2.7.4. Cultural and Social-Emotional Competence

Culture plays an important role in the development of social-emotional competence and other developmental outcomes (Rogoff, 2003; Cole & Dennis, 1998; Saarni, 1998). Culture has an influence on how children think and relate with other people; it is indirectly integrated into the children's social-emotional competence (Morelli & Rothbaum, 2007; Thompson & Virmani, 2010). Similarly, Nsamenang (2009) contends that culture has an influence on every aspect of a child. Also, cross-cultural researchers (Vygotsky, 1978; Rogoff, 2003) emphasise the role of socio-cultural context in the development of social-emotional competence. For instance, smiling means friendliness and it is encouraged in many cultures. African societies do not encourage eye-to-eye contact because it is construed as impolite behaviour (Olatunji, 1982). While some communities appreciate silence as being a cultural value, others however, may discourage it. This implies that social-emotional competence is rooted in culture and every society places different norms and values on the children's social-emotional competence. It should be noted that this views might not be the same in all African societies due to modernisation. It is therefore important to have clear knowledge of the culture and social setting of a developing child in order to understand his social-emotional competence.

Several studies reveal that different societies have different values for the development of social-emotional competence in children (Chen et al., 2006; Greenfield et al., 2006). According to Triandis (1997, p. 439), culture is a "shared set of beliefs, attitudes, norms, values and behaviour organised around a central theme and found among speakers of one language in one time period and in one geographic region". Culture can also be referred to as the way of life of people in a society. It can thus be deduced that the major similarity of every culture is their beliefs and values which bring about different societal goals in relation to the social-emotional competence of the child. For instance, collectivist cultures such as Asian and other

non-western societies emphasise group interaction in order to promote quality social relationships with other groups, and children are not encouraged to express their emotions in order to maintain interpersonal and group harmony (Kitayama, Markus & Lieberman, 1995; Tamis-LeMonda & Cabrera, 2002; Tamis-LeMonda, Shannon, Cabrera & Lamb, 2004; Tamis-LeMonda, et al., 2008). This implies that every culture has its values and norms but diverse in their goals due to differences in societal expectation.

Chinese culture controls negative emotion in order to achieve a societal goal (Chen, French & Schneider, 2006). This culture is similar to the Nigerian culture because it is also collectivist. Akinsola (2011) states that Nigerian parents emphasise; respect and obedience to authority, and children are discouraged in the expression of emotion. In contrast, in the individualist western culture, the value and belief is to encourage autonomy and positive social skills (Triandis, 1995). Positive social-emotional competence is considered appropriate in individualistic cultures, and inability to be socially active is termed maladjustment or social-emotional incompetence (Rubin, Burgess & Hastings, 2002). For example, a child that is shy is perceived as well behaved in non-western culture, but socially incompetent in western culture. This implies that cultural background may influence people's perception on social-emotional competence, specifically in response to questionnaire.

Furthermore, Essau et al. 2012 conducted a study on similarities between five domains of SDQ and the three dimensions of externalising, internalising and pro-social behaviour. In their observation of the psychometric properties of Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) involving 2,418 adolescents from 5 countries aged between 12 and 17 years, the result revealed that the internal consistency and validity of the SDQ total difficulties were good for all the countries. However, the dimensions of the SDQ provide different results across the countries. In addition, the findings improved when the reversed questions were removed as suggested by Essau et al. (2012). Overall, these results have provided evidence for the reliability and internal consistency of the SDQ as a whole. This implies that cultural settings due to different interpretation of the social-emotional domains may affect SDQ and the inverse score may also have effect on the results. It can be concluded that the dimensions of social-emotional competence may be valued differently in both

individualistic and collectivist cultures (Goodman 2001, Rothbath & Bates, 2006). This implies that dimensions of social-emotional competence such as hyperactivity, conduct, peer problems, emotionality and pro-social behaviour according to Goodman's scale, might have different meanings in different cultures. Nevertheless, pre-school children from different cultures may respond differently to these dimensions of social-emotional competence (Chen & French, 2008).

One current issue is the extent to which cultural background and differences influence the abilities of a child to acquire and exhibit the set of social-emotional competence needed to function properly in their larger society. Several studies (Ogbu, 1981; Bronfenbrenner & Morris 2006; Chen & French, 2008; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Rogoff, 2003) have proposed that social-emotional competence should be studied within the cultural setting in which the child is developing. Nevertheless, socio-cultural theorists and psychologists agree that there are basic principles of child development that apply to all children. These are subject to different cultural and ethnic backgrounds (Rogoff, 2003; Gauvain, 2001).

Cultural values and norms can also affect social interaction (Chen et al., 2006). In the same way, children affect cultural norms and values through social interaction (Bell, 1968; Masten, 2006; Patterson, 1965; Sameroff, 1975, 2010). Social interaction with peer groups is the fundamental tool for children's development in almost every society. Peers and adults consider sociable children active and socially competent in an individualistic culture (Rubin, Burgess & Hastings, 2002). However, this is less encouraged in collectivist culture. For instance, Chen, Liu and Li (2000) in their studies among Chinese children indicate that sociability in Chinese children positively predicts social impact but not social acceptance.

Edwards, de Guzman, Brown and Kumru (2006) examined interaction with peer groups and sociability from six countries by observing children's play. The findings indicate that the cultures that value social-emotional competence seem to facilitate social interaction among peers. The result indicates that children in open communities such as Okinawa and the United States where peer social interaction is encouraged had significantly higher scores on social interaction than children from close agricultural communities (Kenya and India). Chen et al. (2006) also carried out

a study among Canadian pre-school children and their Chinese counterparts. The findings revealed that Canadian pre-schoolers were more actively involved in social interaction with their peers than children from Chinese background. This implies that there is a relationship between cultural values and sociability.

Furthermore, Whiting & Edwards (1988) found that children from a traditional society where the extended family live together and are expected to carry out family responsibilities show more pro-social behaviour than children from families with high socio-economic status. In addition, Chen & French (2008) confirm that kindergarten children in China display more cooperation among peers during social interaction than children in Canada. Pro-social behaviour among peers in some Asian countries has been associated with societal values (Chen & French, 2008).

Researchers have suggested that the effect of culture on social-emotional competence is a dynamic process which can be classified into three levels: the developing child, the changing cultural setting and the role of social interaction as a mediator between the child and the school and parents. Chen and French (2008) propose that it is important to explore the characteristics of the child and socialisation practices which have influence on developmental outcomes within the cultural setting. Since different cultures have their own set of attitudes, beliefs, values and behaviours which are shared among the people in the society, it is necessary to find out the social-emotional competence of pre-schoolers in Nigeria.

Figure 2.7-1: Factors influencing socio-emotional competence of the developing child

In summary, all the aforementioned factors describe the bio-ecological systems of the child, which is the microsystem of the child. It is well known that parents, schools, teachers, peers, neighbours and culture all form a composite matrix through which the social life of a child is formed, either by direct instruction or indirectly through contacts in a social setting (Eisenberg et al., 2010). It is noteworthy that parents contribute to children's development in the domains of social-emotional competence, academic performance and psychosocial development. In addition, at the pre-school age, parents interact with the child more than any environmental factor in the social system (microsystem). The development of social-emotional competence begins within the home environment and plays a vital role in developmental outcomes. Although studies have acknowledged the role of peers, siblings, teachers and the school community, parents are the first point of contact, the primary teachers of a child. Therefore, the parental role is important during the developmental process. It should be noted that different styles of parenting affect social-emotional competence. It is therefore necessary to explore the influence of styles of parenting and social-emotional competence. The review of different types of parenting style and its effect on social-emotional competence will be discussed in the next section.

2.8. Bio-ecology of Parenting

Studies have shown the influence of parenting on child developmental outcomes. From an ecological viewpoint, parents behave and react to their children according to their societal norms and values. In addition, parents' personal characteristics and experiences in the social environment, parents history, culture, socio-economic status (parental education and occupation) and the larger society, also affect parenting styles.

2.8.1. Parenting

According to Martins (2000), parenting is the process of promoting and supporting the physical, emotional, social and intellectual development of a child from infant to adulthood. It is also the process through which parents nourish, protect and guide a child throughout the process of development (Brooks, 1991). Darling (1999, p. 1) and Darling and Steinberg (1993, p. 487) also defines parenting as, "a

complex activity that includes many specific behaviours that work individually and together to influence child outcomes". Maccoby, 2007 describes parenting as two fundamental factors which involve love; which can be regarded as parents' emotional support for their children through communication of affection, or parents' imposition of discipline in form of scolding, reasoning, spanking, neglecting and temporary withdrawal of affection. Appropriate balance between love and discipline helps in the development of social-emotional competence (Maccoby, 2007). The similarity in these definitions is that parenting is seen as the way parents nurture children from birth to adulthood in compliance with the standards of the society. This implies that apart from the biological relationship, parenting can also be described as the process of child rearing, which involves different styles and skills. This shows that parenting is a continuous process of interaction in which the child learns through adult support. It should be noted that parental nurturing is different from one culture to another.

Nigerian parents believe in child nurturing from birth to adulthood (Akinsola, 2011), in contrast to western culture where independence is encouraged at an early stage (Grusec & Hasting, 2007; Triandis, 2001). In the context of this study, parenting can be defined as the strategies that parents use to bring up a child in order to enable them develop properly in all areas, in accordance with societal expectation. Parents have the social responsibility to take care of their children through socialisation in Nigeria. Socialisation refers to the way in which children acquire the social skills, education, training, observation, attitude, motive and behaviour which are required for successful integration into the society (Grusec & Hastings, 2007; Ladd & Pettit, 2002; Parke & Buriel, 1998). The socialisation process is bi-directional in that though parents convey socialisation messages to their children yet children vary in their responses to such messages (Grusec & Kuczynski, 1980; Grusec & Hastings, 2007). The styles of parenting and its association with developmental outcomes are important parts of socialisation.

2.8.2. Socialisation as a Concept

Socialisation refers to the process through which the whole set of standards of behaviour; skills, beliefs and attitudes that are acceptable in society are inculcated in children (Grusec & Hastings, 2007). According to Spera (2005, p. 126), socialisation

is simply the "manner by which a child, through education, training, observation and experience acquires skills, motives, attitudes and behaviours that are required for successful adaptation to a family and a culture". Socialisation can also be explained as "an adult-initiated process by which a young person through education, training and imitation acquires culture as well as the habits and values congruent with adaptation to that culture" (Baumrind, 1978, p. 239). It represents the impact of the environment on children. The gradual transition into responsible adulthood involves the acquisition of social and emotional skills. At pre-school age in Africa, the child is taught personal hygiene and how to do domestic works. According to Nsamenang (2009, p.102), "indigenous African parenting practices socialise the norms which foster children's self-education in participative learning processes in their families and communities, especially in early childhood". As stated earlier, socialisation is a "bi-directional" process, which means that children act upon the socialising agents in their social environments and this action can bring about a change in the socialising agents' behaviours (Grusec & Hastings, 2007). Hastings (2006) opines that experiences in a child's social environment interact with biological make-up to create individual development trajectories. Bell (1968) and Bell and Chapman (1986), in their "Child Effect Theory" propose that parents' and children's behaviour influence each other and it is possible that the child's behaviour might have an influence on parenting styles.

Sameroff (2010) describes in more detail how things change over time by using transactional double-helix theory to explain the relationship between parent and child. Some researchers (Coplan, Arbeau & Armer, 2008) have also shown the relationship between parental sensitivity and social and emotional development and how this benefits the school adjustment of children. Similarly, Eisenberg, Spinrad and Eggum (2010) suggest that parental sensitivity could be influenced by the interaction between child temperament and contextual factors such as child gender and social support. Likewise, Meng (2012) argues that child temperament has an influence on parenting styles and parenting goals. Since child characteristics affect parenting styles, children's social-emotional competence would be affected by parenting styles. This implies that socialisation is the process of transforming a biological being (nature) into a social being (nurture).

Parents play important roles in determining children's development. The method used to raise their children is called parenting style. Thus, parents can transmit the socialisation goal of each culture because parents are primary agents of socialisation and are responsible for the transmission of cultural norms and values. The child must be able to conform to the norms, values and goals of the society (Chao & Tseng, 2002). These are required for proper integration into the society through attainment of cultural standards of adult competence (Chao & Tseng, 2002). In Nigeria, children are mainly cared for by parents and close relatives. Parents are the first and main socialising agents for children but later, peers, teachers and friends also play important roles.

However, studies have shown that parents in every society, particularly in Nigeria, struggle with how to raise children in order to prepare them for challenges of life and adulthood (Yorburg, 2002). Societal rules and regulations help parents raise children to become competent, responsible and fully functioning members of the society. The socialisation of Nigerian children does not involve the biological parent alone. It is the responsibility of the entire family and the entire community as a whole. Family members and the community socialise children to the norms, values and standards of the society. There is an adage among the Yoruba of South-Western Nigeria that says only one person gives birth to a child, but the entire community becomes the social parents (Emmanuel et al., 2012).

Nevertheless, modernisation and urbanization have combined to influence the collectivist roles of extended family networks which affect children's social behaviour. The individualistic culture of the western world has affected the socialisation process of Nigerian parents. The individualistic role of child rearing has diluted styles of parenting such that now, parents employ house-helps to take care of their children due to the work pressure in urban areas (Emmanuel et al, 2012). It should be noted that this might have an effect on parenting style.

2.8.3. Parenting Styles

Parenting style is defined as the emotional climate of the home environment where parents raise their children (Baumrind, 1996; Coplan et al., 2002; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). These styles can also be described as the constellation of parental

attitude and the nature of interactions between parent and child across different settings (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). According to Baumrind (1991, p. 57), "parenting style is used to capture normal variations in parents' attempts to control and socialise their children". This definition is similar to Eastin, Greenberg & Hofschire (2006, p. 493) who view "parenting style as representing the amount of involvement and strictness used by a parent to deal with their teenage children". It could be deduced therefore that the variance in children's behaviour is a function of the different approaches employed by their individual parents in raising them. Based on the above definitions, parenting styles can be described as the strategies and standards used by parents to raise their children.

Early researchers studying the influence of parenting style on child behavioural patterns explored different dimensions of parenting styles. These include responsiveness (Baldwin, 1948; Freud, 1933; Rogers, 1960; Sears, Maccoby & Levin 1957; Schaefer, 1959), democratic/autocratic (Baldwin, 1948), emotional involvement (Baldwin, 1948), tendency towards control (Schaefer, 1959), acceptance (Symonds, 1939), tendency towards dominance (Symonds, 1939) and restrictiveness/permissiveness (Becker, 1964). Their results showed that parents who support their children to be independent and show them affection (responsiveness, warmth) and firm control had children with higher levels of social competence (Baldwin, 1948; Sears, Maccoby & Levin, 1957). Baumrind's works, between the late 1960s and early 1970s were the most popular and important approaches used to study parenting styles (Jackson, 2002).

2.8.4. Baumrind's Parenting Styles Typologies

Baumrind conducted extensive research on parenting styles after the work of early researchers. Baumrind (1967) presented a global foundational study which has become the most significant work on the subject. Her multi-dimensional approach led to the general classification of parenting styles into three: authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. Maccoby and Martin (1983) introduced the fourth style: uninvolved and neglecting permissive parenting styles. Researches published within the last two decades have largely focused on the effects of parenting styles on children's developmental outcomes. Results support the notion that authoritative

parenting produces the best outcomes while authoritarian and permissive parenting produces negative outcomes (Demo & Cox, 2000). In Baumrind's original study, four dimensions of parental behaviour were identified: Parental Control, Parental Demands, Parental-Child Communication and Parental Nurturance (Baumrind, 1967).

According to Baumrind (1967, 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b & 1991c), parenting styles were derived from analysing parenting which was centred on middle class and white families. These three typologies of parenting have different effects on cognitive and social competence (Akinsola, 2012; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Lu & Chang, 2013; Martínez, García & Yubero, 2007; Steinberg et al., 1992; Sorkhabi, 2005). In a study of 32 pre-school children, Baumrind (1967) compared the parenting backgrounds of children showing good indications of maturity and stability with those lacking these qualities. The author drew a connection between social-emotional competence in pre-school children and controlling and nurturing attributes of their parents. It was discovered that parents of children lacking in social skills were non-supportive while immature children also had non-controlling parents. This study formed the basis of Baumrind's original description of the first three parenting styles.

Baumrind (1971) also conducted a longitudinal study of 134 middle class Caucasian children aged four to five years involving two home visits of three hours followed by a structured interview of both parents. This led to the identification of a group of children who are clearly discontented, withdrawn and distrustful when compared to others. The parents of these children were detached, controlling and lacked warmth in contrast to other parents. This longitudinal study was different from the previous study in which the families were selected based on the children's pattern of behaviour and that of their parents. In this longitudinal study, families were categorised and compared on the basis of parent's pattern of behaviour in relation to their children.

Baumrind (1971) noted that children whose parents are authoritative appear to be most competent in school. In contrast, children whose parents are authoritarian or permissive are less competent in school. Baumrind (1971) suggested that authoritative parenting provides support for a child's independence. Authoritative parenting is built around effective communication between the parent and the child.

The parent is actively involved in the development of the social-emotional competence of the child and balances these responsibilities in moderation. The authoritative parent is warm and responsive, reasons and explores the consequences of choices made with the child (Baumrind, 1991a, 2013; Demo & Cox, 2000). While allowing flexibility for the child within the set limit, the authoritative parent expects a responsible and mature behaviour without being restrictive. This parenting style attempts to balance the child's innate personality with the need to acquire emotional and social skills required to integrate within the society. Thus, authoritative parents help their children to develop their personal attributes with the right mix of demandingness and responsiveness. This type of parenting helps in nurturing high social-emotional competence and autonomy by creating an avenue for guidance (Grolnick & Pomerantz, 2009). This in turn helps the child to be emotionally stable.

In contrast, authoritarian parenting, according to Baumrind (1971) is characterised by rigidity and harshness. Parents with authoritarian tendencies are often pre-occupied with maintaining a clearly defined status by demanding obedience. Authoritarian parents generally set and enforce rules without taking time to explain them, leaving no room for the involvement of the child in controlling actions and decisions. This parenting style is also associated with high demands and very little responsiveness. Evidence shows that authoritarian parenting leads to negative social and emotional competence in children which are frequently carried through to adolescence.

In contrast to authoritative and authoritarian parents, Baumrind (1971) suggests that permissive parents are low in demands. The main element of this parenting style is laxity and inconsistency in setting standards and limits for the child. Permissive parents are generally non-demanding but show high levels of responsiveness. While this model tends to promote highly affectionate relationships between children and parents, children of permissive parents are frequently impulsive and this is manifest in instant gratification and aggressiveness. Permissiveness can sometimes go beyond unwillingness to discipline children; it also involves parents encouraging the child to freely express impulses and emotions in any setting.

Maccoby and Martins (1983) introduced two new dimensions of parental behaviour: parental demandingness and parental responsiveness. Parental demandingness encompasses control, supervision and maturity demands while parental responsiveness includes warmth, acceptance and involvement (Maccoby & Martins, 1983; Baumrind, 1989, 1991a). As shown in Figure 2.8-1, Baumrind (1989); Maccoby & Martins (1983) use these two dimensions in their subsequent studies to develop four types of parenting styles. Using the elements of demandingness and responsiveness, the permissive parent described by Baumrind was further delineated into 'indulgent' and 'neglecting' parenting. The former are parents that are characterised by low levels of demandingness and high level of responsiveness. Glasgow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg and Ritter (1997, p. 508) described this parenting as "tolerant, warm and accepting, yet exercises little authority, makes few demands for mature behaviour and allows considerable self-regulation by the adolescent". These adolescents are college students of age group between 15 and 16 years. On the other hand, the latter is non-responsive. These parents are neglectful and do not monitor their children.

Figure 2.8-1: Parenting styles

(Based on Baumrind, 1989; Maccoby and Martin, 1983)

Baumrind (1989) conducted a second wave longitudinal study when the children were nine years of age. This study involved 162 children and their parents. Parenting styles, classified based on the mother and father's profiles were identified as well as the children's level of competence. As shown in Figure 2.8-1, authoritative parenting scored high in both demandingness and responsiveness. Authoritarian parents were highly demanding and were barely responsive. Permissive parents were highly responsive and barely demanding. Traditional parents showed different parenting styles in which mothers were highly responsive and barely demanding while fathers were highly demanding but non-responsive. Rejecting-neglecting parents scored low in both demandingness and responsiveness. The study concluded that children reared by authoritative parents had high levels of competence which

comprises ideal competence (scoring high on both socially assertive and socially responsive). Traditional parents in Baumrind's study showed mixed parenting styles but the study failed to indicate its outcome on children's development.

Baumrind (1991a) seemed to approve of Martins and Maccoby's findings and in her later studies applied the concepts of demandingness/responsiveness. Demandingness can be described as the assertions parents make on their own children to become part of the family unit by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront children who disobey the rules. However, responsiveness is any action which purposefully inculcates independence, self-regulation and self-assertion by the provision of attuned support, warmth and sensitivity to the important requirements and demands of the child (Baumrind, 1991a).

Baumrind (1991b) carried out the third wave longitudinal study collecting data when the children were at the age of 15. This study involved 139 adolescents and their parents, all chosen from a well-educated, wealthy Caucasian background. The parenting styles and their effects on children's developmental outcome were studied over a period during which the subjects were between the age of four and 15 years. The study concluded that authoritative parents indicate high demandingness and high responsiveness which show a high degree of success in instilling proper socialisation in their adolescents. It was also shown that children of authoritative parents display self-confidence and cope well in stressful and challenging situations later in life.

The results of the three longitudinal wave studies were constant from the pre-school sample to the adolescent sample. There is a relationship between the authoritative parenting style and high social and instrumental competence. However, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles are related to lower social and instrumental competence (Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c & 2013). These studies show that the authoritative parenting style is the most appropriate and several other studies have found a strong link between authoritative parenting and school performance. It should be noted that the majority of the children in the sample study are from affluent homes and they are white; apparently, this may affect the parenting style.

Table 2.1 below shows the summary of the dimensions of parental behaviour.

Table 2.8-1: Dimension and Types of Parenting

	Disciplinary Strategies	Warmth & Nurture	Communication Styles	Expectation of Maturity & Control
Authoritative	High	High	High	High
Authoritarian	High	Low	Low	Low
Indulgent	Low	High	Low	Low
Neglecting	Low	Low	Low	Low

The Table 2.1 reveals that permissive neglecting parents pay little or no attention to their children thereby causing them to score low in demandingness and responsiveness. Parents who adopt this parenting style neither correct nor monitor the progress of their children. They are more likely to find ways to avoid taking responsibility for their children. Children raised in neglected settings are susceptible to a lack of social competence and show signs of low academic achievement due to truancy and inability to relate with their peers (Capaldi & Patterson, 1991). However, there is only limited study of this style since parents in this category are not responsive to their children. Thus, the study will examine the three other parenting styles, authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. Because the children are pre-school children, permissive parenting styles will be used without delineating it into two.

Baumrind (1991c) argues that demandingness could be separated into those demands placed by children on the society and those placed by the society on children. She contends that using demandingness and responsiveness as parameters for ascertaining the differences is insufficient. Other criteria such as restrictiveness and firm control may be more useful in relation to authoritative and authoritarian parenting. While both of them are high in firm control, authoritarians are highly restrictive. The aforementioned large empirical evidence suggests that authoritative parenting produces better social-emotional competent children (Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c & 2013; Elias & Yee, 2009; Spera, 2005). However, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles are often related to lower

social-emotional competence and developmental outcomes particularly in the area of academic achievement (Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c & 2013; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Halpenny, Nixon & Watson, 2010; Nixon, 2012; Spera, 2005). One of the limitations of Baumrind's study is her failure to recognise the bi-directional influence between the parent and the child. However, it should be noted that the study was conducted among the elite and specifically, among the middle class in the west.

Authoritative parenting has been recommended because it encourages autonomy, which is known to help children develop confidence and positive social-emotional competence. Studies have shown that authoritative parenting help children to develop autonomy (Sroufe, 1996). Parents from an individualistic culture tend to encourage autonomy, emotional independence, assertiveness and privacy. By implication, individualists encourage autonomy and collectivists encourage their children towards obedience and respect to authority. Pomerantz, Moorman and Litwack (2007) suggest that parents who encourage autonomy more than control provide the child with the opportunity for problem solving on their own. There are indications that development of self-autonomy is an important issue of ontogenetic development (Cicchetti, 1990; Cicchetti & Schneider-Rosen, 1986; Sroufe, 1990). Again, studies (Deci & Ryan 1985; Grusec & Hasting, 2007) have shown that autonomy help the child to be involved in problem solving and to be independent. Similarly, Crockenberg and Litman (1990), note that autonomy is a basic foundation in the development of social-competence during the pre-school period.

However, from researchers' point of view, in a collectivist culture like Nigeria where emphasis is on family harmony, respect, family integrity and obedience, autonomy may not be encouraged. This implies that children are not allowed to express their emotions. In support of this, some cross-cultural researchers (Grusec & Hasting, 2007; Triandis, 2001) argue that autonomy is more encouraged in western than non-western cultures. Moreover, studies have shown that cultures where authoritarian parenting is practised are now known to practise authoritative parenting styles due to modernisation. Kim and Chung (2003) pointed out that authoritative parenting style is becoming more frequently used and this may be ascribed to increased exposure to western culture. Notwithstanding, Baumrind (1972,

1996) suggests that authoritative parenting style may not be the most appropriate in some cultures and in certain circumstances, specifically in relation to children from low income or dangerous backgrounds. Baumrind (1972) conducted a study on the effect of socialisation by comparing the influence of parenting styles on the behaviour of pre-school children- some Black-White children. The sample consists of 16 black children and their parents. Exploratory analysis was used to analyse the study. The result indicates that black parents were viewed by white standards as being authoritarian than their white counterparts. The girls from authoritarian families were found to be most self-assertive and independent. To buttress this view, Baldwin and Cole (1990) comment that children are well adjusted when authoritarian parenting style is used. Similarly, McWayne, Owsianik, Green and Fantuzzo (2008) question the validity of using Baumrind's theoretical framework in the study of parenting styles within minority groups.

The effect of authoritative parenting in achieving school performance was more pronounced within the European and Hispanic Americans than the Asian and African-Americans (Baumrind, 1971; Coplan et al., 2002; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Kaufmann et al., 2000). In addition, studies have shown that parents in collectivist cultures are more likely to use authoritative parenting style when dealing with pre-school children. Supporting this view, Kaufmann et al. (2000, p. 242) stated, "the benefit of authoritative parenting for this age group in relation to both lowered maladjustment and enhanced competence is not limited to white middle-class youngsters". This view is subject to debate because there are cases of children raised under authoritarian African parents who possess a high social competence and achieve high academically in school (Ang & Goh, 2006; Baumrind, 1972, 1996; Chao, 1994; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Dwairy & Menshar, 2006; Dwairy, Achoui, Abouserie & Farah, 2006; Gaspar & Paiva, 2004; Steinberg et al., 1991; Kaufmann et al., 2000). The inconsistency of results implies that parenting styles might be different due to cultural differences arising from different beliefs and norms (Baumrind, 1972; Chao, 1994; Deater-Deckerd, Dodge, Bates & Pettit, 1996; Pomerantz & Wang, 2009; Steinberg, Dornbusch & Brown, 1992; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts & Dornbusch, 1994).

The influence of parenting styles on child development will depend on the interpretation of the parent's intentions by the child. According to socio-constructivism theory, children see a parent's discipline as being appropriate when compared to the parent's level of responsiveness (Grusec & Davidov, 2007; Maccoby, 2007; Martinez & Forgatch, 2001; Vygotsky, 1978). This implies that the appropriateness of parenting styles might vary due to cultural background and social policy while parenting styles may be different across cultures.

Baumrind used different kinds of methods to assess parenting styles. These include psychologist's Q-sorts, parents' rating scales and behavioural observation method. Baumrind's original work was based on observations of mother-child interactions. Subsequent studies also used parents' or child's reports as a measure for parenting styles. The limitation in Baumrind's method is the use of fewer samples. Despite the limitations of the theory, Baumrind's model has been widely used in different cultures to understand parenting styles.

In order to improve on Baumrind's methodology and number of samples, Dornbusch et al. (1987) conducted a study on 7,826 multi-ethnic pupils and found that there is a strong correlation between parenting style and adolescent school performance. The Dornbusch study also shows that the effect of authoritative parenting in achieving school performance tends to be more pronounced among European and Hispanic Americans than among Asian and African-Americans (Dornbusch et al., 1987). From the foregoing, ethnic and cultural background are important determinants of parenting styles and have their respective outcomes. The authoritative parenting style was found to be more predominant among white parents while the authoritarian parenting style was more common among African-Americans, Asian-Americans and Hispanic-Americans respectively (Abell, Clawson, Washington, Bost & Vaughn, 1996; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Odubote, 2008; Steinberg et al., 1991).

Furthermore, Buri (1991) developed the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) to measure correlates of parental permissiveness, authoritarian and authoritativeness. The tool was used to assess parenting styles as perceived by adolescents. Children raised under permissive and authoritarian environments tend to be impulsive and struggle to display goal-oriented activities. They are generally less

independent than their peers brought up in authoritative families. Inadequate supervision of children by parents is associated with incompetence among young and adolescent children to adjust and integrate into school. Children of permissive parents are not significantly different from children of authoritarian parents. Nevertheless, when compared with children of authoritative parents, they achieve less academically. Notwithstanding, the limitation of this method is that it is not based on data from the parents themselves and does not consider other variables that interact with these parenting styles.

Several studies used adolescents' reports of parents to obtain the information needed in assessing the three main typologies of parenting styles of Baumrind (Buri, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg, Elmen & Mounts, 1989; Steinberg et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992). These indirect parenting measures completed by adolescents and used in assessing adolescent outcomes eliminate several disadvantages of Baumrind's approach. However, they may be unsatisfactory for use with younger children since they are designed to document adolescents and how they were parented. Questions that are related to academics are often used in the questionnaire item and measurements based on categorical and dimensional measures have equally been widely used.

Categorical measures scored authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles for each respondent while the dimensional measures provide the scores on dimensions of parental behavioural control and parental responsiveness for each respondent [Child Rearing Practices Report, (Block, 1961); Parental Bond Instrument, (Parker, Tupling & Brown, 1979)]. The dimensional measures of parenting behaviour could be used to categorise parenting styles into three styles of parenting.

Robinson, Mandleco, Frost Olsen and Hart (2001) constructed parenting scale for parents of pre-school children with the use of Baumrind's model of parenting styles. This is an example of categorical measures. 1,251 samples size of parents completed the PSDQ questionnaire and factorial analysis was used to analyse parenting styles. The three styles of parenting were discovered along with dimensions of parenting styles. This measure of parenting styles has been used in

different cultures, specifically in the western culture, African-American as well as Asian-American cultures.

Buttressing this view, Winsler, Madigan and Aquilino (2005) believe that tools of Parenting Style and its Dimensions, developed by Robinson et al. (2001) is the new way of measuring individual parenting style. Besides, it has the advantage that each parent reports their own style as well as their spouse's. Winsler, et al. (2005) studied the correspondence between self-reported maternal and paternal parenting styles as well as mother and father perceptions of spousal parenting with a population involving parents of pre-school children. Mothers and fathers of 28 pre-school children participated in the research. Parenting Style and Dimension Questionnaire (PSDQ) was used to assess parenting styles. The subject-parents received their questionnaires directly from the school and were asked to complete the survey independently. The completed questionnaires were returned with the child to the pre-school. According to Winsler et al. (2005), the PSDQ was an outstanding instrument for assessing parenting styles and a potent parameter for measuring psychometrically secure scale with particular reference to parental nurture and discipline.

The general applicability of parenting styles has been of interest to several researchers and this has generated a lot of questions, specifically, as to whether the authoritative parenting style is the most appropriate in every culture or not. For example, Kaufmann et al. (2000) indicates that research among African-American families found higher scores on the authoritarian parenting styles. George (2004) found similar results in a study indicating that African-American parents are more likely to choose an authoritarian parenting style than white parents. It is, therefore, necessary to explore the range of parenting styles in the Nigerian context.

Belsky's Model, which comprises ecological theory and parent's competence, suggests that different factors affect parenting styles. Moreover, researchers proposed that parenting style could be influenced by marital stress, mental health, child-rearing history, parent's personality, parent's occupation and education, child's characteristics, social network and marital status (Belsky, 1985; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999). In support of this view, Bronfenbrenner (1979, 2005 & 2006) suggest that other factors outside the child environment have influence on the

parenting styles of the parents in the exosystem and the macrosystem. Thus, these factors, which might affect the way parents raise their children will be discussed.

2.8.5. Factors Influencing Parenting Styles

Developmental researchers and educational psychologists have been interested in factors that affect parenting styles. Studies have shown the relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence of children (Baumrind, 1989; Baumrind, 1991a; Denham et al., 2000; Elias & Yee, 2009; Nixon, 2012; Pearson & Rao, 2003). However, as parents have influence on child-development, other factors also influence parenting styles. Based on Brofenbrenner's ecological system, as noted earlier, these factors include cultural background, parents' personality, parental history, age, social network and socio-economic background (Baumrind, 1972; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999; Bornstein, 2006; Chan, Bowes & Wyver, 2009).

2.8.5.1. Cultural and Ethnic Background (Collectivist and Individualist Culture)

Culture can be classified as individualist (western culture) and collectivist (non-western culture). Keshavarz and Baharudin (2009) commented that parenting styles differ from one culture to another, and this is based on the cultural point of view on values and beliefs of the society. The individualist culture values self-assertion, autonomy and equality with parents (Oyserman, Coon & Kemmelmeir, 2002) while the collectivist culture emphasises family cooperation, respect, controlled negative emotions and obedience (Chen et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2005). Several studies suggest that children from collectivist cultures are more pro-social, empathetic, helpful and altruistic than children in individualist cultures (Cook, 2012; Eisenberg, Fabes & Spinrad, 2006). Authoritarian parenting in a collectivist culture encourages children to consider the needs of other people in the family and suppresses theirs in order to promote family harmony (Bornstein, 1995; Chen et al., 2003; Chen et al., 2005; Ferrari, 2002; Grusec & Hasting, 2007). The Nigerian society expects a leader to portray this attribute.

Cross-cultural researchers have found that the culture in which a family dwells influences parents' socialisation practice, which in turn affects parenting styles. For instance, parents in traditional cultures are less responsive and affectionate than parents in modern cultures (Bradley & Corwyn, 2005). It should be noted that the meaning ascribed to less responsive in one culture might differ from that ascribed in another. Perhaps, this explains why harsh and spanking parenting is common among Nigerian parents (Parke & Clark-Stewart, 2011). In addition, Nigerian parents believe that children should not be given much attention during conversation because of the belief that adults are more knowledgeable. Yet, this might count as neglect in the west. This belief has a bearing on how a child is raised in the family. However, this does not mean that parents do not care for their children. It simply implies that parenting styles are better understood in cultural contexts.

Baumrind (1972) mentioned that children would understand parenting behaviour if it is consistent with cultural values. Similarly, Kim (2005) maintains that behavioural control is associated with parenting styles in a study conducted in Korea. He found out that parents were perceived as warm and accepting among students, while in European culture, behavioural control is perceived as harsh. In addition, Triandis (1989, 2001) observes that parental culture can shape children's belief, attitude and values. However, Niles (1998) opines that every individual differs in the aspect of prioritisation. Darling and Steinberg (1993) draw attention to the contextual variability of the effects of different parenting styles and advocate that cultural background should be taken into consideration in determining which parenting styles are more effective. This implies that parents from different cultural settings may have similar goals for their children but apply diverse parenting styles in achieving those goals. Thus, the difference between individualist and collectivist culture is their values and beliefs on socialisation. It is however, important to note that some cultures may be heterogeneous in nature due to modernisation. To buttress this view, Thompson and Virmani (2010) contend that studies have failed to recognise the heterogeneity of culture for failing to mention the changes in the societies due to globalisation.

2.8.5.2. Socio-Economic Status of Parents

Several studies have shown that cultural contexts can influence not only the parenting styles adopted but also the effectiveness of certain parenting styles in a given socio-economic context (Baumrind, 1972; Chan et al., 2009). Socio-economic status is another well-known predictor of parenting style (Bornstein, 1993, 1995; Emmanuel, et al., 2012; McLoyd, 1990; Shumow, Vandell & Posner, 1998). Studies show that differences in socio-economic status affect parenting styles (Lareau, 1989, 2002).

Socio-economic status consists of three related demographic characteristics: education, income and occupation. Bradley and Corwyn (2002) describe socio-economic status in terms of capital or resources and identify three elements of this determinant as financial capital or resources, which may include parental income and the material comfort of the neighbourhood in which a child is brought up; human capital or non-material resources which refer to investments such as the level of parents' education; and social capital which refers to resources that are accessible through social connections of the parents. It is noteworthy that these elements tend to be interconnected. However, the western socio-economic status may not be applicable in Nigeria. Based on the researcher's observation, a non-educated parent could have a good income through self-employment and might be living in an affluent area.

Furthermore, socio-economic factors including low-income, low level of education and job loss are described as potential risk factors in child development. This is because they affect parents' response to their children (McLoyd, 1990; Menaghan & Bathurst, 1990; Foster & Kalil, 2005; Lareau, 1989, 2002; Hoff, Laursen & Tardif, 2002). These studies revealed the effect of socio-economic status on parenting and the researchers suggest that lack of economic opportunities often lead to authoritarian parenting styles among parents. Similarly, a study of single parent African-American mothers showed a link between financial empowerment and positive parenting practices (Brody & Flor, 1998). This tendency was also found in two-parent families of similar background. Offord, Boyles and Jones (1987) in their empirical study found that affluent mothers were more responsive and affectionate than their poor counterparts across all racial groups. This suggests that

some aggressive behaviour exhibited by low-income parents is poverty-induced. It is important to note that the aggressive response of the parent among families with low income and no education in the western culture may not be applicable in Nigeria due to cultural differences. Low-income families in Nigeria still get emotional and material support from their extended families and the community.

Moreover, socio-economic considerations alone are inadequate in predicting parenting styles in low-income African-American parents. Abell, Clawson, Washington, Bost and Vaughn (1996) identified parental behaviour as an additional factor that needs to be considered in formulating intervention policies. According to Black, Dubowitz and Starr (1999), the result of the investigation of the importance of paternal involvement in child development shows that fathers who are well engaged in terms of employment and are able to provide financial support for their children usually have fewer problematic children.

Studies have found a relationship between parental education and parenting styles. For instance, Dornbusch et al. (1987) confirm that parents with higher educational level are more likely to use authoritative parenting styles and less inclined towards both authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Similarly, Kelley, Power and Wimbush (1992) conducted a study on parental styles of discipline and attitudes in a sample of low-income African-American mothers. 42 mothers were interviewed about their styles of parenting discipline, the parents' socialisation goals for their children having regard to concerns about crime rates in the neighbourhood and worries about whether the children would be susceptible to anti-social behaviour. The study revealed that parental education and the number of parents in the home were related to the parents' styles of discipline. In addition, single young mothers with low education were found to be more likely to be authoritarian than parents who are older, more educated and not separated. This result shows that socio-economic factors play a role in parents' styles of discipline. The reason for this might be the age and marital status of the parents. This implies that parents from lower socio-economic classes are more likely to use authoritarian style. However, it is important to note that not all parents with low socio-economic status use authoritarian parenting style, although researchers have commented that parents use authoritarian style as a protective base against crime rate in the

environment; which is beneficial to the child (Baldwin, Baldwin & Cole, 1990). Since the aim of parents; educated and non-educated, is for their children to achieve high academic excellence (Spera, 2005), the expectation of parents with low socio-economic status in the west may be different from a non-western culture like Nigeria. A study conducted by Leung, Lau and Lam (1998) in four countries, indicates that there is a positive relationship between parents with low educational status and children's academic achievement.

However, Bornstein and Bornstein (2007) have questioned the applicability of high socio-economic status to a white middle class sample. They suggest that it should be studied in other cultures. Based on the Bronfenbrenner ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 2005), the differences in the level of socio-economic status may affect parenting styles in different cultures. In Nigeria, socio-economic status has been found to be associated with parenting styles. Emmanuel et al. (2012) conducted a study on the influence of socio-economic status on parenting styles among the people of Badagry in Lagos State, Nigeria. The researchers found a significant relationship between parents' socio-economic background and parenting styles. They also found that modernisation has an impact on the parenting styles among the people. This implies that modernisation, which is also social change, has significant influence on parent-child interaction. Social change can be referred to as changes in the chronosystem in Bronfenbrenner's theory. In addition, Atere and Olagbemi (1998) argue that family setting has effect on the present and future behaviour of an individual. Children from a low socio-economic background may be different from those from an affluent home in terms of social behaviour. These backgrounds may have attendant consequences on how parents nurture their children.

Nevertheless, studies have shown that what the parent does with the child is also as important as socio-economic status. Evangelou et al. (2009) propose that the level of influence the home-learning environment has on children's development is similar to their mother's educational level. The researchers further argued that the quality of the home learning environment is more important for children's intellectual and social development than parental occupation, education or income. Similarly, Sylva et al. (2004, p.5) observe that "what parents do with their children is more important than who they are".

Gutman and Feinstein (2007) also suggest that children who experience emotional relationships with their mother in a warm environment have positive developmental outcomes, irrespective of parental educational level and income. This implies that the quality of parent-child relationship is as important as socio-economic status. Ermisch (2009, p. 65) proposed thus: "it is useful to think of the relationship between what parents do and assessments at age three in a production function framework, relating inputs (what parents do) to developmental outcomes, both cognitive and behavioural". Moreover, Cunha and Heckman (2007) suggest that early childhood is a stage where parents need to invest in their children because it is a 'sensitive' or 'critical period' in their lives.

Several authors (Brody, Stoneman & Flor, 1995; Brody, Stoneman & MacKinnon, 1986; Brody et al., 1994; Brody et al., 2006) support the view that harmonious family environment where there is strong emotional support from the parents coupled with good academic environment are directly related to social-emotional competence and academic success among school age children, while parental socio-economic status are indirectly related to child social-emotional competence. The contribution of parents to the life of their child is as important as their social status. While this has been established in the western culture, little is known about the influence of parental education and occupation on parenting style in Nigeria.

2.8.5.3. Social Networks have an Influence on Parenting Style

Social support networks also possess strong influence on parenting behaviour. The support network that promotes emotional stability and contentment of the parent can indirectly affect parenting style. Studies have shown that there is a positive association between effective parenting and social support for parents (Pascoe, Loda, Jeffries & Easp, 1981). Some ways in which social context can influence parenting styles include the provision of emotional support, practical help in child-care and setting guidelines for children (Powell, 1982).

The direct and indirect support provided by friends, neighbours, teachers and relatives are important factors that contribute towards effective parenting (Belsky, 1984; McLanahan & Julia, 1989; Powell, 1982). The positive effects of these

influences are most likely mediated through the psychological well-being of the parents (Belsky, 1984). Positive social interactions with friends and relatives are likely to develop in the parent strong desire and willingness to transfer social competence and emotional stability to the child. However, a full examination of parenting styles and social network is beyond the scope of this study. The social context, which reflects the culture of the parents, can also have an influence on the personality, which in turn affects the parenting style.

2.8.5.4. Parents' Personality, Age and Developmental History

Studies have shown that parent's personality, age and developmental history affect parenting style. Studies have revealed that a combination of temperament and parenting affects child development (Crockenberg, 1987; Sanson & Rothbath, 1995; Rothbart & Bates, 2006). According to Rothbart and Bates (2006), temperament and parent-child interaction influence children's social behaviour. More recent studies have shown that parents manifesting negative emotional states such as depression and anger show less sensitivity and display more authoritarian tendencies in their parenting style (Belsky, 1984; Kanoy, Ulku-Steiner, Cox & Burchinal, 2003; Brody, McBride-Murray, Kim & Brown, 2002; Orvaschel, Weissman & Kidd, 1980). For example, Orvaschel et al. (1980) and Belsky (1984) observed that depressed mothers offer a hostile, non-supportive home environment which eventually leads to dysfunctional behaviour in their children. It is also documented that parents who are socially active and enjoy positive emotions display parenting behaviour characterised by sensitivity, warmth and overall support (Belsky, Jaffee, Sligo, Woodward & Silva 2005).

Furthermore, older first time mothers are more stimulating and show more sensitivity and care for their children than younger mothers (Hall, Pawlby & Wolkind, 1980). Young mothers are less equipped and less prepared to offer the desirable child-fostering qualities characteristic of adequate parental functioning (Field, Widmayer, Stringer & Ignatoff, 1980; Jones, Green & Krauss, 1980). These two early studies show how maternal age and experience correlate with parental warmth, sensitivity and responsiveness.

It has also been observed that the developmental history of the parents has significant capacity to influence parenting style (Belsky, 1984). This perhaps is the basis of Belsky's (1980) assertion that parents who were maltreated during childhood are likely to maltreat their children. Other studies show that parents who grew up in broken homes have difficulties in raising their own children (Frommer & O'Shea, 1973; Hall et al., 1980). On the contrary, positive childhood experiences shape pleasant personalities which are carried through in life. These developmentally positive factors may eventually foster caring and supportive parenting methods.

2.8.5.5. The Personality and Actions of the Child Shape Parenting Style

The direct role of a child's personality in shaping or influencing parenting style is well known to child developmental psychologists (Bell, 1968; Belsky, 1984; Campbell, 1979; Milliones, 1978; Sameroff, 2010). Milliones (1978) believes that mothers who perceive their infants to be difficult tend to give less emotional responsiveness to child caring. Campbell (1979) also argues that children who respond negatively to care and affection are likely to receive less attention than those displaying positive emotions in response to affection from their mothers. Nevertheless, children showing positive emotional responses receive constant and supportive parenting. Thus, there is a link between negative responses and less-supportive parenting (Belsky, 1984). The child's personality, particularly temperament, can be a source of influence on the parenting style.

Children's social-emotional competence can be predicted by combining their temperament and the type of parenting style used on the child. In a study involving 52 boys and 52 girls, Rubin, Burgess, Dwyer and Hasting (2003) investigated the link between causes of conflict and negative externalising behaviour in children and found that pre-school children who initiated negative maternal responses are more likely to show externalising problems a few years later. This study shows child temperament as a possible determinant for aggressive or negative parenting. In fact, other studies have confirmed that child temperament and parenting style could influence each other (Bell, 1968; Belsky, 1984; Lengua, 2006; Sameroff, 1975). This may be true because many of the actions of children are spontaneous, a function of their current state of mind.

Nonetheless, parental rejection tends to cause an increase in externalising behaviour. Jaffari-Bimmel, Juffer, Van IJzendoorn, Bakermans-Kranenburg and Mooijaart (2006) show that caring and sensitive parenting could reverse the negative effect of social-emotional and behavioural difficulties in early childhood. This shows that changes in parenting strategies could lead to changes in child temperament while the emotional climate of the home where parents and child cooperate with each other can improve social-emotional competence of the child (Evangelou et al., 2009). In order to have more understanding on parent-child relationship, the section below will review the parenting styles and child development.

2.9.   The Effect of Parenting Styles on Child Development

Here, the effect of different parenting styles on children's development from both theoretical and empirical literature will be reviewed. Studies show that a child's ability to develop desirable social-emotional skills and produce positive life outcomes is largely affected by parenting styles (Akinsola, 2011; Ang, 2006; Baumrind, 1991a; Carlo, McGinley, Hayes, Batenhorst & Wilkinson, 2007; Denham et al., 2003; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Elias & Yee, 2009; Mildon, & Polimeni, 2012; Nixon, 2012). This may be why research on competent parenting has always interested child psychologists. Belsky (1984) described competent parenting as parenting approaches that impart the ability to acquire and develop skills and character needed to deal with the environment at every stage of life. This definition puts emphasis on authoritative parenting as the most helpful and competent parenting style (Baumrind, 1991a). Tiller et al., (2003, p. 3) suggest that, **"there is a need to study families with younger children so that parents can better understand their children's development in light of their own parenting practices".** Though some research about the effect of parenting styles and child development is available, the empirical basis is limited and has not focused on all dimensions of child development. The influence of parenting styles on various aspects of child development such as academic achievement, anti-social behaviour and pro-social behaviour will be discussed subsequently.

2.9.1. Effect of Parenting Styles on Academic Achievement

Studies have shown a positive relationship between authoritative parenting styles and academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1989). Other studies also link strong school engagement such as a positive disposition towards school and learning with authoritative parenting (Steinberg et al., 1992; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). For example, Steinberg et al. (1992) showed that authoritative parenting characterised by high acceptance, supervision and psychological autonomy leads to higher adolescent school performance and improved participation in school activities. The positive impact of authoritative parenting in this study was linked to the involvement of parents in the schooling activities of their children.

Cohen and Rice (1997) conducted a study on academic achievement and children's perception of parenting styles. The result showed that children's high academic grades were associated with children's perception of higher authoritativeness, lower permissiveness and lower authoritarianism. Similarly, Hess and McDevitt (1984) examine a study on academic attainment and parenting styles; they concluded that positive academic success is related to authoritative parenting styles and this is linked to encouragement of independent problem solving and critical thinking. It was suggested that authoritarian parenting could have negative effects on the child's academic performance since this style does not encourage problem solving.

Research has suggested that the element of control in authoritarian parenting leads to passive behaviour and a lack of interest in school (Barber, 1996; Steinberg et al., 1994). According to Barber (1996) permissive indulgent and permissive neglecting parenting styles, both of which are low in control tendencies, do not encourage self-regulation and self-discipline. This might account for the observation that permissive indulgent and permissive neglecting parenting styles could cause low academic achievement in children and adolescents (Aunola, Stattin & Nurmi, 2000; Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). In the Aunola et al. study (2000), association between parenting styles and adolescent achievement strategies showed that adolescents from families where authoritative styles are used tend to employ adaptive achievement strategies such as low levels of failure expectation and the use of self-improving approaches. In contrast, adolescents from authoritarian families

applied maladaptive strategies characterised by task-irrelevant behaviour, passivity and inability to motivate themselves. Again, it is necessary to note that these studies are conducted in western cultural settings and results may be different in non-western cultures. Chin-Yau and Cindy (2003) argue that several studies on children in African and other developing countries focus on the influence of parenting on academic performance. It is important to note that majority of the studies are on academic achievement and adolescent's perception of parenting styles. There is paucity of research on parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence in Nigeria.

2.9.2. Effect of Parenting Styles on Anti-social Behaviour

It is well documented that parenting styles have an influence on anti-social behaviour. Anti-social problems in children are classified as either internalising or externalising problem behaviour (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). Internalised negative behaviour is directed at oneself and manifests in moodiness, emotional symptoms, fearfulness, anxiety, extreme shyness or withdrawal (Eisenberg et al., 2001; Aunola & Nurmi, 2005). According to Cole, Teti & Zahn-Waxlerm (2003), externalised problem behaviour includes display of aggression, conduct problems, hyperactivity, anger and frustration while internalised problem behaviours are underlined by inhibition and suppression of feelings. Bradshaw & Tipping, (2010) conducted a research in Scotland; UK on the nature of social, emotional and behavioural difficulties among Scottish children between ages 3-5yrs. SDQ was used to measure social and emotional development. Cluster analysis was used to divide the children's score into five SDQ sub-scales. The results indicate that 10% to 27% of children have behavioural problems. This study suggested that teachers are better predictors of hyperactivity and conduct problems while mothers are better predictors of emotional symptoms. Similarly, Tizard, Blatchford, Burke, Farquhar & Plewis (1988) also found that 17% of four to seven year olds as perceived by teachers were having mild behavioural difficulties with 16% been viewed as having definite behaviour problems (Tizard et al., 1988). Another study conducted in Scotland, showed that 24.5% of children are on the borderline level of difficulties in behaviour (Dunlop et al., 2008). These percentages are in accordance with the range score

allotted for community by the author of SDQ (Goodman, 1997). It is significant to note that different cultures may have different interpretations for internalised or externalised behaviour. For example, from the researcher's observation, Nigerian parents and teachers do not count hyperactivity to be a behavioural problem. A hyperactive child is interpreted to be an active and interactive child.

Behavioural inhibition is manifested as negative emotion in young children (Kagan, Reznick, Clarke, Snidman & Garcia-Coll, 1984), withdrawal from new experience in toddlers (Calkins, Fox & Marshall, 1996) and social discomfort and shyness in pre-schoolers (Rubin et al., 2002). It is also known that behavioural inhibition is associated with internalising problems in childhood (Biederman et al., 2001). Children showing behavioural inhibitions are likely to develop social withdrawal tendencies when they are subjected to intrusive and controlling maternal influences characteristic of authoritarian parenting (Degnan, Henderson, Fox & Rubin, 2008; Rubin et al., 2002). However, children that similarly manifest signs of early behavioural inhibition but are not subject to excessive maternal control and intrusiveness show significantly better social competence (Degnan et al., 2008; Rubin et al., 2002). It should be noted that shyness, which counts as social incompetence in the west is recognised in non-western cultures as a sign of being well brought-up which might be referred to as being competent. For example, Chinese children are encouraged to suppress their emotions in order to satisfy group expectation. A behavioural inhibition child is seen as a quiet child and called '*omoluabi*' (meaning a person of good character) in the western part of Nigeria (Awoniyi, 1975). They believe that a person of good character is one that shows respect and is properly nurtured by the parents. In addition, the person needs to be honest in both private and public life, courageous and helpful in solving problems and people always like them.

Nevertheless, studies have suggested that parental warmth may be detrimental to child emotional well-being. A study conducted by Liu (2003) on child's perception of parental warmth indicated that parental warmth relates to internalising and externalising problems in pre-school children. It is however, known that authoritative parenting reduces the risk of internalising and externalising problems in childhood and adolescence. In contrast, both permissive and

authoritarian parentings lead to increase in internalising and externalising problems (Steinberg, Blatt-Eisengart & Cauffman, 2006). This suggests that older children appreciate their parents' styles of parenting than pre-schoolers, implying that children's age may affect the way they perceive their parents.

It is necessary to note that different levels of control influence anti-social behaviour. Some authors (Barber, 1996; Steinberg, 1990) have classified control into two forms: behavioural and psychological controls. Although an authoritarian parenting style with its characteristic behavioural control is widely regarded as less successful in raising self-confident children, several studies show that this form of parenting leads to low levels of anti-social and other externalising behavioural problems (Barber & Olsen, 1997; Barber, 1996; Steinberg, 1990). These findings are understandable since authoritarian parenting emphasises strict compliance with socially accepted norms. On the other hand, psychological control, which is also characteristic of authoritarian parenting, is associated with internalised problem behaviour in children and adolescents (Barber, Olsen & Shagle, 1994).

Both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles have dimensions of control. However, the level of control practised in socialisation is different. Behavioural control is the same for both styles of parenting. Nevertheless, authoritarian style of parenting relies more on psychological control, which seems to be less responsive. This indicates that there is no parent-child relationship, because the parent always emphasises obedience and authority, which gives room for no social interaction.

Children's difficulties in achieving social adjustment have been linked to authoritarian parenting style, mainly due to its features of high behavioural control and low affection. Thijs, Koomen, De Jong, Van der Leij and Van Leeuwen (2004) showed that authoritarian parenting style tends to increase internalising problems and later adolescent anxiety in children showing fearfulness. However, Aunola and Nurmi (2005) reveal that high psychological control could override the potential beneficial effects of the display of affection by parents. According to them, high levels of psychological control are associated with increased internal and external anti-social behaviour, irrespective of the level of affection shown by the parents. The observation that children of permissive or authoritarian parents tend to be less social-

emotionally competent has been replicated across several socio-cultural groups (Baumrind, 1991; Chang et al., 2003; Denham et al., 2000; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg & Dornbusch 1991). It should be noted that these studies are western-based and may therefore not be applicable in an African country. Besides, from the ecological perspective, there may be cultural differences in the meaning and perception of parent-child interaction or peer interaction (Pearson & Rao, 2003). Studies have linked authoritarian parenting to social-emotional competence among African children (Baumrind, 1972, 1996; Rudy & Grusec 2006).

2.9.3. Effect of Parenting Styles on Pro-social Behaviour

Several studies have revealed evidence suggesting that dimensions of parenting such as warmth and inductive reasoning are positively related to children's pro-social behaviour across cultures (Baumrind, 2013; Chen, Dong & Zhou, 1997; Mullis, Smith, & Vollmers, 1983; Nelson, Nelson, Hart, Yang & Jin, 2006; Rohner, 1986). Eisenberg et al. (1998) linked pro-social behaviour to a child's positive social interaction which allows the child to integrate well and function properly in his immediate environment. According to them, these behavioural characteristics include: cooperation, honesty, empathy, helpfulness and willingness to share and play with others. They also opine that behavioural control is an important factor in encouraging the development of pro-social behaviour and it promotes self-regulation in situations where social skills are required. Akinsola (2011) proposed that children develop their personality and skills that will make them excel in life through their relationship with their parents. The researcher further argued that the parent-child relationship is based on parenting styles and this forms part of the strategies that are used to build social-emotional and cognitive competence in children.

Goodman (1997) observed that there are five indicators of pro-social behaviour and these include empathy, sharing, helpfulness, co-operation and kindness. These elements are tools for positive social-emotional competence. The development of positive social-emotional competence is consistently linked to supportive and affectionate parenting (Steinberg et al., 1994). Authoritative parenting, which emphasises parental affection and behaviour control, has been shown to play a vital role in helping children to adjust to their social environments

(Baumrind, 1967; Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Steinberg et al., 1994). The role of a quality mother-child relationship in the development of social competence is well known as displayed by Kiang, Moreno and Robinson (2004). Manifesting maternal sensitivity, warmth and active involvement in infants' lives is associated with empathic and pro-social behaviour toward adults when they are a year older. This implies that mothers who are sensitive and less intrusive towards their toddlers had children who were more able to engage with their peers and strangers in social activities.

Hence, early experience of maternal warmth, sensitivity and feelings of security in a child's early life are correlated with the progressive development of social-emotional competence. Teachers of pre-schoolers attest to the link between balanced affectionate maternal parenting and pro-social behaviour (Clark & Ladd, 2000; Hastings & Coplan, 1999). Authoritative parenting is associated with social competence, pro-social behaviour, feelings of self-worth and resistance to negative peer pressure among adolescents (Baumrind, 1991; Lamborn et al., 1991). In a study designed to examine the correlation between perceived maternal parenting styles and interpersonal relationships among adolescents, Hall and Bracken (1996) found that students who perceived their parents to be authoritative enjoyed better relationships with their peers than students from an authoritarian home. Engels, Dekovic and Meeus (2002) reached a similar conclusion that supporting flexible parenting promotes good interpersonal skills in young children. These scholars are simply suggesting that the best approach to raising a child is by being flexible. Similarly, Okorodudu (2010) conducted a study on the influence of parenting styles on adolescents' delinquency in the eastern part of Nigeria. 404 sample adolescents completed the questionnaire. Regression statistic was used for the analysis of the study. The results indicate that permissive parenting style was significantly related to adolescent delinquency while authoritarian and authoritative were not. Conversely, authoritative parenting was positively related to social competence in adolescents.

Carlo et al. (2007) conducted a study on the relationships among parenting styles, parental practices and adolescent's empathy and pro-social behaviours. 233 high school adolescents from the United States completed the questionnaires on the measures of parenting practices, parenting styles, pro-social behaviours and empathy.

The results indicate that parenting practices are significantly associated with adolescents' pro-social behaviours. The relations between parenting practices and pro-social behaviours however, occur mostly through the indirect relations with empathy. The relations among parenting practices, empathy and pro-social behaviours vary as a function of the specific parenting practice and the specific pro-social behaviour.

However, as mentioned earlier, authoritative parenting style is positively related to pro-social behaviour. Researchers have nonetheless warned against generalising the study because it does not make allowance for different cultural backgrounds (Baumrind, 1972, 1996).

2.9.4. Effect of Cultural Background on Parenting Styles and Children's Developmental Outcome

Research has suggested that culture plays an important role in the relationship between parenting styles and children's developmental outcome. Several studies have found the relationship between parenting styles and children's development in the cultural setting. Cross-cultural studies emphasise that child development cannot be separated from socio-cultural activities (Bronfenbrenner, 2005; Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978).

In the western countries, authoritative parenting styles are related to positive developmental outcomes of children in the area of social-emotional competence, behaviour and academic performance (Baumrind, 2013; Sorkhabi, 2005; Spera, 2005). In the study among Chinese parents, Chen et al. (2000) reported that authoritative parenting styles are positively related to adaptive behaviour, school adjustment and social-emotional competence while authoritarian and permissive parenting styles can be linked to children's aggression, lack of self-control, impulsiveness, delinquency and social incompetence (Baumrind, 1971, 1978, 1991a & 2013; Davies and Cummings, 1994; Denham et al., 2009). Similarly, Liu (2003) conducted a study in a rural area among Chinese children to investigate the effect of parenting practice on children's emotional adjustment. The results show that harsh parenting is related to social incompetence and emotional behavioural problems such as aggression. In addition, Li and Hao (1998) argue that parents that show over-

involvement, too much love and over-protection caused a negative effect on children's school and social adjustment. This implies that universally, parenting styles have effects on child developmental outcome. However, cultural differences may create diversity in response to parents' behaviour.

Chao (1994, 2000, & 2001) questioned the relevance of the construct of authoritarian parenting for Chinese immigrant families in the United States. The researcher suggested that although Chinese immigrant mothers scored high on authoritarian parenting compared to white American mothers, their parenting style can be more meaningfully understood within the Chinese concept of child training. Results emphasise the importance of teaching Chinese children appropriate behaviour in order to succeed academically and in the family context. Chao, in her studies comments that the Chinese concept of training, which is based on family harmony, respect and obedience is not included in Baumrind's authoritarian parenting style. In addition, Rudy and Grusec (2006) suggest that in styles of parenting among the South Asian and Middle-Eastern immigrants sampled in Canada, authoritarian parenting style was also linked to self-confidence. However this type of parenting may be classified as restrictive and strict in white middle-class families in Western culture. Thus, authoritarian type of parenting within the Chinese cultural context has positive implications for child development.

Other studies have shown a positive relationship between authoritarian parenting and positive developmental outcome. An example is Leung et al. (1998) who examined the influence of parenting styles on adolescent's academic achievement in four countries: United States, Hong Kong, China and Australia. The instrument used was modified by a tool of parenting styles developed by Dornbusch et al. (1987). The researcher found that authoritarian parenting was negatively related to academic achievement in all countries except in Hong Kong where it was related to positive academic achievement. The results also revealed that among parents with low education in the United States and Australia, there was a positive relationship between authoritarian parenting and adolescent academic achievement. This implies that authoritarian parenting was positively related to academic achievement for low educated parents in the United States and Australia. This finding also indicates that children of parents with low educational background with the use of an authoritarian

parenting style can still have positive academic achievement due to parental involvement in their schoolwork. This study supports some researchers (Evangelou et al., 2009; Sylva et al., 2008) who state that quality time that parents spend with the child helps the child's developmental outcome. It is important to know that inappropriate parenting in one culture might be appropriate in another due to societal expectation goals. For example, the goal of Nigeria parents is for their children to be successful in their academic careers, irrespective of their own educational background.

Furthermore, in Eastern cultures, priority is given to maturity and understanding self-control. The belief is that a child that is shy, thoughtful and reserved is well behaved (Chen et al., 1998; Wang, Chen, Chen, Cui & Li, 2006). In addition, children who express negative emotions and disobedience are perceived by Chinese parents as being difficult and may be liable to punishment. Chen et al., (1998) proposed that Chinese toddlers' behavioural inhibition is positively related to mothers' acceptance and encouragement of independence and negatively related to mothers' rejection and punishment. Studies have shown that Asian parents encourage education and behaviour that take other people into consideration (Chen, et al., 2000; Greenfield & Suzuki, 1998). However, this may cause children in the society to display relatively low autonomy and emotional expression during social interaction (Schneider, Woodburn, del Pilar Soteras del Toro & Udvari, 2005). Generally, the findings of these studies show that children who are disobedient and unable to control negative emotion tend to receive punishment in collectivist cultures. This societal rules and norms are similar to the Nigerian culture which emphasises respect and obedience whereby a quiet child is recognised as being well behaved.

Moreover, it has been found in certain social settings that children from authoritative parenting styles do not have better developmental outcomes than children from permissive parents (Martínez, García & Yubero, 2007). Kim and Rhoner (2002) observed that Korean-American adolescents raised by authoritative parents do not have better academic achievements compared to youths raised by indulgent parents. Similarly, in a study conducted in Mexico, Villalobos, Cruz and Sanchez (2004) found that adolescents from authoritative and indulgent families obtained higher scores than adolescents from neglectful families based on diverse

measures of competence and adjustment. In Portugal, Gaspar & Paiva, 2004 conducted a study on parenting practice and children's socio-emotional development. The Sample consists of 362 Portuguese preschool children between 3 to 6 years and mother/father completed the Parenting Practices Questionnaire and Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. The result shows that harsh parenting was positively related to pro-social behaviour. It is noteworthy that majority of these studies are based on adolescents, little is however, known about studies on parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence in cultural settings.

Even in the Chinese context, the effects of authoritarian parenting are rarely consistent. In studies conducted among Chinese immigrant families in the USA, no difference was observed between Chinese-American families and European-American parents with regards to parenting styles (Ang & Goh, 2006; Kelly & Tseng, 1992; Lin & Fu, 1990). Tam and Lam (2003) examined parenting styles among Chinese fathers in Hong Kong as perceived by their school-age children. The sample consisted of 1011 Primary children from six schools and 471 fathers. Parent Behaviour Report questionnaire was used to measure the four styles of parenting. The results show that authoritative and permissive parenting had similar impact on children's academic performance while authoritarian parenting was not different from neglecting parenting in terms of the impact on children.

In Egypt, Dwairy et al. (2006) conducted a study on parenting styles in Arab societies. The Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) (Buri, 1991) was administered on 2,893 people in eight Arab societies. Cluster analysis showed three mixed parenting styles: inconsistence (permissive and authoritarian), controlling (authoritarian and authoritative) and flexible (authoritative and permissive). The findings reveal that authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles both have positive impact on children's emotional well-being among Arab children. The result also shows that parenting style is different across Arab societies. The consistency of parenting styles was more predictive of emotional well-being than the typologies of parenting styles within Western societies. The result indicates that good parenting involves parenting style that is sensitive to the emotional well-being of a child. This study implies that in cultures where authoritarian parenting is the custom, the style may have no negative effect on child development.

In Iran, Alizadeh, Abu Talib, Abdullah & Mansor (2011) conducted a study on the relationship between parenting style and children's behavioural problems. The sample comprised 681 mothers of children (of which 347 were girls and 334 were boys) in primary schools. Cluster sampling was used and the children identified the participants. Furthermore, Buri (1991) was used to assess parenting styles (Authoritative, Permissive and Authoritarian) and Children's Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) (Achenbach, 1991) was used to measure children's behavioural problems (internalising and externalising symptoms). The results revealed that there is a significant relationship between parenting styles and children's behavioural problems. The researcher concluded that authoritative parenting style is directly related to fewer internalising and externalising symptoms. It should be noted that in the above explanation, Buri's questionnaire was used, but this only accommodated children's responses to parent's style of parenting. In addition, Achenbach's CBCL was used to measure behavioural problems and it comprises of more negative tools than positive items and it is not easily accessible. It is understandable however, why the research used Buri's questionnaire; perhaps because the sample children used were old enough to administer questionnaires, and CBCL was used because the researcher measured behavioural problems.

In another study conducted in an Indian community, Sharma and Sandhu (2006) examined the association between dimensions of parenting styles and externalising behaviour. 240 parents completed the PSDQ questionnaire and CBCL was used to assess children's behaviour. The result shows that verbal hostility, physical coercion, non-reasoning and indulgent parenting dimensions are positively related to externalising behaviour. Regulation and connection parenting dimensions are negatively related to externalising behaviour. It is noteworthy that this study only investigated specific parenting behaviour, which is part of the dimension of global parenting styles.

Supporting the view of Chao (2000) on parenting styles among Chinese and European-American mothers, Raval, Ward, Raval and Trivedi (2013) conducted a study on the strength of typology of parenting styles in India. 195 sample College Students with 275 mothers and 145 middle schools completed the Parental Authority Questionnaire (Buri, 1991). The result revealed that across three samples, the

Cronbach's alpha values for permissive parenting sub-scale of the PAQ had the lowest value while the authoritarian parenting had the highest value. Exploratory factor analysis indicates a two-factor structure (with the first component consisting of authoritative and permissive items while the second consists of authoritarian items) which makes the Cronbach's alpha to be in the acceptable range. Only PAQ authoritarian scale was linked to youth adjustment problems across all three samples while findings concerning authoritative and permissive scales were mixed. They concluded that authoritative and permissive parenting scales measure of parenting style of self-report questionnaire did not show enough concept validity and reliability in samples from urban India. This result questions the cultural relevance of these parenting styles. This implies that authoritarian parenting can be used to correct behavioural problems in children. The researchers suggested that other parenting measures should be developed that will be suitable for different cultures and ethnic groups.

In Southern Africa, Latouf (2008) in a research dissertation explored the influence of parenting style on the social status behaviour of children aged five. 30 sample parents were given PSDQ questionnaires to administer and teachers observed 24 children with the use of Behavioural Questionnaire (BQ). The result indicates that authoritative parenting styles are predominantly used and parenting styles are significantly related to children's social status behaviour.

Finally, LeVine (1988) and LeVine and New (2008), state that every culture has its own ideas which influence parental goals and parenting styles. This implies that what seems good in one culture may be bad in another. For example, an individualist culture encourages autonomy, but this is not encouraged in a collectivist culture. Furthermore, studies have found a relationship between parental control and perceived parental hostility in the western culture (Rohner & Rohner, 1981). The same parental practice that was described as parental involvement and care among African-American communities (Baldwin, Baldwin & Cole 1990; Lamborn, Dornbusch & Steinberg, 1996) was perceived as parental warmth and acceptance in Korea and among Chinese adolescents (Chao, 1994; Rohner & Pettengill, 1985). Darling and Steinberg (1983) argue that the socialisation goals and values of each culture have definite influence on parental behaviour. Thus, the same kind of

parental attitude and behaviour may be given different meanings in different cultural backgrounds, which in turn will affect the relationship between parenting style and child developmental outcome.

Another study among the Asian-Americans suggests that parents are more permissive on their children when they are young and they tend to be more authoritarian over time as they reach "the age of understanding" (Garcia Coll & Pachter, 2002, p. 198). This implies that parenting styles might be different due to the age of the child. Having obtained research evidence from different cultures, it is important to study parenting style and children's social-emotional competence in Nigeria.

Nigerian parents may be more authoritarian and strict due to the cultural norms and values and parental authority (Odubote, 2008). Moreover, some researchers (Chen et al., 1997; Lau & Cheung, 1987) state that the relationship between authoritative and authoritarian styles of parenting and child outcome might be similar within the same culture. It is therefore questionable to make a generalised statement based on the findings of one culture.

Authoritative parenting styles were found to be more predominant among white parents while authoritarian parenting styles were more common among African-American, Asian-American and Hispanic-American parents respectively (Steinberg et al., 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987). However, Sorkhabi (2005) provided more clarification on the applicability of Baumrind's authoritative model to other cultures. He reviewed the empirical evidence for and against the similarity and differences in the association between Baumrind's parenting styles and children's developmental outcomes in different cultures. His conclusion was that Baumrind's parenting styles have similar functions in both individualist and collectivist cultures. From Sorkhabi's position, one could argue that parenting styles in all cultures share common characteristics. This would provide advantage for this study as it considers the Nigerian social reality. It is apparent that the authoritative parenting style may not actually be the only determinant of positive developmental outcomes in children. Thus, some children would naturally perform well regardless of how they are raised. It is important to note that some of the studies involved the influence of specific parenting behaviour (parenting practices) on internalising and externalising

behavioural problems. It was however, advised that other measures could be developed to measure parenting styles. By inference, it could be said that there are substantial studies on the research on parenting styles and adolescent developmental outcomes while we conclude that there is paucity of study on parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence. It is, therefore, necessary to examine the relationship between parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence in Abuja, Nigeria.

2.10. Parenting Styles and Children Outcome in Nigeria

A substantial body of research has compared the likelihood of various parenting styles across cultures and examined the relationship between parenting styles and children's developmental outcomes in different cultures. The interplay of parenting styles and social development in children is emerging as a significant tool in assisting children from minority or low-income groups to integrate fully into the larger productive society (McWayne et al., 2008). While these principles have been clearly established and their potential usefulness in formulating social policies in developed countries is well appreciated, the extent of their relevance and applicability in developing societies has not been explored fully. However, there seems to be little, if any, research evidence on the influence of parenting styles on children's social-emotional competence in Abuja, Nigeria.

Some empirical studies on parenting styles in Nigeria suggest that parenting styles and practices are linked with child developmental outcome (Akinsola, 2010b, 2011, & 2013). Parenting style and socio-economic status were found to be strong determinants of antisocial behaviours among adolescents in selected secondary schools in Eastern Nigeria (Okonkwo, 2009; Okorodudu, 2010). Results from this study indicate that permissive parenting style is a major cause of antisocial behaviour among adolescents. Children from poor homes were found to be more at risk of antisocial behaviours. Similarly, Uwe et al. (2008) argued that much of the increasing adolescent antisocial behaviours in Nigeria are due to a growing tendency towards permissive parenting. In addition, Akinsola and Udoka (2013) examined the influence of parenting style on social anxiety in children aged 7-16 years. The

sample consisted of 567 children and adolescents who were assessed on performance and social anxiety. Baumrind's parenting styles scales were used and the questionnaires were administered on children. The results indicate that permissive and mixed parenting styles seem to promote social and performance anxieties in the participants more than other parenting styles. The study suggests that parents use the mixture of demandingness and responsiveness in addition to care, sensitivity and love. The combination of the dimensions of parenting allowed the children to perceive their parent to be either authoritative or authoritarian. This style of parenting is similar to Chinese parenting styles as described in a study conducted by Chao (1994). These studies imply that both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles are used among Nigerian parents. By extension, it implies that cultural background has influence on parenting style because of the values and beliefs of the society.

Fakeye (2008) found that children from permissive parents scored higher in reading achievement than other styles of parenting. In addition, the study also revealed that there was no association between parenting styles and reading abilities of primary school pupils in South-Western Nigeria. Additionally, Adejuwon (2005a) examined the correlation between parenting styles in a changing society and personality among Nigerian students. The result showed that parental responsiveness and high socio-economic status were strongly linked with the personality formation among youths in Nigeria. This implies that parental warmth and parent's socio-economic status have influence on the way adolescents' rate themselves in terms of uniqueness. In addition, the result also shows that modernisation affects parenting styles and children's perception about themselves. Moreover, Adejuwon's study suggests that low autonomy and high responsiveness helps in the development of personality. This indicates that cultural background contributes to the way children perceive the parenting styles of their parents. It should be noted that high autonomy is an attribute of authoritative parenting style in the western culture which helps in the development of social-emotional competence. Similarly, Adejuwon (2005b) also discovered that mothers who reported low confidence in parenting had children who exhibited higher externalising behaviour than those whose mothers reported high confidence. Besides, those whose mothers reported external attribution in parenting showed more externalising behaviour than children whose mothers reported internal

attribution in parenting. Parenting styles were found to affect not only academic achievement in secondary school pupils but also their choices of career.

Furthermore, Akinsola (2010a) conducted a study on the relationship between parenting styles and sexual attitudes of secondary school students in Nigeria by using questionnaires. The sample consisted of 852 students aged between 11 to 24 years from two ethnic groups (Yoruba people of Oyo State and Efik of the Cross-River State). The study reveals that authoritative and mix authoritative/authoritarian parenting styles were positively related to restraint sexual attitude and negatively related to liberal and loose sexual attitudes. Similarly, Abu and Akerele (2006) showed that there was a significant relationship between parenting style and adolescent sexual behaviour in Ibadan, South-Western Nigeria. Amoran et al. (2005) reported that well-educated parents with high socio-economic status enlighten and protect their children from early sexual experience. In contrast, children from polygamous and single parent families are prone to early sexual activity. In addition, Akinsola (2011) stated that Nigerian styles of parenting are in obedience and compliance with parental rules and regulations. He added that authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles as well as mixed parenting styles are significantly practiced among Nigerian parents.

However, Tunde-Ayinmode and Adegunloye (2011) conducted a study on parenting style and conduct problem in children. It was based on the case study of self-poisoning of a 12 year-old Nigerian boy. It was found that authoritarian parenting style led to the conduct problem. This implies that children might perceive parenting styles in different ways and this can be influenced by the personality of the child. Since personality is the response to environmental factors due to genetic makeup, this implies that both nature and nurture may contribute to parenting styles.

Odubote (2008) examined the role of culture in the relationship between parenting style and delinquency. The study analyses the applicability of Baumrind's parenting style in an African context. The research used 479 Nigerian adolescents and their parents from data collected in 2002. The result revealed that strict parenting style is associated with delinquency among European-American children but not among African children; instead, it has positive effects on African adolescents. The researcher argued that most western theories are centred on the western culture and

therefore, they are not generalisable. In addition, Adejuwon (2005a) found that cultural attitudes and beliefs could predict outcomes of parenting styles which could be different from those studies carried out in developed western countries.

Available evidence seems to suggest that the relationship between parenting styles and children developmental outcome is far from being conclusive. However, overwhelming evidence supports the notion that parenting styles can determine different developmental outcomes. Parenting styles in western culture might be different from that of Nigeria due to cultural background and the genetic factors of the child. It is important to note that majority of the studies conducted in the reviewed literature in Nigeria deal with childhood, adolescents and other aspects of children developmental outcome. As mentioned earlier, there is a plethora of literature review on parenting styles and adolescent's developmental outcomes. Little is known, however, about parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence. It is therefore necessary to investigate the different ranges of parenting styles that are in practice in Abuja, Nigeria and their influence on children's social-emotional competence. In addition, it is important to explore the influence of socio-economic status on parenting styles.

2.11. Summary of Literature Review

Studies have shown that social-emotional competence is important for child development because it is related to every aspect of developmental outcome. Different factors, however, contribute to social-emotional competence. Children have unique personalities which contribute to their own development, and as children contribute to their own personality, the child's interaction with the immediate environment (microsystem and mesosystem) such as peers, siblings, teachers, school and parents contribute to the development of social-emotional competence.

The role of parents cannot be overlooked in children's social-emotional competence. The literature review indicates a strong relationship between parenting styles and child developmental outcomes. The parent-child relationship atmosphere (emotional climate) and parent-child relationship behaviour (parent's response to the child) affect the relationship with the environment. This type of parental behaviour and attitude towards the child is known as parenting style. Dimensions of parenting

styles are responsiveness and demandingness, and these have resulted in four categories of parenting styles related to the level of parents' warmness and control over the child. These parenting style typologies are authoritative, authoritarian, permissive indulgent and permissive neglecting.

Researchers have shown that parenting styles have influence on child developmental outcomes (Baumrind, 2013; Elias & Yee, 2009; Nixon, 2012; Steinberg et al., 1991; Steinberg et al., 1992). Studies conducted on Euro-American families in the United States with samples of children and adolescents of all ages have shown that authoritative parenting is consistently related to positive developmental outcomes in children (Baumrind, 1971, 1989, 2013; Baumrind & Black, 1967; Elias & Yee, 2009; Nixon, 2012; Steinberg et al., 1989; Steinberg, et al., 1994). These developmental outcomes include school adjustment and academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1992), higher self-esteem and psychosocial competence and less emotional and behavioural dysfunction (Baumrind, 1971; Buri, 1989; Lamborn et al., 1991; Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Although there is plenty of literature reviews on parenting styles, most of these studies are on adolescents' perception of parenting styles and their academic achievement and self-esteem. Evidently, there is a paucity of study on the relationship between parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence.

Different studies have questioned the validity of the results from the western culture and its generalisability in other cultural backgrounds. Culture contributes a major factor to parenting styles because parents can be influenced by their societal goals, values and beliefs. For instance, studies conducted among African-American and Asian-American adolescents indicate no evidence of positive influence of authoritative parenting on academic achievement (Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1991). In addition, studies have suggested that Asian-American adolescents from authoritative families are not better off in school than those from authoritarian families (Chao, 2001). Several researchers (Chao & Tseng, 2002; Lamborn et al., 1996) found authoritarian parenting to be positively related to developmental outcome among Chinese, Asian-American and African-American children.

Darling and Steinberg (1993) argue that parenting styles should be studied in the child's environment because of different cultural values and beliefs which might

affect parenting style. In addition, cross-cultural researchers (Rogoff, 2003; Vygotsky, 1978) state that culture might influence the way children perceive their parents' attitude and behaviour due to how they were constructed by their parents during scaffolding. Moreover, previous research found authoritarian and permissive parenting styles to be effective in other countries. In particular, different results were found for low-income minority families among African-American and East Asian communities.

Sorkhabi (2005) argues for and against the similarity in the applicability of Baumrind authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles in the association between Baumrind's parenting styles and child outcomes in different cultures. The researcher contends against the view that authoritative parenting is beneficial or authoritarian parenting is not harmful to child development. Sorkhabi concludes that Baumrind's parenting styles have similar function in both individualist and collectivist cultures. Additionally, different societies have mixed cultural dimensions. This is to underscore the fact that there is always an overlapping of cultures where people either by commission or omission, inculcate other cultures into theirs.

The interplay of parenting styles and social-emotional competence in children is emerging as a significant tool in assisting children from minority or low-income groups to integrate fully into the larger productive society (McWayne et al., 2008). While these principles have been clearly established and their potential usefulness in formulating social policies in developed countries is well appreciated, the extent of their relevance and applicability in developing societies has not been explored fully. However, there seems to be little, if any, research evidence on the influence of parenting styles on children's social-emotional competence.

A substantial body of research has found several factors that affect parenting styles, which include cultural background, parents' and child's personality, social network and socio-economic status (Belsky, 1984; Bronfenbrenner, 2006; Tamis-Lemonda, 1999). Although much work has been done on the socio-economic status and children's developmental outcomes in western countries, little is known on socio-economic status and child development in Nigeria. In addition, there is a very scanty study on the factors that influence parenting styles in Abuja, Nigeria, specifically the study on socio-economic status and parenting styles in Nigeria. This

study is deemed necessary to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence and the influence of socio-economic status on parenting styles.

Literature on parenting styles in different cultures varies across these cultures. While some of the cultures practise the same parenting styles, the differences in socio-economic and policy research in China may cause differences in parenting styles. In the same way, Nigeria and her cultures may be different. Most studies in Nigeria focused on parenting styles and academic performance, self-esteem, social anxiety, personality formation and sexual experience of adolescents (Akinsola, 2010a, 2010b & 2011; Okonkwo, 2012; Okorodudu, 2010). However, little is known about parenting style and social-emotional competence, specifically in Abuja, Nigeria.

In reviewing the research findings presented, it is important to notice difficulties that arise in research methodology. Majority of studies on parenting styles in Nigeria use Baumrind's tool to measure parenting styles; although majority of the samples in the study comprise of adolescents and none of the studies in Nigeria has used SDQ to assess child's social behaviour. The inclusion of spousal reporting in some of the studies made the PSDQ tool a vital instrument in the investigation. This implies that either parent can fill in the questionnaire.

Majority of the studies examined the relationship between parenting styles and child developmental outcomes by the use of correlation. However, higher levels of statistical method will be used in this study. The present study will use PSDQ & SDQ in measuring parenting styles and social-emotional competence. The validity and reliability test of the PSDQ (Parenting Styles Dimension Questionnaire) by Robinson et al. (2001) and SDQ (Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire) by Goodman (2001) have been tested in almost every culture and they were good.

The research evidence has indicated a strong linkage between parenting style and children's developmental outcomes based on the literature reviewed and Bronfenbrenner's ecological model (1979). In the earlier review on parenting styles, the present study is expected to discover the three typologies of parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. It is expected that both authoritative and authoritarian will be most frequently used. Furthermore, parents'

educational status and occupation are expected to relate with parenting styles. In addition, both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles are expected to be positively related to social-emotional competence while a negative relationship is expected to exist between permissive parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence as perceived by their teachers. This study will examine the relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence and determine the relationship between socio-economic status and parenting styles by answering the following questions.

1. What are the parenting styles in practice among parents of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria?
2. Is there a relationship between socio-economic status and parenting styles in Abuja, Nigeria?
3. Is there a relationship between parenting styles and teachers' perceptions of social-emotional competence of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria?

Answers will be proffered to the research questions by following the procedure specified in the research methodology in the next chapter.

The diagram highlighted below in Figure 2.12-1 illustrates the summary of the terms used in the present study. The socialisation (nurture) process is conducted through the three types of parenting styles, which are in turn being influenced by other factors such as culture, education and occupation. Culture shows that the cultural background of the parent influences the three parenting styles. In addition, educational and occupational backgrounds have effect on parenting style which in turn may have impact on the social-emotional competence of the child.

Furthermore, the diagram shows that social-emotional competence is influenced by the child's personality (nature) and this affects his thinking and developing ability which can be perceived through their pro-social behaviour, hyperactivity, emotional symptom, peer problem and conduct problem.

Figure 2.11-1: Summary and Illustration of Terms

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

3.1.   Introduction

This chapter presents the research design, philosophical worldview and quantitative method used to achieve the aims of the study. It also gives the sampling method, study area, population, measurements and procedure. Furthermore, it justifies the rationale for using the questionnaire method of approach for data collection and how the data is analysed. The present study reflects the hypothesis and theoretical framework of Bronfenbrenner's Ecological Model. Researchers have used this theory to model statistical, correlational and regression studies. Although several factors influence children's social-emotional competence, this study only conducted research on the influence of parenting style. The research approaches comprise of research design, philosophical worldview and research methods.

3.2.   Research Design

According to Creswell (2003), research design involves a series of stages that are used to provide answers to identified research questions. The research design explains in detail the systematic approach that is involved in conducting the study from the beginning and how questions asked in each research step will be answered. In this study, the research questions focus on the range of parenting styles and the effect of socio-economic status on parenting styles. In addition, the relationship between parenting styles and the social-emotional competence of children in Abuja, Nigeria is examined. Research design comprises of two stages: planning and execution of the study. The overall process of planning is the methodology while that of execution involves collection of data.

In the current study, as illustrated in Figure 3.2-1, the research design consists of a sample 100 parents of pre-school children whose age ranges from four to five, and five teachers from five schools in Abuja, Nigeria. Parents completed Parenting Style Dimension Questionnaire (PSDQ) in order to measure parenting styles and teacher's perception of children's social-emotional competences was measured by the use of Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). In addition, descriptive

statistics, analysis of variance, with correlation and regression analyses were used for statistical analysis. Figure 3.2-1 below shows the steps in research design.

STEPS IN RESEARCH DESIGN

Figure 3.2-1: Steps in Research

3.3. Research Paradigms and Methodological Approach

Coryn (2007) defines research as an attempt at seeking the truth with the final aim of being able to predict and explain the world. Research is a logical process which tends to answer questions posed by identified gaps in the body of knowledge (Robson, 2011). This implies that research seeks an objective truth, which can be known, and the realities are used for the purpose of predicting and explaining the new knowledge found. For the purpose of this study, research simply means to add to the existing body of knowledge by analysing data collected in order to find its relationship with other variables.

Research methodology can be viewed philosophically as paradigms which are influenced by ontology and epistemology positions. These are the paradigms that underline the research method. A paradigm simply means a belief system that guides the way we do things. Paradigms are interwoven, which demonstrates the relationship between the philosophical debates and method. Ontology is the way we see the world and our beliefs about existence and relationships; this can either be viewed as objectivism or constructionism. Ontological position gives rise to epistemological paradigms. Epistemology is the way we believe knowledge can be produced and discovered. This philosophical position can either be positivism or interpretism.

Several philosophers have presented their views on how they understand the social world; this can either be understood by scientific method or naturalistic method. Auguste Comte was the first to propose that real knowledge is based on objective experience. This viewpoint is termed positivism (Thompson, 1976) and is based on the belief that a general rule can be made, which can be used to investigate the unknown aspects of the world. This general rule is derived from the observation of facts and its interpretation is used as basis to form theories through which the new knowledge is integrated into the existing body of research. The empirical and measurable evidence obtained through the process of observation and enquiry can be tested with hypothesis, which can either be accepted or rejected. Conclusions can be drawn based on deductive reasoning in which the truth of the assumption is a logical consequence of the hypothesis (Bryman, 2008; Robson, 2011).

One of the attributes of positivist epistemology is that the researcher cannot manipulate the outcome of the method used. The scientific method is relevant and has the tendency to test for reliability and validity of the study. Reliability connotes the ability to measure the fact in question consistently using objective methods of investigation. On the other hand, validity means the capability of the chosen method to measure what it is aimed at measuring by using an approach that allows for control of the research setting (Bryman, 2008; Robson, 2011). The reliability and validity measures make it possible to make deductive conclusion on the hypothesis of the study; this is called quantitative method.

In contrast to the positivists who view the world as truths comprised of general rules that rely on numbers and data, the observers of the social world argue that the world cannot be measured numerically. Adherents of this viewpoint, known as interpretivism believe that the truth is not objective but subjective and that it is important to have direct contact with the participant in order to get information about human behaviour. Open-ended questionnaires, diary accounts, unstructured observation and interviews are favoured for data gathering. This implies that the situation can be observed and conclusions can be generated in order to form a theory; this is called qualitative method.

There are several features that distinguish between quantitative and qualitative methods. Quantitative research is based on scientific method that deals with numerical values in order to investigate the relationship between two or more identified variables and is related to the positivist paradigm. This research method uses quantification or measurement in the collection of data and analysis. Quantitative method uses questionnaires that involve specific measurement. It also uses quantities expressed in figures which enable evaluation, using statistical approach. The method studies human behaviour with the use of scientific methods which can be explained and predicted. This assumption of determinism implies that a situation can be determined by one or more variables. Furthermore, this method provides meaning to the presentation of the raw data by use of techniques such as graphs, charts and statistics (Bryman, 2008; Cohen, Manion & Morrison, 2011; Robson, 2011). According to Bryman (2008) and Bryman and Bell (2007), this research method integrates the practices and normal pattern of the natural scientific

method with particular emphasis on positivism. Positivism provides an important approach for conducting research in the natural sciences (Cohen et al., 2011).

It is an objective method which explains theories to aid the understanding of social phenomena. Since there is an assumption that these are measurable, positivism is associated with quantitative methods of analysing data (Bryman & Bell, 2007 and Cohen et al, 2011). The advantage of quantitative research is that it can be conducted large-scale, using surveys. The quantitative method allows for a large sample to participate and prevents bias on the part of the researcher. Quantitative methods answer research questions that aim to find out the extent of relationship between two variables and it can be predicted and explained through a general law that makes up a theory.

In contrast, qualitative research methods can be described as making sense out of the environment and the factors that condition people's lives. Qualitative research uses words rather than measurement in the collection and analysis of data. It deals with how people feel and think about their environment. It is the gathering of data concerning personal experiences and behaviour. The qualitative researcher believes that human behaviour is dynamic and findings cannot be generalised because each person is viewed as an individual that is subject to changes over time. The information gathered here is not in numerical in value but descriptive. This is more difficult to analyse than quantitative data. This approach tends to be effective in providing deep insight into the subject of inquiry (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 2003). It is useful in answering in-depth research questions into human behaviour. For example a case study could be used to find out about the life experiences of a person.

Qualitative research is inductive in nature because the researcher observes the phenomenon and uses his observation to construct a theory or hypothesis through the explanation that they receive from the participant. On the other hand, quantitative research is deductive in nature because it deduces reality from general rules and uses it to create hypotheses. The advantage of quantitative research is that it can be replicated and the results generalised, making the findings predictable and more comparable. A qualitative researcher has direct contact with the participant though the result cannot be generalised. The qualitative researcher treats each person as an

individual with unique personality. This gives him wide and in-depth knowledge about the participant.

Based on the nature of this study, which aim is to find out the extent of relationship between two variables, the quantitative method will be used to answer research questions. This research attempts to study human behaviour with the use of scientific methods because human behaviour can be explained and predicted through hypothesis from the research questions. This assumption of determinism implies that a situation can be determined by one or more variables (Frosch & Johnson-Laird, 2011). This implies that social-emotional competence can be determined by parenting style. Contemporary quantitative researchers use probabilistic causes because traditional researchers have been unable to identify the general law for human behaviour (Frosch & Johnson-Laird, 2011). For example, a socially competent child may be more likely to be raised by authoritative than authoritarian parents. This implies that human behaviour could either be predicted or not, depending on the situation or circumstance.

3.4. Justification for Quantitative Method

Research design can either be qualitative or quantitative method. This depends on what the research is set out to achieve. Analyses of literature show that studies that addressed relationship between variables used quantitative methods. Due to the nature of research questions in the current study which aims to explore the relationship between two variables, a quantitative approach has been used. The reason for using quantitative method is that it provides room for large samples. The statistical nature of the approach can make it possible to be replicated due to its nature of accuracy. On the basis of these precedents, a quantitative research method might be most appropriate in order to facilitate the interpretation and discussion of the data collected. However, the researcher is aware that more details about the participants may not be known because of the indirect contact with the participants.

Several studies of parenting styles and social-emotional competence have used research approach on observation method, behavioural checklist, interview, attitude testing, field experiments and survey method. If a researcher wants to have an in-depth insight into a child's social-emotional competence and understanding of

parent-child interaction in terms of parenting styles in daily activities, the qualitative method may be most appropriate. However, it involves more training and is expensive. It involves small sample, which will not allow the study to be generalised.

This study used a cross-sectional survey design to assess the type of parenting styles practiced by sample of parents. In addition, this method provides overall breath and knowledge of parenting styles. This helps to have a wide picture of what parenting styles are. Moreover, several studies have used the quantitative research method and the reliability and validity of the standardised questionnaires used have been tested (Akinsola, 2012; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Goodman, 1997; Robinson et al., 2001; Steinberg et al., 1992; Winsler et al., 2005; Wu et al., 2002).

The current study used questionnaires to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and a child's social-emotional competence. Three standard questionnaires were used to gather information at a single point in time. There are two parts to the parents' questionnaire. The first part was designed to obtain information on the socio-economic status and demographic variables of the parents. The second part obtained information on parenting styles, which was measured by Parenting Styles Dimension Questionnaire (Robinson et al., 1995, 2001). The third part of the questionnaire was used to assess teacher's children's perception on social-emotional competence and this was measured by using Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 1997, 2001).

The questionnaire consists of questions on the three types of parenting styles that parents use on their children and this is asked through questions on dimensions of parenting styles: authoritative parenting style (Connection Dimension; Regulation Dimension; Autonomy-granting Dimension), authoritarian parenting style (Physical Coercion Dimension; Verbal Hostility Dimension; Non-Reasoning Dimension), permissive parenting style (Indulgent Dimension). The questions also deal with the relationship between parents' socio-economic status (occupational and educational levels) and parenting style.

The PSDQ questionnaire was used to answer research question one, which dealt with the range of parenting styles. In order to answer research question two on the effect of parents' education and occupation background and parenting styles; the demographic variables determined the social economic status of the parent while the

PSDQ was used with the demographic variable questionnaire. The third research question asks if there is a relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence. The SDQ questionnaire was used to assess the domains of social-emotional competence (hyperactivity, emotional symptoms, peer problems, conduct problems and pro-social). However, as this cannot answer the question alone, the PSDQ was used to assess the influence of parenting styles on social-emotional competence.

The strength of using the questionnaire is that it is easy to administer and makes the study replicable and generalisable. One questionnaire cannot provide all the answers. In conclusion, the use of the three tools helps the current study to answer the research questions. The questionnaires are described in detail below.

3.4.1. Justification for Research Tools

Varieties of measures have been used to assess children's social-emotional competence and associated constructs, including behavioural observations, parent and teacher ratings as well as peer and self-report. Some studies have used SDQ tool in studies such as Growing up in Scotland (Bradshaw & Tipping, 2010), Growing up in Ireland, (Halpenny, Nixon & Watson, 2010; Nixon, 2012), Growing up in Australia (AIHW, 2010; Mildon, & Polimeni, 2012) and studies by Early Years Learning Development (Evangelou, et al., 2009; Sylva, et al., 2004). However, researchers have also used items from the Child Behaviour Checklist and Teacher Report Form (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001) for children between age 1.5 and 5 years and age 6-16 to find out the perceptions of parents and teachers on children's social behaviour. The tool measures hyperactivity, aggression, bullying, deviance, violence and conduct problems. The items from these measures provide more information on negative than positive behaviour. They also capture more about children's behaviour than relationships with peers. For this reason, this scale might not be suitable for the measurement of social-emotional competence.

Additionally, the Rutter questionnaire is also well known as a good behavioural screening questionnaire, which has reliability and validity in many contexts (Elander & Rutter, 1996). According to Achenbach (1991), its advantage over Child Behaviour Checklist (CBCL) is that it is quicker to complete.

Nevertheless, SDQ teachers' version was used in this study because the tool has more positive attributes than negative characteristics of children's social-emotional competence. In addition, it also shows the extent of relationship between the children and their peers. This implies that the SDQ scale covers children's behaviour, emotion and relationship and possesses both positive and negative aspects in its five scales. The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare in 2012 conducted an assessment to determine the most suitable indicators for measuring social and emotional well-being of children in Australia. Twenty-two potential indicators were involved in the screening to measure social-emotional well-being. SDQ was found to be the most suitable tool for the measurement of social-emotional competence. Besides, it also has the advantage of being freely accessible online.

Some studies have shown that SDQ have similar theoretical meaning with Achenbach questionnaire, Rutters questionnaire and measures of anxiety and ADHD (Goodman, 1997; Goodman & Scott, 1999; Muris, Meesters & van den Berg, 2003; Muris, Meesters, Eijkelenboom & Vincken, 2004). It should however, be noted that several researches on psychometric properties of the SDQ have been done using European samples. SDQ has not been used in studies in Nigeria and this is because little or nothing is known about the study on social-emotional competence. It is therefore deemed necessary to use SDQ for the measurement of social-emotional competence in other to know its validity and reliability in the African context.

In assessing parenting styles, Baumrind used different types of methodology; these comprised observation method in a natural setting, psychologist' Q-sorts and parents 'rating scales'. Her study was based on observations of mother-child interactions and she later used parents' or child's reports as a measure for parenting styles. However, this approach involves small samples. Several other studies improved on Baumrind's methodology by increasing the number of samples with the use of adolescents' reports of parents' to obtain the information needed in assessing the three main typologies of parenting styles (Buri, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Steinberg et al., 1989; Steinberg et al., 1992; Steinberg et al., 1991). For instance, Buri (1991) developed the Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) to measure correlates of parental permissiveness, authoritarian and authoritativeness. The tool was used to assess parenting styles as perceived by adolescents. These indirect

parenting measures completed by adolescents and used in assessing adolescent outcomes eliminate several disadvantages of Baumrind's approach. Nevertheless, this tool may not be suitable for younger children since they are assigned for adolescents' perception of their parent's styles of parenting. Moreover, questions that are related to academics are often used in the questionnaire items. Despite the advantage of this method, the limitation is that it is not based on data from the parents themselves and does not consider other variables that interact with these parenting styles.

Robinson, Mandleco, Frost Olsen and Hart (2001) developed a scale for parenting styles which is suitable for children and has been used in many cultures (global). 1,251 parents of pre-school and primary school children completed 133 items of parenting questionnaires. The items were reduced using principal axes factor analyses followed by varimax rotation. The result revealed that a 62-item instrument was retained and the global parenting dimensions were subsequently analysed to assess their internal structures using principal axes factor analyses followed by oblique rotation. A number of specific factors were identified for each of the three global dimensions of parenting styles. Three global parenting dimensions emerged consistent with Baumrind's authoritative, authoritarian and permissive typologies.

Several studies have emphasised the widespread use of the PSDQ in most recent literature and confirmed its current acceptance for effective use in multiple cultural settings, including Russia, China (Wu et al., 2002) and Africa-America head-start communities (Coolahan, McWayne, Fantuzzo & Grim, (2002). The study concluded that both parents gave accurate result of the parenting style of their spouse which indicates that the questionnaire can be administered by either of the parents.

3.5.   Permissions/Ethics Consideration

Prior to the start of this research study, a full ethics permission request was submitted to and approved by the Ethics Research Committee of the University of Strathclyde. This is in accordance with the Ethics Code of the University of Strathclyde in relation to research projects in social science. Permission was obtained from the head teacher and proprietor of each school in which the study was conducted. These permissions were sought through formal letters (Appendix III) addressed to the appropriate head teachers and proprietors. The schools were informed that anonymity

and confidentiality would be observed and no names of individuals would be revealed in the final study. The schools were asked to code the questionnaires using school registration lists for anonymity and confidentiality. Consent forms, questionnaires and information letters detailing the purpose of the investigation were sent as a package to parents through their children (Appendix VII & IX). No child was excluded from the study except where parents elected not to participate. Inclusion was based on voluntary participation of parents and schools.

3.6. Population
This study was conducted in Abuja, Nigeria. As a cosmopolitan city, Abuja is the Federal Capital Territory of Nigeria (Appendix I); where every tribe and ethnic group in Nigeria are represented. There are five district areas in Abuja, which include Maitama District, Wuse District, Central Area District, Asokoro District and Garki District (Appendix II). Two of the five districts were chosen: Wuse and Asokoro Districts. The target population of the study was all pre-school children in nursery schools; both private and public in the two districts. The population consists of people from diverse socio-economic, cultural and tribal groups. Purposive sampling procedure was adopted in the selection of schools, because some schools did not wish to participate. The target sample size consists of 125 parents of children aged four to five years old registered in the school. The study involved all the children in selected five schools. Majority of the schools had sample of 25 children and one teacher was selected per school.

3.7.Participants
A total of 125 parents and five teachers of pre-school children participated fully in the study. One teacher responded for the 25 pupils chosen in each school. Seven schools were approached on the basis of their location and easy accessibility. Six responded positively and agreed to participate in the study. However, one of the schools that had earlier agreed withdrew and returned the questionnaire uncompleted. The reason given was that the parents had no time to complete the questionnaire. In one of the schools, a teacher refused to fill the questionnaire after the head teacher had given permission, however, another teacher agreed to participate in the study.

This research focused on 125 parents and 5 teachers of girls and boys between the ages of four and five as sample target. English speaking parents (as identified by the school) were invited to participate because the questionnaires were developed in English. Five classes and five teachers were asked to participate. No particular child was excluded from the study. A total of 125 questionnaires were returned. However, 25 had to be discarded since vital information necessary for data analysis were missing. Some questionnaires had no code numbers while some parents' questionnaires could not be matched with those of the relevant teachers. Others were returned with no information. The numbers of parents who responded in the five nursery schools are 23, 22, 20, 18 and 17 respectively. The returned questionnaires indicated that there were 36 boys and 25 girls but the sex of the remaining 39 children were not indicated.

The three types of questionnaires used for the study are demographic questionnaire, questionnaire on parents' parenting styles and questionnaire on teachers' perception of social-emotional competence. The questionnaires are described in detail below.

3.8. Methods of Data Collection

3.8.1. Parenting Styles Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ)

The PSDQ is a widely used and psychometrically robust questionnaire (Robinson et al., 2001) tapping into parental use of the three distinct parenting styles i.e. authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parenting styles.

Scores from the Parenting Styles Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ) (Robinson et al., 2001) assessed the parenting styles of parents or caregivers with respect to Baumrind's typology of parenting styles: authoritarian (high control, low warmth), permissive (low control, high warmth) and authoritative (high control, high warmth). This questionnaire was originally designed to evaluate the parenting styles of 4 to 12 year old children and is therefore useful for analysis of parenting dimensions that are linked with child behavioural outcomes. It is a short version of the Parenting Practices Questionnaire (PPQ), which consists of a 62-item measure of self-reported and spouse-reported parenting practices for parents of pre-adolescent children (Robinson et al., 1995). According to Robinson et al. (2001), the recent

form of the instrument consists of 32 items of which 15 are for authoritative, 12 for authoritarian and 5 for permissive dimensions. It is widely used in studies designed to investigate perceptions of different types of parenting style. The questions reflect Baumrind's theoretical framework of three dimensions of parenting as discussed earlier. Examples of the items include (a) 'I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles' (authoritative), 'I find it difficult to discipline my child' (permissive) and 'I spank my child when my child is disobedient' (authoritarian). Response choices range from 'never' to 'always' on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Higher scores indicate increased use of parenting practice associated with a specific style.

Robinson et al. (2001) provided the original psychometric properties of American samples. He reported internal consistency reliability (crombach alpha) of .91, .86 and .75 respectively for mothers and fathers for authoritative, authoritarian and permissive scales.

In a review of instruments assessing parenting practice, Locke and Prinz (2002) highly recommended PPQ/PSDQ as one of the few instruments available with psychometric valid scales linking to parental nurturance and discipline. This instrument is frequently used in literature and across cultural settings which include Russia (Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olson & McNeilly-Choque, 1998), China (Wu et al., 2002) and African-American head-start communities (Coolahan et al., 2002).

3.8.2. Strength and Difficulty Questionnaire (SDQ) Teacher's Form (4-10)

Goodman developed SDQ in 2001 to assess children's social-emotional competence; it consists of 25 items. The SDQ is a brief behavioural screening inventory that explores children's positive and negative characteristics of social-emotional competence and it assesses both social and emotional characteristics. It is divided into 5 scales of 5 items which include Hyperactivity Scale (0-10 points), Emotional Symptoms Scale (0-10 points), Conduct Problems Scale (0-10 points), Peer Problems Scale (0-10 points) and Pro-social Behaviour Scales (0-10 points). The hyperactivity scale measures a range of child behaviour including restlessness, impulsiveness and concentration span. The emotional scale measures a range of negative emotions such as sadness, fear and worry. The peer problems scale measures the child's peer relationships including not having friends, being picked on, playing by themselves or not being liked by other children. The conduct problem scale measures a child's

tendency to display negative behaviour when interacting socially with other children and adults. The pro-social behaviour scale measures positive social behaviour.

Scores can be classified into normal, borderline and abnormal based on established cut-offs. What differentiates normal from abnormal behaviour in the SDQ scale is not the presence of specific problem behaviours but their frequency of occurrence in group, strength and the social setting in which they occur. Summing the scores for the five items generates the score for each of the five scales and thus a scale score ranging from 0-10. Each sub-scale contains 5 questions with 3-point response scales ('Not true' = 0, 'Somewhat true' = 1, 'Certainly true' = 2) with a score range of 0–10. A total difficulties score from the first four sub-scales was calculated. For each sub-scale, except pro-social behaviour, higher scores on each sub-scale indicate higher levels of difficulty. The scores for the four difficulties scales can be summed to generate a total difficulty score ranging from 0-40. Goodman (2001) provided the original psychometric properties using British samples and reported a Test-Retest reliability of 0.85. This instrument has been employed to shed light on issues such as mental health of subjects for both children and adolescents suffering from mental illnesses (Goodman, 2002; Goodman, Ford, Simmons, Gatward & Meltzer, 2000).

3.8.3. Demographic Variables

Demographic questionnaire was designed to investigate parental socio-economic status. Status was classified into two categories - parental educational status and parental occupational status. This was because the education and occupation system in Nigeria are different from the western culture. The education scale is in four-Likert, varying from not educated (1) to tertiary education (4). The occupational level was identified and given a score of one to three ranging from civil servant (1) to private employee (3).

3.9.Procedures

Permission to conduct the study on the chosen schools was sought from the head-teacher through an introductory cover letter (Appendix III). The cover letter stated clearly the objectives of the study and provided reassurance that no personal information of the parents or pupils would be disclosed in the course of the study.

The school was informed that anonymity and confidentiality would be observed and no names of individuals will be reflected in the final report. To ensure this, the coded questionnaires were collected and analysed using the coded numbers. The school used the school register to assign identification numbers to each participating pupil to ensure that confidentiality was maintained.

Class teachers of children ages 4-5 were given information sheets and consent forms (Appendix VI & V). The consent forms, questionnaires and information letters detailing the purpose of the investigation were packaged in the children's bags to be delivered to their parents (Appendix VI, VII & IX). Parents were asked to return the questionnaires. No child was excluded from the study except where parents elected not to participate. Inclusion was based on voluntary participation of parents and schools.

3.10. Data analysis

In this study, the Statistical Package for Social Scientists (SPSS) version 20 was used to analyse the raw data obtained from the coded questionnaires. SPSS was used for the quantitative analysis of data because it is a student-friendly and reasonably affordable statistical package (Cohen et al., 2011). The SPSS package has made it easy to analyse data obtained from the questionnaires, thus reducing the time spent on data analysis and leaving more time to focus on discussing the research results. It has also been found to be very reliable and accurate (Cohen et al., 2011). Means and standard deviation for the three parenting styles were calculated and Friedman's related sample Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate if the distribution parenting styles scores are similar and to also identify the prevalent parenting style. One-way ANOVA was used to test the effect of the parents' characteristics on parenting style. Correlation analysis was used to measure the linear relationship between parenting style and social-emotional competence of pre-school pupils. In addition, factor analysis was used to extract variables that best correlate with the response. Regression analysis was used to study both the effect of parenting styles on a child's social-emotional competence and that of socio-economic status on parenting styles. The variables analysed were parenting styles, demographic

variables and children's social-emotional competence. Results from data analyses were adequately interpreted and discussed in this study.

3.10.1. Description of Study Participants

Study participants were described using frequency distribution tables with percentages. Quantitative variables, such as score of parenting style and social-emotional competence of the pupils were described using mean values with standard deviation (SD) and relevant charts.

3.10.2. Obtaining Parenting Style and Social-Emotional Competence Scores

The PSDQ question items were on a five-point Likert scale. Scores for 15 items for authoritative, 12 items for authoritarian as well as 5 items for the permissive parenting styles were aggregated for each parent and the mean scores obtained. Similar procedure was used for the five strength and difficulty characteristics of the pupils which comprised 25 items made up of 5 scales of 5 items each on a three-point Likert scale (not true, somewhat true and certainly true), ranging from 0 to 2 points. Inverted questions were recorded appropriately. Total difficulty score was obtained by adding up the scores from the 5 scales except pro-social behaviour so that the total obtainable for each child was between 0 and 40. Furthermore, the categories of the social-emotional competences (normal, borderline and abnormal) were obtained using the table below:

Table 3.10-1: Bandings for Classifying SDQ Scores

Scale	Normal	Borderline	Abnormal
Pro-social Behaviour Score	6 – 10	5	0 – 4
Emotional Symptoms Score	0 – 4	5	6 – 10
Conduct Problems Score	0 – 2	3	4 – 10
Hyperactivity Score	0 – 5	6	7 – 10
Peer Problems Score	0 – 3	4	5 – 10
Total Difficulty Score	0 – 11	12 – 15	16 – 40

Source: (Goodman, 2001)

3.10.3. Appropriateness of the Variables for Parametric Data Analysis

Measures of dispersion and tests of normality were used to describe the appropriateness of the scores obtained for parametric data analysis. Measures of skewness with corresponding standard error were used to investigate if the data assume a normal distribution and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov goodness-of-fit test was used to verify the fact.

3.10.4. Comparison of Parenting Style Scores and Social-Emotional Competences

It should be that this research is based on Bronfenbrenner's theory, which emphasises the relationship between parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence during interaction and some other factors such as socio-economic status of the parents which may have effect on the parenting styles due to differences in social status, and this indirectly might affect the child. In this regard, (Balli, Demo & Wedman, 1998) assessed the theory using ANOVA whereas Berg (2008) used non-parametric analysis of variance. However, non-parametric related samples of Friedman's analysis of variance were used in this study to compare the distribution and average scores of the parenting style scores (Bewick, Cheek, & Ball, 2004), which is similar to the work of Khalaj, Khabiri, & Sajjadi (2011) and Vahedi (2010) who used Friedman test for prioritizing leadership scales and parental participation in high school administraton respectively.

The assumptions of the Friedman test include the dependent variables are related or repeated measurements, the observations can be ranked or measured on ordinal scale and independence of comparison groups. This test is plausible for comparing parenting styles because the parenting styles were measured on ordinal scale, and each parent answered questions on the three parenting styles, hence the responses are related.

The Friedman's statistic is calculated by comparing the mean ranks of the continuous variables. For each of the N cases, the k variables are sorted and ranked, with average ranking assigned in case of ties. Sum of ranks is then calculated for each of the k variables denoted C_i. The average rank for each variable is obtained as $\bar{R}_i = {C_i}/{N}$. The test statistic assumes a chi-square distribution with k-1 degrees of freedom and is obtained from (Bewick, Cheek, & Ball, 2004):

$$\chi^2 = \frac{\left(\frac{12}{Nk(k+1)}\right)\sum_{i=1}^{k} C_i^2 - 3N(k+1)}{1 - \frac{\sum T}{Nk(k^2-1)}}$$

The denominator is used to control for ties. Post-hoc pair comparison was done using Dunn-Bonferroni test (IBM SPSS, 2012).

3.10.5. Correlation and Regression Analyses and Model Specification

Pearson Product Moment Correlation coefficient was employed to describe the relationship that exists among the parenting styles and between the parenting styles and the social-emotional competences of the pupils. This approach has been employed in some studies by describing the relationship between parenting styles and children's emotional competences (Joshi & Dutta, 2015; Starr, 2011). The correlation coefficient describes the ratio of the covariance to the product of variances of a pair of quantitative variables; and the closer the correlation coefficient- designated $r,$ is to unity, the stronger the relationship between the pair of variables. The direction of the relationship is determined by considering if the correlation coefficient is positive or negative.

Studies (Dunlop et al., 2008; Halpenny et al., 2010; Nixon, 2012) have used the regression method to assess parenting styles, positive behaviour in early years, social, emotional and behavioural characteristics and social-emotional competence of pre-school pupils. This regression model was adapted to Bronfenbrenner's model and is used to investigate the dependence of a child's social-emotional competence on parenting styles and other factors relating to parental style in Abuja, Nigeria. Bronfenbrenner's model makes it clear that the home environment is the primary source of influence on a child's life. Multiple regression analysis was used, given as:

$$Y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 x_{i1} + \beta_2 x_{i2} + \beta_3 x_{i3} + e_i$$

Where for each child $i,$

Y_i = Social and emotional competence

α = Intercept of the model

x_1 = Authoritative parental style

x_2 = Authoritarian parental style

x_3 = Permissive parental style

$e_i =$ is the error term and

$$\beta_k = \frac{n \sum x_{ik} y_i - (\sum x_{ik})^2}{n \sum x_{ik}^2 - (\sum x_{ik})^2} \ldots k = 1,2,3; i = 1,..,n$$

is the regression coefficient. It measures to what extent each independent variable (x) affects the child's social and emotional development (y)

The significance of each independent variable is tested using the t-statistic

$$t = \frac{\beta_k}{SE(\beta_k)}$$

This is the ratio of each regression coefficient to its standard error. This is then compared to a tabulated value of t at n-1 degrees of freedom. It is significant if calculated value is greater than tabulated value or simply if the p-value is less than 0.05.

3.10.6. Principal Component Analysis for Data Reduction

Six additional variables were generated from the initial three variables i.e. authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. The need arose to investigate which of the parenting styles most influences the child's social-emotional competence. As the parenting style variables are mostly correlated with each other, principal component analysis (PCA) was used for data reduction to select the variables (component) whose linear combination accounts for as much variation in the original variables as possible. Of the nine variables that were used to represent parenting styles (i.e. base variables, upper-modal and interaction), PCA was used to answer the question of how many factors are needed to represent the variables and what do these factors represent. The components were rotated by Varimax method.

3.11. Summary

This chapter has presented the research design. The descriptions of quantitative and qualitative methods of research methodology were discussed. It has been described with an appropriate philosophical view that influences the belief of each methodology. Appropriate research philosophy led to the dilemma of opting between the Interpretivism and Positivism approach to research. A variety of researchers have pointed towards the essential factors that could inform the choice between these

two options. For this study, the positivist approach was adopted because the research design fits the characteristics of the approach as outlined in Robson (2011). It was outlined that knowledge can be explored by formulating general rules which can be used to deduce truths by focusing on the facts in order to use the fact to generate hypotheses and can be tested whether it is accepted or rejected.

In addition, the basis for the choice of a quantitative approach is explained. It has been established that the methodology was carefully chosen to address the research questions that form the foundation of the study.

The sample size of the population and the location of the study were discussed with the description about the participants. The different parenting styles are based on defined criteria, well established and confirmed in many studies. The researcher investigated these by generating research questions and hypotheses about parenting styles. This approach provides an understanding of the parenting styles by asking parents the dimensions of parenting styles (emotional support, autonomy granting and corrective discipline) they use on their children. Questionnaires were used for this and to determine whether or not occupational and educational levels of parents affect parenting styles. The study also explored the relationship between parenting styles and a child's social-emotional competence. Empirical facts were collected from a sample size of the population and the hypotheses were tested.

In conclusion, the section explains tools for the collection of data and the procedure for data analysis with the emphasis on statistical approach. It is expected that data collected and their subsequent analysis and discussion can be deemed reliable and valid since all necessary steps were taken to ensure accuracy. The results obtained and their analyses will be presented in the next chapter.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1. Introduction

This chapter presents information from the respondents and the results that were obtained from the questionnaires. This section in particular presents each of the results in a tabular form and discusses the findings. Furthermore, the type of questions allows this researcher to use descriptive statistics and inferential statistics to analyse the background demographic characteristics of the participants and the three types of parenting styles. Friedman related-samples analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used for comparison between mean scores of the different parenting styles and one-way ANOVA to test the effect of parent's social-economic status on parenting styles. Correlation and regression analyses were used to determine the relationship between and among Parenting Styles and Social-Emotional competence as perceived by the teachers.

4.2. Executive Summary of Data Analysis in light of the Objectives of the Study

1. The study aims to examine the range of parenting styles common among parents in Abuja, Nigeria.

   a. Frequency distributions were used to describe the background characteristics of the participant. (Section 4.2)

   b. Parenting style scores were computed by aggregating the values from each of the questions on the three parenting style construct. (Section 4.3)

   c. Average parenting style scores were computed for each parenting style across all the 100 parents that responded. (Section 4.3-1, -2, & -3)

   d. Distribution of parenting style scores were compared using Friedman ANOVA for related samples to provide indication about:

      i. The most common of parenting style comparing the median scores

      ii. Similarity of responses among the three parenting.

      iii. The aim of the analysis was not to investigate which of the parenting styles had the highest average score but to determine the most common of the parenting styles. (Section 4.5.1)

iv. Correlation analysis was also used to investigate if the distribution of parenting styles are similar to show how likely a parent might be in other parenting styles given one parenting style. (Section 4.5.2)

Frequency distributions were used to describe the background characteristics of the respondents. Descriptive statistics were used based on the items in the parenting style aggregate scores were computed to describe the participant. Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to test the normality of the parenting style scores in order to ensure that the variables could be analysed with statistical methods that assume normal distribution. In addition, Friedman's related samples Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was used to investigate if the distributions of parenting style ratings are similar among the parents. The analysis compares the median scores and could be used to provide insight into the comparison of prevalent parenting style.

2. This research also aims at determining how parenting styles might vary with socio-economic status such as occupation and education of parents in Abuja, Nigeria.
   a. Effect of the parents' education and occupation on their parenting styles were analysed using one-way analysis of variance, since the parenting style scores were on continuous scale. (Section 4.5-1, &-2)
      i. F statistic was used to compare differences in means of the three educational levels within each parenting styles group.
      ii. F statistic was used to compare differences in means of the three occupational levels within each parenting styles group.

3. The major goal of this study is to identify how parenting styles could influence social-emotional competences of children aged between four and five years old in Abuja, Nigeria as perceived by teachers.
   a. Correlation analysis was to measure the linear relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competences of the children. (Section 4.7.1)
   b. Linear regression was used to analyze the effect of parenting styles on children's social-emotional competence.

i. Linear regression measured how the three parenting styles influence each of the identified social-emotional competences. (Section 4.7.2)

In sum, Correlation analyses are carried out to find out if linear relationship exists between pairs of quantitative variables. Since both the parenting style scores and social-emotional competence scores are quantitative, they are amenable to a correlation analysis (Mensah & Karuanchie, 2013).

In addition, factor analysis was used to extract variables that best correlate with the response. Inclusion of additional variables necessitated the use of factor analysis (Principal Component Analysis) to extract the minimum number of parenting style variables that would account for most variation in the observed social-emotional competences of the children. Regression analysis was used to study the effect of parenting styles on a child's social-emotional competence (Hunt, 2013; Tiller, et al. 2013).

The variables analysed were parenting styles, demographic variables and children's social-emotional competence. Results from data analyses are adequately interpreted and discussed in this study.

4.3. Background Characteristics of Respondents

A total of 100 parents and five teachers responded to the questionnaire and their responses were included in the analysis. Three-quarter (75%) had tertiary education, 12% had senior secondary school education, 12% had basic education and one percent were not educated. More than half of the parents (56%) work in the civil service, 34% were self-employed (which includes trading), 7% were private employees and 3% did not indicate their occupation status. The distribution of the children indicated that 36% were males while 25% were females; however, gender for 39% of the children was not indicated in the returned questionnaires. The ages of 54% of the children were not indicated in the research tools, 19% were aged four years and 27% were five years old. However, it is known that the age range of children at this level of education in Nigeria is between four and five years. The implicit assumption then in this research is that all children used in this study were aged less than or equal to five.

4.4. Parenting Styles and Dimensions

Items on the research tool were rated on a five-point scale (1 = Never, 2 = Once a while, 3 = About half of the time, 4 = Very often and 5 = Always) to measure the degree to which the participating parents practised each of the items. Mean score and standard deviation (SD) are presented as follows:

4.4.1. Authoritative Parenting Style

Table 4.3-1 shows the mean score for authoritative parenting style obtained from the PSDQ for the 100 respondents. The possible range of mean score for authoritative parenting style was zero to five while the actual range of mean score was 2.07 to 5.00. Mean score for authoritative parenting style was 3.83 (SD = 0.53). For each of the sectional items that made up the authoritative parenting styles, average score for the connection dimension (warmth and support) was 4.10 (SD = 0.60), which implies that the parents of pre-schoolers perceive themselves as showing warmth and support to their children more than half of the time. Therefore, on average, the parents are responsive to their children's feelings and give praise often when their children are good. Regulation dimension (reasoning/induction) average score was 4.13 (SD = 0.61), which also implies that the parents perceive themselves as helping their children understand the reasons for their actions by explaining these to them. Autonomy granting dimension (democratic participation) had a mean score of 3.27 (SD = 0.86) among the parents of the pre-schoolers, which implies that a number of the parents allowed their children some measure of independence more than half of the time at home.

Table 4.4-1: Mean and Standard Deviation Score of Authoritative Parenting Style

Statistics	Mean	Std. Deviation
Connection Dimension (Warmth and Support)		
I am responsive to my child's feelings and needs.	4.41	0.97
I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.	3.85	1.23
I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset.	3.91	0.95
I give praise when my child is good.	4.51	0.82
I have warm and intimate times together with my child.	3.81	1.15
Average	*4.10*	*0.60*
Regulation Dimension (Reasoning/Induction)		
I explain to my child how I feel about the child's good and bad behaviours.	4.36	0.84
I emphasise the reasons for rules.	4.03	1.12
I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed.	4.43	0.95
I help my child to understand the impact of behaviour by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.	3.87	1.09
I explain the consequences of the child's behaviour.	3.94	1.09
Average	*4.13*	*0.61*
Autonomy Granting Dimension (Democratic Participation)		
I take my child's desires into account before asking him/her to do something.	2.59	1.34
I encourage my child to freely express himself/herself, even when disagreeing with me.	3.27	1.41
I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.	3.25	1.51
I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them.	4.10	0.93
I allow my child to give input into family rules.	3.14	1.36
Average	*3.27*	*0.86*
Average mean score for Authoritative Parenting Style*	3.83	0.53

*Cronbach's alpha= 0.764; Sample = 100

4.4.2. Authoritarian Parenting Style

Table 4.3-2 shows the mean score for authoritarian parenting style obtained from the PSDQ for the 100 participating parents. Average score for authoritarian parenting style was 2.54 (SD = 0.53), which implies a relatively low score and thus indicating that parents show this behaviour less than half of the time. According to the different sub-sections that made up the authoritarian parenting behaviour, physical coercion had an average score of 2.42 (SD = 0.66), which implies that this behaviour is common among parents about once in a while although the parents spank their children when they are disobedient more than half of the time as shown on *Table 4.3-2 below*. Furthermore, verbal hostility dimension was observed to be an average score of 2.99 (SD = 0.78). This implies the behaviour exhibited by parents about half of the time. Also, about half of the time, parents either yell or shout when their children misbehave, scold and criticize to make their children improve or scold or criticize when their children's behaviour do not meet their expectations. The average score for non-reasoning/punitive dimension was 2.20 (SD = 0.68), implying that parents show this behaviour towards their children mostly once in a while and also punish their children by putting them off somewhere alone with little, if any explanation. This was exhibited less often. Parents do not provide explanation for their behaviour towards the children more than half of the time.

Table 4.4-2: Mean Score for Authoritarian Parenting Style

Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Physical Coercion Dimension		
I use physical punishment as a way of disciplining my child.	2.53	1.21
I spank when my child is disobedient.	3.35	1.31
I grab my child when being disobedient.	2.01	1.26
I slap my child when the child misbehaves.	1.80	0.91
Average	*2.42*	*0.66*
Verbal Hostility Dimension		
I yell or shout when my child misbehaves.	3.20	1.26
I explode in anger towards my child.	2.27	1.08
I scold and criticize to make my child improve.	3.22	1.32
I scold or criticize when my child's behaviour does not meet my expectations	3.26	1.32
Average	*2.99*	*0.78*
Non-Reasoning/Punitive Dimension		
When my child asks why he/she has to conform, I state: because I said so, or, I am your parent and I want you to.	2.55	1.20
I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little, if any explanations.	2.24	1.06
I use threats as punishment with little or no justification.	2.07	1.07
I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little, if any explanations.	1.95	0.97
Average	*2.20*	*0.68*
Average mean score for Authoritarian Parenting Style*	2.54	0.53

*Cronbach's alpha=0.590; N=100

(a)

(b)

Figure 4.4-1: Dimensions of (a) authoritarian and (b) authoritative parenting styles

4.4.3. Permissive Parenting Style

Table 4.3-3 below shows the mean scores for the permissive parenting behaviour among the 100 parents that participated in the survey. The indulgent dimension is the only sub-category for this behaviour and hence it is the same as the total average score. Average score for the permissive parenting style was 2.03 (SD = 0.60), which implies that the parents of the children show an indulgent behaviour towards their children about once in a while. Hence, on average, parents of the pre-schoolers either give in to their children when they cause a commotion about something, threaten the child with punishment more often than giving it or state punishment to their children and do not actually do them mostly once in a while.

Table 4.4-3: Mean Score and SD for Permissive Parenting Style

Statistics	Mean	Std. Deviation
Indulgent Dimension		
I find it difficult to discipline my child.	1.50	1.17
I give in to my child when the child causes a commotion about something.	2.39	1.30
I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it	2.73	1.01
I state punishments to my child and do not actually do them.	2.37	1.06
I spoil my child.	1.14	0.51
Average	*2.03*	*0.60*
Average mean score for Permissive Parenting Style*	**2.03**	**0.60**

*Cronbach's alpha = 0.507; N = 100

Figure 4.4-2: Comparison among the three parenting styles

   [Line in the middle of the boxes indicates the median score. The dots are outliers].

4.5. Parenting Styles that are in Practice among Parents of Pre-school Children in Nigeria

Since the data used for the measurement of the different kinds of parenting style common among Nigerian parents are continuous data, it is necessary to check their congruence with normal distribution in order to ascertain that they qualify for parametric statistical procedures.

Table 4.5-1 shows the characteristics of the parenting styles scores in terms of measure of central tendency, dispersion and normality. Mean score for the three parenting styles in order of magnitude are 3.85 (SD = 0.55; Median = 3.83), 2.43 (SD = 0.48; Median = 2.42) and 2.07 (SD = 0.63; Median = 2.00) for authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles respectively.

Coefficients of skewness are -0.18 (SE = 0.24), -0.06 (SE = 0.24) and 0.82 (SE = 0.24) for authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles respectively. Also, the coefficients of kurtosis are -0.05 (SE = 0.48), -0.18 (SE = 0.48), and 0.97 (SE = 0.48) for authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles respectively. The skewness and kurtosis values show that the three parenting styles assume a normal distribution since the absolute values of their ratios with their respective standard error of skewness and kurtosis are less than 1.96. On the other hand, since the mean and median values are almost the same, this could also imply that the variables assume normal distribution. Assumption of normality for the variables was also corroborated by the Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z statistic for authoritative (Z=0.918, p=0.369), authoritarian (Z=0.765, p=0.603) and permissive (Z=1.268, p=0.80) parenting styles (*See Table 4.5-1*). Hence, given that the data are normally distributed, parametric tests could be used to carry out the tests of hypothesis.

Table 4.5-1: Normality of Parenting Style Scores

Statistics	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Mean	3.83	2.54	2.03
Median	3.80	2.58	2.00
Mode	3.27	2.33	2.00
Percent of Total Sum	45.6%	30.2%	24.1%
Std. Deviation	0.53	0.53	0.60
Skewness	-0.21	-0.15	0.97
Std. Error of Skewness	0.24	0.24	0.24
Kurtosis	-0.82	-0.12	1.66
Std. Error of Kurtosis	0.48	0.48	0.48
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	0.918[#]	0.765[#]	1.268[#]

4.5.1. Comparison between Parenting Style Scores

Friedman's ANOVA test was used to test the null hypothesis that the three parenting styles have the same distribution. The parenting style scores were ranked and the average compared. Mean rank scores for the three parenting styles were significantly different, χ^2 (2, $N = 100$) = 152.77, $p < 0.01$. Mean ranks for authoritative parenting style was significantly higher than the two other parenting styles and authoritarian parenting styles score was also significantly higher than permissive. Hence, the sampled parents were predominantly authoritative.

Figure 4.5-1: Comparison of parenting style mean ranks for parents in Abuja, Nigeria

4.5.2. Correlation between Parenting Styles

The study further tests the tendency of a parent using two parenting styles. There is negative, almost zero correlation between authoritative and authoritarian, $r(100) = -0.05$, $p = 0.66$ as well as permissive, $r(100) = -0.13$, $p = 0.19$ parenting styles. On the other hand, there is a significant but weak positive correlation between authoritarian and permissive parenting styles, r (100) = 0.26, $p = 0.01$. This implies that authoritative parenting style does not have any relationship with whether a parent would be authoritarian or permissive while the correlation between authoritarian and permissive parenting styles implies that an authoritarian parent is likely to be permissive, but to a very small degree.

4.6. Relationship between Social-Economic Status and Parenting Styles

4.6.1. Educational Background and Parenting Style

Table 4.5.1 shows the effect of educational background on parenting style. Analysis of variance was used to evaluate the hypothesis that "educational background does not have a significant effect on parenting style," which could otherwise be stated as "there is no significant difference in the average scores of the parenting styles across the different educational backgrounds." Since only one respondent did not have any education, the score was included with those with basic education. The results show that we do not have enough evidence to show that educational background of the parents was related to their parenting styles.

Table 4.6-1: Mean (SD) of Parenting Style according to Education Background

Parent's Education	*Parenting Style*		
	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Basic Education	3.57 (0.77)	2.62 (0.42)	2.06 (0.41)
Secondary Education	3.81 (0.58)	2.55 (0.58)	1.97 (0.50)
Tertiary education	3.88 (0.46)	2.52 (0.54)	2.03 (0.65)
F	1.867	0.200	0.080
df1, df2	2. 97	2. 97	2. 97
p-value	0.160	0.819	0.923

Figure 4.6-1: Comparison between parents' educational backgrounds according to parenting style

4.6.2. Parent's Occupation and Parenting Styles

Table 4.5-2 shows the parenting style mean score of the participating parents according to their types of occupation. In order to meet up with the requirement for ANOVA procedure, parents that did not indicate their occupation were excluded from this procedure and the one respondent that was unemployed was combined with those that were self-employed.

Parents that were employed in private organisations had lowest authoritative parenting style scores compared to other occupations. Inferentially, the parents' occupation did not incline them towards authoritarian and permissive parenting style whereas there was observed an effect of occupation on authoritative parenting style.

Table 4.6-2: Mean (SD) of Parenting Style according to Parent's Occupation

Parent's Occupation	*Parenting Style*		
	Authoritative	**Authoritarian**	**Permissive**
Self employed	3.64 (0.52)[*]	2.54 (0.42)*	2.16 (0.63)*
Civil service	3.99 (0.48)[§]	2.52 (0.62)*	1.96 (0.60)*
Private employee	3.59 (0.53)[*§]	2.69 (0.32)*	2.09 (0.45)*
F	6.002	0.327	1.187
df1, df2	2, 94	2, 94	2, 94
p-value	0.004	0.722	0.310

[*,§] *Means (SD) with same superscripts are not significantly different at 0.05 level along the columns.*

Figure 4.6-2: Comparison between Parents' Occupations according to each Parenting Style

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL COMPETENCE OF PRE-SCHOOL CHILDREN

4.7. Social-Emotional Characteristics of Children

Table 4.6-1 shows the mean scores and level of the strength and difficulty characteristics of the pre-schoolers. Most of the pre-schoolers fall within the normal group across all the categories on the social-emotional competence tool. Nine in ten of the children were in the normal range for emotional symptoms, 77% of the children were in the normal range for conduct problems, 70% of the children were in the normal range for hyperactivity, 85% were in the normal range for peer problem and 67% of the children were in the normal range for total difficulty score. In addition, 84% of the pre-schoolers were rated normal for pro-social behaviour while about one in ten were on borderline range. Also, about one in five were on the abnormal range for hyperactive and about one in ten each were in the abnormal range for conduct problem and total difficulty scores.

Table 4.7-1: Social-Emotional Characteristics among the Pre-schoolers

Strength and Difficulty Characteristics	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Categories of Social-Emotional Competences			
			Normal (%)	Borderline (%)	Abnormal (%)	Total (%)
Emotional Symptoms	1.80	1.66	90	7	3	100
Conduct Problem	1.43	1.53	77	13	10	100
Hyperactivity	4.52	2.35	70	11	19	100
Peer Problem	1.57	1.56	85	12	3	100
Total Difficulty Score*	9.32	4.90	67	22	11	100
Pro-social Behaviour[#]	7.46	2.02	84	11	5	100

[#] *Cronbach's alpha =0.635, N=100.*

*Cronbach's alpha=0.726; N=100. Total difficulties score excludes pro-social score.

4.7.1. Relationship between Total Difficulty Score and Pro-social Behaviour

Table 4.6-2 below shows an inverse relationship between pro-social behaviour and other total difficulty indices. In particular, there is a significantly strong inverse relationship between pro-social behaviour and total difficulty score, $r(100) = -0.61$, $p < 0.01$. This indicates that the higher the social-emotional competences of the children, the lower their total difficulty scores.

Table 4.7-2: Correlation Coefficients between Total Difficulty and Pro-social Behaviour

Total Difficulty	R	P
Emotional Symptoms	-0.198	0.048
Conduct Problem	-0.506	<0.001
Hyperactivity	-0.459	<0.001
Peer Problem	-0.521	<0.001
Total Difficulty Score	-0.611	<0.001

$Df = 100$

Figure 4.7-1: Histograms showing the distribution of strength and difficulties scores of the pre-schoolers

4.7.2. Impact Scores

Table 4.6-3 shows the overall perception of the teachers about difficulties of the pre-schoolers with emotional, concentration, behavioural problems or being able to get on with other people. Of the total, 90 percent were indicated to have no difficulty emotionally, that is, no problem with concentration, behaviour, or being able to get along with others, 9 percent of the children had minor difficulties and 1 percent (one child) had severe difficulty. However, most of those that have difficulty had it for 1-5 months while two percent had their difficulties for less than a month and over a year respectively (*see Table 4.6-4*). Likewise, nine percent of the children were upset or distressed by the difficulties either not at all/only a little, while one percent of the children was upset a great deal. The difficulties either did not interfere at all or interfered only a little with the children's peer relationships. Similarly, seven percent of the pre-schoolers had the difficulties interfering with their classroom learning, while three percent were affected in class a great deal (*see Table 4.6-5*).

Table 4.7-3: Overall, do you think that this child has difficulties in emotions, concentration, behaviour or being able to get on with other people?

Response Categories	Frequency	Percent
No	90	90.0
Yes - minor difficulties	9	9.0
Yes - severe difficulties	1	1.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 4.7-4: Distribution of Period of Difficulty in Children

Period	Frequency	Percent
Less than a month	2	2.0
1-5 months	6	6.0
Over a year	2	2.0
Not applicable to child	90	90.0
Total	100	100.0

Table 4.7-5: Percent Distribution of Difficulty Impact in Children

Difficulty Characteristics	Not at all/Only a little	A great deal	Not applicable to child	Total
Difficulties upset or distress child	9.0	1.0	90.0	100.0
Difficulties interfere with PEER RELATIONSHIPS	10.0	-	90.0	100.0
Difficulties interfere with CLASSROOM LEARNING	7.0	3.0	90.0	100.0

4.8. Parenting Styles and Teacher's Perception of Social-Emotional Competence of Pre-school Children

4.8.1. Correlation between Parenting Styles and Social-Emotional Competence of Pre-school Children

Table 4.7-1 and *Figure 4.7-1* show the correlation between the parenting styles scores and the social-emotional competence scores of the pre-school children. All of the correlation coefficients were less than 0.5, which implies a weak relationship between social-emotional competences and the parenting styles; most of the correlation coefficients are apparently not significant. However, pro-social behaviour had a significant inverse relationship with authoritative parenting style, $r(100) = -0.22$, $p = 0.03$, and hyperactivity had a significant positive relationship with permissive parenting style, $r(100) = 0.31$, $p < 0.01$. Thus, pro-social behaviours are higher among children with less authoritative parents and hyperactive children are more associated with parents with permissive parenting style.

Table 4.8-1: Correlation between Parenting Styles and Social-Emotional Competence of Pre-school Children

	Parenting Style		
	Authoritative	Authoritarian	Permissive
Emotional Symptoms	0.03	0.04	-0.02
Conduct Problem	-0.02	-0.06	-0.02
Hyperactivity	0.06	0.01	0.31**
Peer Problem	0.08	0.10	-0.01
Total Difficulty Score	0.06	0.03	0.13
Pro-social Behaviour	-0.22*	-0.02	0.04

*$p < 0.05$, **$p < 0.01$*

Figure 4.8-1: Scatter diagrams showing relationship between parenting IDS

a) Conduct Problem   b) Emotional Problem   c) Hyperactivity   d) Pro-social Behaviour

e) Peer Problem   f) Total Difficulties

4.8.2. Regression of Parenting Styles on Social-Emotional Competences of Pre-school Children

Multiple regression equation was employed in determining the extent of the effect of parenting styles on the social and emotional competences of pre-school children as indicated by their teachers. In order to carry out this procedure, additional variables were introduced to generate a more robust regression equation with as many predictors as possible.

4.8.3. Additional Variables

As earlier mentioned in the methodology, additional variables were introduced in order to ascertain the impact of parenting styles on the social-emotional competence of pre-school children. This section shows the characteristics of the additional variables and their relevance to the study before they were employed in the research process.

Parents with scores above the modal score for each parenting style were identified. Modal scores for authoritative parenting style was 3.27, authoritarian was 2.33 and 2.00 was for permissive. Of the total, proportion of parents with parenting style scores above modal score were 81 percent authoritative, followed by 67 percent authoritarian, and 59 percent permissive parenting styles. There was a significant inverse relationship between authoritative parenting style and pro-social behaviour of the pre-schoolers, $r(81) = -0.26$, $p = 0.02$. Also, hyperactivity had a positive linear relationship with permissive parenting style, $r(40) = 0.51$, $p < 0.01$.

Mean scores were computed across the items of pairs of parenting styles to compute the interaction between the pairs of styles. Three additional variables were computed as D1 = authoritative-authoritarian parenting style, D2 = authoritative-permissive parenting style and D3 = authoritarian-permissive parenting style with mean scores of 3.18 (SD=0.37), 2.93 (SD=0.37) and 2.28 (SD=0.45) respectively. All the correlation coefficients between the additional variables and social-emotional competences were less than 0.3, which implies weak linear relationship between the interactive parenting styles and the social-emotional competences of the pre-schoolers. However, only hyperactivity had a significant positive relationship with

authoritative-permissive, $r(100) = 0.29$, $p < 0.01$ and authoritarian-permissive, $r(100) = 0.21$, $p = 0.04$ parenting styles.

Table 4.7-6 shows the regression coefficients, the F-statistic of each model and the R-squared statistics of parenting styles on social-emotional competences of pre-school children. It was observed that all the regression models significantly represented the relationships between parenting styles and pre-schooler's social-emotional competences.

Authoritative and permissive parenting styles are significant predictors of hyperactivity behaviour while authoritative and permissive behaviours were significant predictors of pro-social behaviour. Total difficulty was mainly affected by authoritative behaviour.

Table 4.8-2: Regression of Parenting Styles on Social and Emotional Competence of Pre-school Children

Dependent Variable	Predictors	Coefficient			Model		
		β	t	P	F	Sig.	R-Squared
EMOTIONAL SYMPTOMS	*Authoritative*	0.30	1.63	0.11	37.98	<0.01	0.54
	Authoritarian	0.25	0.85	0.40			
	Permissive	0.00	0.01	0.99			
CONDUCT PROBLEM	*Authoritative*	0.30	1.75	0.08	27.39	<0.01	0.46
	Authoritarian	0.01	0.05	0.96			
	Permissive	0.12	0.46	0.65			
HYPERACTIVITY	*Authoritative**	0.61	2.51	0.01	138.73	<0.01	0.81
	Authoritarian	-0.25	-0.64	0.53			
	*Permissive**	1.39	3.77	0.00			
PEER PROBLEM	*Authoritative*	0.23	1.38	0.17	34.34	<0.01	0.52
	Authoritarian	0.32	1.18	0.24			
	Permissive	-0.07	-0.29	0.77			
PRO-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR	*Authoritative**	0.97	3.87	0.00	342.13	<0.01	0.91
	*Authoritarian**	0.85	2.09	0.04			
	Permissive	0.72	1.92	0.06			
TOTAL DIFFICULTY SCORE	*Authoritative**	1.44	2.70	0.01	120.21	<0.01	0.79
	Authoritarian	0.34	0.39	0.70			
	Permissive	1.43	1.78	0.08			

*Predictor significant at 0.05. **Predictor significant at 0.01.*

4.8.4. Regression of Parenting Style Score and Additional Variables on Social-Emotional Competence of Children

Regression analysis was carried out to investigate the effect of parenting style on teachers' perception of social-emotional competence of pre-school children. In order to avoid multi-colinearity owing to the number of variables employed in the regression model which are all from the same set of root variables, data reduction was done with factor analysis (Principal Component Analysis) in order to reduce the number of variables to those that are not highly correlated. Three factors were extracted which accounted for 100% of the variation observed in the nine variables. With the rotation, the first component would explain 35% of variations, second component would explain 33% and the third component would explain 32% of variation in the nine variables. Hence, only the three interactive variables, which were highly correlated with the extracted components, are included in the regression model.

Table 4.8-2 shows the result of regression of social-emotional competence of the children against the parenting styles of their parents. All of the linear regression models were significant. Only authoritative-permissive parenting style is a significant factor for hyperactivity; $\beta = 2.25$, $p < 0.01$, while none of the interactive parenting styles had significant effect on the other social-emotional competences of the pre-school children. This corroborates earlier finding that authoritative and permissive parenting styles were factors that significantly influenced hyperactivity behaviour.

4.9.   Summary of Findings

Table 4.9-1: Correlation between Parenting Styles and Social-Emotional Competence of Children

Parenting Style	Emotional Symptoms	Conduct Problem	Hyperactivity	Peer Problem	Total Difficulty Score	Pro-social Behaviour
Authoritative	0.03	-0.02	0.06	0.08	0.06	-0.22*
Authoritarian	0.04	-0.06	0.01	0.10	0.03	-0.02
Permissive	-0.02	-0.02	0.31**	-0.01	0.13	0.04
D1	0.05	-0.06	0.05	0.13	0.06	-0.18
D2	0.01	-0.03	0.29**	0.05	0.15	-0.13
D3	0.01	-0.05	0.210*	0.05	0.11	0.01
D4	0.19	0.09	-0.04	0.21	0.14	-0.26*
D5	0.07	-0.15	0.00	0.17	0.03	-0.03
D6	-0.10	-0.01	0.51**	-0.01	0.22	0.10

*** $p < 0.01$, *$p < 0.05$.**

D1 is authoritative-authoritarian, D2 is authoritative-permissive and D3 is authoritarian-permissive. D4 is authoritative above modal score, D5 is authoritarian above modal score and D6 is permissive above modal score.

Table 4.9-2: Summary of Results (Regression Coefficients) Obtained from Regression of Parenting Styles and Social-Emotional Competence of Children

Parenting Style	Strength and Total Difficulties Scores					
	Emotional	Conduct	Hyperactivity	Peer	Pro-social	Total
Authoritative	0.30	0.30	0.61*	0.23	0.97**	1.44*
Authoritarian	0.24	0.01	-0.25	0.33	0.85*	0.34
Permissive	0.00	0.12	1.39**	-0.07	0.73	1.43
F	37.98**	27.39**	138.73**	34.34**	342.13**	120.21**
R Squared	0.54	0.46	0.91	0.81	0.52	0.79
D1	0.55	0.19	-1.03	0.63	1.10	0.34
D2	0.05	0.40	2.25*	-0.17	0.84	2.53
D3	-0.04	-0.17	0.52	0.02	0.61	0.33
F	37.98**	27.39**	138.73**	34.34**	342.13**	120.21**
R-Squared	0.54	0.46	0.81	0.52	0.91	0.79
D4	0.91	0.65	-0.38	-0.69	0.77	0.50
D5	-0.18	-0.72	0.21	1.43	0.25	0.74
D6	-0.51	0.29	2.51**	0.02	1.28*	2.31*
F	16.44**	10.57**	102.29**	8.53**	155.20**	68.06**
R-Squared	0.69	0.59	0.93	0.54	0.96	0.90

$**p < 0.01$, $*p < 0.05$

D1 is authoritative-authoritarian, D2 is authoritative-permissive and D3 is authoritarian-permissive. D4 is authoritative above modal score, D5 is authoritarian above modal score and D6 is permissive above modal score.

Values presented are coefficients (B) of the parenting style scores in the regression models, the F-statistic, which shows if the regression models are significant and the R-squared values, which show the coefficient of determination (i.e. percentage of the strength and difficulties of the children explained by each regression model)

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

5.1. Introduction

This study was designed to examine the range of parenting styles that are in practice among parents of pre-school children in five schools in Abuja, Nigeria. The research also explored the relationship between socio-economic status (as measured by parents' level of education and occupation) and parenting styles. Furthermore, the study investigated the relationship between parenting styles and teacher's perception of social-emotional competence of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria. This study adds to the body of literature by indicating that authoritative parenting is predominantly used among the sampled parents in Nigeria and that parenting style is linked with parents' occupational status but not educational status. In addition, parenting styles are related to some aspects of social-emotional competence. It discusses the results of the quantitative aspect of the study. Finally, the limitations of the study are discussed. Thus, this chapter serves to integrate the findings of this study with the earlier findings gleaned from literature.

5.2. Parenting Styles that are in Practice among Parents of Pre-school Children in Abuja, Nigeria

Several studies on parenting styles found different parenting approaches in different cultures. This study examined the range of parenting styles in five pre-schools in Abuja, Nigeria. The findings showed that authoritative parenting style had the highest mean score (3.85, SD = 0.55), followed by authoritarian parenting style (2.43, SD = 0.48) and permissive parenting style (2.07, SD = 0.63). The findings are in line with that of several authors (Akinsola & Udoka, 2013; Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1989, 1991a & 2013; Buri, 1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Maccoby & Martins, 1983; Robinson et al., 1995, 2001) who confirm that there exist different types of parenting styles. Further investigation, using correlation analysis, revealed significant correlation between permissive and authoritarian parenting styles. The correlation between authoritarian and permissive parenting styles means that an authoritarian parent is slightly likely to be permissive. The association between permissive and authoritarian parenting styles may indicate that both have the same effect on child developmental outcome as explained by some researchers

(Akinsola & Udoka, 2013; Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1989, 1991a, 2013; Sorkhabi, 2005). Investigations also showed that authoritative parenting style does not have significant correlation with the other two types of parenting (authoritarian and permissive parenting styles). This indicates that authoritative parenting style does not have any correlation on whether a parent would be authoritarian or permissive. This suggests that authoritative parenting style may have different influence on child developmental outcome when compared to permissive and authoritarian parenting styles. In addition, almost half (46%) of the total sum of parenting styles was authoritative and this serves to corroborate the fact that authoritative parenting style is most predominant among parents surveyed within this study.

The study shows that the most frequently used style of parenting is authoritative as depicted by the mean score. However, Nigerian parents are thought to be more authoritarian in their styles of discipline than authoritative or permissive because it is an African country (Chao, 1994, 2000,& 2001; Dornbusch et. al., 1987; Odubote, 2008; Steinberg et. al., 1991). Kim and Chung (2003) suggest that authoritative parenting style is now commonly used in non-western cultures, which may be as a result of being exposed to the western culture. This connotes that authoritative parenting is not limited to the western culture (Kaufmann et al., 2000). In addition, this confirms Sorkhabi's argument which states that authoritative or authoritarian parenting styles are the same in every culture.

The findings of the present study are similar to those relating to western culture in which parents scored higher on the authoritative parenting styles than authoritarian and permissive parenting styles (Baumrind, 1967; 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c & 2013; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999; Kaufmann et al., 2000; Kim & Chung 2003). Similarly, a study carried out among Chinese immigrant mothers of pre-school children shows that an authoritative approach is the most predominantly used of the parenting styles (Chao, 2001). The present study indicates that Nigerian parents are child-centred, where parents are responsive to the needs of their children, specifically at pre-school age. Furthermore, the result of this study indicates that parents provide warmth and support (connection dimension). In addition, Nigerian parents tend to give reasons to their children for any action taken (regulation dimension).

However, from the result on the dimension of parenting styles, Nigerian parents are low in autonomy granting dimension, implying that the sampled parents did not give their children

the opportunity in decision-making. This study corroborates previous research which suggested that children are to be seen and not heard in Africa, particularly in Nigeria (Akinsola, 2011; Emmanuel et al., 2012). This is also similar to Liu et al. (2005) which stated that Chinese children might be lower in autonomy than their western counterparts because parents place greater emphasis on emotional control and regulation in order to satisfy group; respect for adult, obedience and family harmony are of paramount importance. This research enlightens us with the fact that despite the use of authoritative parenting style among the sample parents, autonomy granting is not permitted.

Moreover, studies have shown that autonomy granting is important for the development of social-emotional competence (Cicchetti, 1990; Cicchetti & Schneider-Rosen, 1986; Sroufe, 1990). Supporting this view, Deci and Ryan (1985) suggested that autonomy helps children to become confident and solving problem. Encouraging autonomy also helps children to be socially competent and confident, especially in academic success (Grusec & Hasting, 2008). And it is only through parenting that this can be developed (Sroufe, 1996). However, caution should be exercised on this view because studies have shown that authoritarian parenting is related to the assertiveness of a black female American child (Baumrind, 1972, 1996). Future research is therefore needed on the comparative study of social-emotional competence of children in Nigeria and other western countries.

The reason for the result of low autonomy granting may be largely cultural. The explanation might be that Nigeria is classified as collectivist, which emphasises family harmony, family integrity, obedience, sociability and adequate security (Odubote, 2008). Parents from individualistic culture tend to encourage autonomy, emotional independence, assertiveness and privacy. This study however, supports the view of some cross-cultural researchers (Chao, 1994, 2001; Grusec & Hasting, 2008; Triandis, 2001) who state that autonomy is more encouraged in western than non-western cultures. By implication, individualists encourage autonomy and collectivists encourage obedience and respect for elders. Future research is needed on the cultural dimensions of parenting style and social-emotional competence in Nigeria.

The finding contrasts with previous studies which suggested that authoritarian parenting is most frequently used in African countries (Odubote, 2008). Some researchers (Baumrind, 1972, 1996; Chao, 2000; Chen et al., 1997; Dwairy, et al., 2006; Dornbusch et al., 1987;

Kaufmann et. al., 2000; Odubote, 2008) suggest that Africans are more likely to be authoritarian than parents raising their children in accordance with western culture. Similarly, studies among Asian and African-American families also show that authoritarian parenting styles are more common than authoritative and permissive parenting styles (Dwairy, et al., 2006; Dornbusch et al., 1987; George, 2004; Rudy & Grusec, 2006; Kaufmann et. al., 2000). George (2004) states that African-American parents are more likely to choose an authoritarian parenting style than white American parents.

The possible explanation for the present result is that the study focused on pre-schoolers, which implies that the sampled parents might decide to use authoritative parenting styles due to the age of the child. Studies have shown that parenting styles may be different, depending on the developmental stage; this means that parenting style may change as children grow (Sameroff 2010). A study among Asian-Americans suggested that parents are more permissive when their children are young. However, they tend to be more authoritarian over time as they reach "the age of understanding" (Garcia Coll & Pachter, 2002, p. 198). Supporting this, Kaufmann et al. (2000, p. 242) stated, "the benefit of authoritative parenting for this age group in relation to both lowered maladjustment and enhanced competence is not limited to white middle-class youngsters". It is important to point out that the result may be different in other states in Nigeria because Nigeria consists of different tribal groups. And this may lead to different types of parenting. Nigeria has about 250 different ethnic groups with different languages. To buttress this point, LeVine (1988) mentioned that every culture has its own ideas and these might influence parental goals and parenting styles. It is therefore necessary for future studies to examine parenting styles in other states in Nigeria, specifically the rural areas.

Another reason for the result may be due to modernisation. Sameroff (2010) explained how parenting changes over time. Another research conducted in Nigeria by Emmanuel et al. (2012) found that modernisation has effect on parenting styles among the people of Badagry in Lagos State. According to Triandis (2001), cultural interrelation may influence parenting styles. Inferentially, one culture can be borrowed into another. This implies that parents are now enlightened on parenting styles.

Another possible explanation for the result might be that the sampled parents use different types of control that is not examined in the current study, which can either be

behavioural or psychological control (Barber, 1994; Steinberg, et al., 1994). Future study is needed to explore the type of control that is predominant in Nigeria. It is worthy of note that the above conclusion regarding parenting styles was drawn from either of the parent in the family. It is recommended that future research should include both parents. This study is a correlational design and findings cannot be generalised. A widespread representative study on parenting styles is therefore recommended.

The present study shows that authoritative parenting is predominant among the sampled parents. However, the result also indicates that culture may have an influence on the styles of parenting. Specifically, the result shows that sampled parents are connected to their children but they do not encourage autonomy. This is similar to previous studies by cross-cultural researchers. Chen et al. (2005) pointed out that in a collectivist culture like China; the basic socialisation goal among parents is the encouragement of connectedness, which is interpersonal co-operation and family harmony relationships. On the other hand, Canadian mothers scored higher on the encouragement of autonomy. It may, therefore, be reasonable to argue that parenting styles may be influenced by culture, which invariably may have effect on child developmental outcome.

It may be concluded that sample parents are less authoritative compared to their western counterparts. This is because encouragement of autonomy is a basic fundamental part of authoritative parenting style in western culture (Baumrind, 1971). In the future, comparative studies on autonomy and parenting styles in Nigeria and western countries can be done. In addition, this study is similar to findings obtained from Nigeria where different types of parenting style were observed including mixed parenting (Akinsola, 2010a, 2011, 2013). Apparently, this study provides evidence of mixed parenting in the sample parents in Nigeria.

5.3.   Relationship between Socio-conomic Status and Parenting Styles in Abuja, Nigeria

The second research question sought to determine the relationship between socio-economic status and parenting styles. Socio-economic status was assessed on the basis of parental education and occupation. Lareau (1989, 2002) states that differences in socio-economic status have effect on parenting styles. Several authors have found significant relationship between

154

socio-economic status and parenting styles (Bornstein, 1993, 1995; Emmanuel et al., 2012; Lareau, 1989, 2002; McLoyd, 1990; Shumow et al., 1998).

Nevertheless, findings from this study indicate that there are no significant differences among the mean scores of parenting styles across different educational levels. This shows that educational background does not have significant effect on parenting style, which implies there is no significant difference in the average scores of the three parenting styles across the different educational backgrounds. However, parents with tertiary education had the highest authoritative parenting style mean score (3.88) while the least were those that had basic education (3.57). Also, parents with basic education had the highest authoritarian parenting score (2.62) while parents with tertiary education had the least authoritarian parenting style score (2.52). Moreover, parents that had basic education had the highest permissive parenting styles score (2.06). Although, there was no significant relationship between educational status and parenting styles, yet, among each group of parenting styles in the ANOVA analysis, the result shows that civil servants had the higher on the authoritative parenting scale and parents with basic education had the highest score on authoritarian and permissive parenting styles.

This result is similar to the findings of some previous studies which proposed that there was no significant relationship between parenting styles and educational level of parent (George, 2004). The study analysed the relationship between parenting styles and the social status of primary school children. Aside from confirming that African-American parents are more likely to choose an authoritarian parenting style than white parents, he also found out that there was no relationship between parenting styles and socio-economic status. This implies that parents' level of education had no significant effect on the parenting style of sampled parents. This means that education is not a significant factor in the choice of parenting style in this study. Although literature suggests that enlightenment and cultural civilization are strong factors giving rise to authoritative parenting (Baumrind, 1967; 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c & 2013; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999; Kaufmann et. al., 2000; Kim & Chung 2003), Baumrind (1971) proposed that middle-class European-American families with higher levels of education are more likely to adopt authoritative parenting styles.

However, other studies also showed that parents who had lower level of education were more likely to use authoritarian parenting styles compared to the authoritative approach adopted

by more affluent families (Emmanuel et al., 2012; McLoyd 1990, Menaghan & Bathurst, 1990; Foster & Kalil, 2005; Lareau, 1989). In a study on the effect of maternal resources and parenting practice on the psychosocial competence of African-American children, Brody and Flor (1998) showed that maternal education was a major factor in determining the parenting styles adopted by mothers. The insignificant relationship between parental education and parenting style could be due to the homogenous nature of the sample. The sample consisted of a higher rate of parents with tertiary education (75%). This indicates that the result should be treated with caution.

Also, cultural background could be a possible explanation for why parental education has no effect on parenting styles. The result could also be attributed to the geographical area where the research was conducted. Moreover, explanation for the result could also be attributed to the scale used to measure socio-economic status. A more comprehensive measure can be employed which may involve neighbourhood area, parental income and financial status. This implies that other factors may affect parenting styles apart from the educational level. Future research is therefore needed on the relationship between parenting styles and parental education as well as some demographic factors such as parental gender, neighbourhood area, parental income and financial status.

The findings also revealed that parents who are civil servants were significantly more authoritative than parents in other occupations. The result indicates that parent's occupation is significantly related to authoritative parenting styles. This is similar to findings from previous studies which showed that middle class parents use authoritative parenting more than other parenting styles (Baumrind, 1971). However, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles did not vary significantly from occupation to occupation, which implies that parents' occupation did not incline them towards authoritarian and permissive parenting styles whereas there was an effect on authoritative parenting style. This finding supports Bornstein & Bornstein (2007) who argue that the high socio-economic status of white middle class sample cannot be generalised to other cultures. This study indicates that the relationship between socio-economic status and parenting style might be different from one culture to another.

The possible explanation for this is that three in four of the parents had tertiary education but this did not have any influence on the kind of parenting style practised among the different groups. This could be because of the effects of cultural belief on parenting in Nigeria. In

particular, the Africans believe that one person gives birth to a child but several people raise the child (Emmanuel et al., 2012). This type of parenting is similar to what obtains in the Chinese culture where group satisfaction and family harmony is emphasised. Another possible explanation for this may be due to what Evangelou et al. (2009) proposed, that the home learning environment may be more important for intellectual and social development than parental occupation, education or income. Sylva et al. (2004, p. 5) maintain that "what parents do with their children is more important than who they are". Therefore, parental input into children's lives may be as important as their social-emotional competence. Ermisch (2009, p. 65) proposed: "it is useful to think of the relationship between what parents do and assessments at age three in a production function framework relating inputs (what parents do) to developmental outcomes, both cognitive and behavioural". Moreover, Cunha and Heckman (2007) suggest that early childhood is a stage where parents need to invest in their children because it is a 'sensitive' or 'critical period' in their lives. Future research is therefore needed on the relationship between parent-child relationship and parenting styles and its impact on the quality of interaction. Future research is recommended also, to examine the relationship between socio-economic status and parent-child quality relationship using social-emotional competence as a mediator.

The lack of significant relationships between authoritarian and permissive parenting styles and socio-economic variables indicates some other variables which are not included in the present study. Further research on relations between parenting style and other variables need to be considered.

5.4. Relationship between Parenting Styles and Teachers' Perception of Social-emotional Competence of Pre-school Children in Abuja, Nigeria

The present study shows that parenting styles are related to some of the domains of children's social-emotional competence. The social-emotional competence scores were obtained from the sum of the scores for all the items on the domains of SDQ within each section of the research tool.

Findings indicate that majority of children are developing well without significant social-emotional problems. Approximately 67% are on the normal range, 22% are on the borderline range and 11% are on the abnormal range of the total difficulty SDQ score. This result can be

compared with previous studies. The author of SDQ suggested that children from any community population could have a borderline score of 20% SDQ scores and these scores could be based on different cultural backgrounds (Goodman, 1997, 2001). By implication, SDQ could have different results based on different cultural interpretations. The result can also be interpreted as the lower the mean score total difficulty, the higher the social-emotional competence and vice-versa.

The full scale of total difficulties score ranges from 0 to 40 and the mean score total difficulties score among the sampled children is 9.27. This is within the normal range of 0-11 of the SDQ, indicating that sampled children developed properly in the area of social-emotional competence as perceived by their teachers. In a previous study which used similar methods, the authors stated that 17% of four to seven year olds were perceived by teachers as having mild behavioural difficulties with a further 16% viewed as having definite behaviour problems (Tizard et al., 1988). Similarly, Dunlop et al., 2008 found that 24.5% of children showed borderline level of difficulties in behaviour. Although total difficulties scores show that there are various types of difficulty in each domain, it does not show the extent of difficulty for each individual.

The possible explanation for the 67% of the SDQ normal range score might be due to the banding range for the teacher which is different from that of the parent. The normal banding range for total difficulties scores for the teacher is 0-11 while that of the parent is 0-13. In addition, according to Goodman (1997), the scale might be different for each country due to cultural differences in the meaning of the wordings of the questions. Some researchers (Essau et al., 2012) conducted a study in six countries and suggested that reversed scores should be removed in order to yield reliable results. In addition, the teachers might also be biased about their views on each child. This is because only five teachers administered the questionnaire. The result might have been better if more than five teachers were used. Moreover, teachers' cultural background might also affect the teacher's perception of children's social-emotional competence.

Most of the sampled children were social-emotional competent and they showed high level of hyperactivity than others scored on the total difficulties scale. The mean score of hyperactivity is 4.52 and the rest are: 1.80 (emotional symptom), 1.43 (conduct problem) and 1.52 (peer problem) respectively. This implies that children did not have peer problem. Also,

they were generally emotionally stable and could conduct themselves well as perceived by their teachers. In addition, the mean score for pro-social behaviour is 7.46, which indicates that the children have positive social-emotional competence. All these imply that they had low total difficulty scores with a mean score of 9.32, although one in five of the children were perceived to have abnormal total difficulty score.

The findings from the correlation analysis of the present study show that there is a significant relationship between hyperactivity and the permissive parenting style. Parents who are permissive were characterised as high responsive and low demanding. Thus, permissive parents do not guide their children to regulate their behaviour and allow them to make their own decisions. Furthermore, the results from this study show that there is a significant inverse relationship between pro-social behaviour and the authoritative parenting style. This implies that the lesser the authoritative parenting style the higher the pro-social behaviour of the child; though the result of the correlation cannot be totally relied on because it does not show the direction of the influence. Moreover, all the three types of parenting styles were not significantly related to emotional symptoms or to conduct and peer-problems. The authoritarian parenting style was not significantly related to hyperactivity. In addition, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles were not significantly related to SDQ total difficulty scores.

Additional variables were used to analyse the mix parenting styles based on the interaction between pairs of parenting styles and the higher modal scores of the parenting styles. The correlation analysis shows that hyperactivity had a significant relationship with the authoritative-permissive parenting style. Similarly, the finding also indicates that there is a significant relationship between permissive parenting style with scores above modal score and hyperactivity. Authoritative above modal score is also inversely related to pro-social behaviour. All the correlation coefficients are less than 0.3%, which means there is a weak linear relationship. This finding implies that some aspects of parenting styles are related to social-emotional competence. For this analysis, the correlation coefficient is low, which means that there is a weak relationship between parenting styles and some of the domains of social-emotional competence.

In order to ascertain the association between parenting styles and social-emotional competence, the variables were added in the regression analysis. In the regression model, the

three types of parenting styles are not significantly related to emotional symptoms, conduct problems and peer problem behaviour. In addition, authoritarian parenting style is not significantly related to hyperactivity behaviour. However, parenting styles are significantly related to some of the domains of social-emotional competence. These domains are pro-social behaviour and hyperactivity. For example, authoritative, authoritarian and extreme permissive parenting styles (permissive parenting styles above modal score) are significantly related to pro-social. In addition, the findings indicate that authoritative, permissive, authoritative-permissive are significantly related to hyperactivity. This implies that parenting styles is significantly related to only pro-social and hyperactivity behaviour.

The current study emphasises significant relationships between the parenting styles and social-emotional competence of pre-school children in the area of pro-social behaviour. These findings are consistent with previous studies which found a relationship between authoritative parenting styles and various children's developmental outcomes such as academic performance (Dornbusch et al., 1987), achievement (Steinberg et al., 1992), self-esteem (Baumrind, 1971, 1991b, 2013) and emotional maturity (Lamborn et al., 1991).

In line with the previous research, parenting styles are significantly related to some of the domains of social-emotional competence. Authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles are significantly associated with pro-social behaviour with the authoritarian parenting style implicating the cultural type of parenting in Africa. In addition, the permissive above modal scores, which means extreme permissive parenting style, is significantly related to pro-social behaviour. This is in line with some studies which confirm that children from an authoritative home are not different from children from a permissive home (Kim & Rhoner, 2002; Martínez, García & Yubero, 2007). This study is similar to other studies like Carlo et al. (2007) that support the view that permissive parenting style is related to pro-social behaviour. Rothbauff et al. (2009) also noted that there was no significant difference between children from an authoritative home and those from a permissive home. Similarly, Lamborn et al. (1991) stated that children from authoritative homes do not behave better than those from permissive homes.

These findings also support various studies which show a relationship between parenting style and children's developmental outcome (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1972, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c & 2013; Chen, 2010; Davies & Cummings, 1994; Denham et al.,

2009; Degnan et al., 2008; Dunlop et al., 2008; Elias & Yee, 2009; Lamborn et al., 1991; Maccoby, 1992; Nixon, 2012; Steinberg, et al., 1992; Williams et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2002). Aunola and Nurmi (2005) found a direct link between psychological control and antisocial behaviour in children aged five to six years. In another study with similar objectives, Degnan et al. (2008) showed that authoritarian parenting is associated with emotional and peer problems. This study established a strong correlation between psychological control and increased levels of internal and external problem behaviour.

However, the findings in this study reveal that the authoritarian parenting style is significantly related to pro-social behaviour. This is similar to the finding in a previous study conducted in Portugal on the effect of parenting practice on social-emotional development of pre-school children (Gaspar & Paiva, 2004). The results show that harsh parenting, which is a characteristic of authoritarian parenting, is significantly related to pro-social behaviour. Gaspar and Paiva (2004) concluded that authoritarian parenting style might be used as a protective for children in order to control behavioural problems. Similarly, Baumrind (1972, 1996) confirms that authoritarian parenting style is related to assertiveness among black children in America. Also, Kaufmann et al. (2000) explored the relationship between parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence and found that black parents score higher on authoritarian parenting styles than others. To buttress all these views, Baldwin et al. (1990) maintained that children are well adjusted when authoritarian parenting style is adopted. The implication of this result is that there is a strong support for cross-cultural studies in the African context, which state that authoritarian parenting style, does not have a negative outcome on children's development.

The observation above might be due of course, to parental goals set by Africans, which include a sense of sharing as well as respect for authority. These parents also believe that parenting styles involve the promotion of interdependence and cooperation in children rather than autonomy. This suggests that the concept of cooperation and taking others into consideration that is emphasised by parents might serve as a tool for the promotion of pro-social behaviour. Similarly, Baldwin, Baldwin and Cole (1990) conducted a research among low-income minority parents living in a high-risk environment. The researchers stated that the authoritarian style of parenting was beneficial to children's adjustment and development,

specifically when it is used as a protective in a dangerous neighbourhood and this indirectly improved their academic performance.

Another possible explanation for this result might be cultural goals and societal expectations. According to Rudy and Grusec (1999), parenting styles are not actually different in their relationship with children's development. Nevertheless, their differences depend on the goals of the particular cultural environment. Non-western culture highly values collectivism in which children are expected to obey the rules and regulations of the society and depend on the group for decision- making. Studies conducted in Asia support the view that authoritarian parenting is significantly related to positive outcomes, specifically academic outcomes (Chen, 2010). On the other hand, parental control, which is perceived as parental hostility in western culture (Rohner & Rohner, 1981) is seen as parental involvement and care among African-Americans (Baldwin et al., 1990; Lamborn et al., 1996). In Korea, this was related to perceived parental warmth and acceptance (Rohner & Pettengill, 1985) among Chinese adolescents (Chao, 1994). Darling and Steinberg (1993) argue that the socialisation goals and values of each culture have influence on parental behaviour. The same kind of parental behaviour may thus be given different meanings in different cultural backgrounds (LeVine, 1988) and this might affect the relationship between parenting styles and child developmental outcome. Nigerian parents may be more authoritarian and strict due to the cultural norms and values which lean toward parental authority (Odubote, 2008).

Moreover, some researchers (Chen et al., 1997; Lau and Cheung, 1987; Sorkhabi, 2005) state that the relationship between authoritative and authoritarian styles of parenting and child outcome may be similar within the same culture. Baumrind (1972) commented that the child would not accept discipline as hostile but as love and care if it were part of the culture. Vygotsky (1978) suggests that children tend to believe in the way they have been raised due to cultural norms during scaffolding.

While permissive, authoritative and authoritative-permissive parenting styles are significantly related to hyperactivity, the two parenting styles have similar characteristic of high responsiveness. A possible explanation for the result might be the nature of both parenting styles that is high in responsiveness. Furthermore, authoritative and permissive parenting styles are characterised by being more child-centred than other types of parenting styles. These styles of

162

parenting respect the view of their children and the children are very free with them, thereby creating a strong emotional relationship between the parent and the child.

Steinberg (2008) supports the view that children tend to model their supportive parents by sharing similar values with them and this allows them to accept their parental authority. This is in line with Bandura's theory which argues that children model and imitate their parents through observation and imitation. However, this means that even if children lack control, this may not create a problem because parental responsiveness, which they adopt, will help them to develop pro-social behaviour in a school environment. The possible explanation for this is that the data for social-emotional competence is only from teacher's reports; this may not be enough tools to measure social-emotional competence. In support of this, Goodman et al. (2000) suggest that the combination of both teacher and mother's perception of children' developmental outcome will give good results on SDQ validity. Future research is therefore needed to use parents' and teachers' SDQ tool to measure social-emotional competence.

Another reason for the result may be the nature of parental responsiveness. Due to cultural values and norms in which children are given low autonomy, however, in the situation where the children are given the privilege of making decisions or parents are too responsive, such children might lack self-regulation. This in turn could lead to hyperactivity. It is important to note that hyperactivity may have different cultural meaning. For example, from the researcher's observation, a hyperactive child is known to be full of energy and they usually sit beside the teacher in the classroom. Teachers do not take an inattentive child as having a behavioural problem. Authoritarian parenting style, which is high in demandingness, is always used to curb children's behaviour. To buttress this, Baldwin et al. (1990) commented that authoritarian parenting style is used to control behavioural problems in children. In addition, parents also use mixed parenting styles. This could explain why parents use mixture of parenting styles on their children. Studies have shown that parents use a combination of parenting styles based on cultural background and age of the child (Berk, 2009; Chen, 2010; Mullins et al., 1983). This result indicates that parents might be using mixed parenting style to control their children's behaviour. Future studies should examine the effect of mixed parenting styles on social-emotional competence.

The reason for the present findings could also be due to child's characteristics such as temperament. However, this is beyond the scope of this study. It could also be that these parents are more sensitive to children's emotion and behaviour. Previous researches show parental warmth is beneficial to children's social-emotional competence and school adjustment (Coplan et al., 2008) and peer relations (McElwain & Volling, 2004). It is not clear if some children characteristics, which are beyond the scope of this study, might affect parenting styles. Future studies should study the influence of a child's temperament on social-emotional competence.

In conclusion, these findings are different from previous researches which found a relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence (Baumrind, 1991). This is because parenting styles are found not to relate to all the domains of social-emotional competence and other factors such as child characteristic, school, sibling, peer group and parents' characteristics that may affect children's level of social-emotional competence. The lack of significant results in all the domains of social-emotional competence provides support for examining other variables that might affect the choice of parenting style. Future research needs to explore other factors that influence social-emotional competence aside from parenting styles.

Based on theoretical perspectives, Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1989 & 2005) supported the view that there are various factors that influence parenting styles and these affect children directly or indirectly. However, it is also possible that the results of this study are limited because the characteristics of the children were not considered. Studies (Bell, 1968; Bell & Chapman, 1986; Coplan et al., 2008; Sameroff, 2010) have shown that parent-child relationship is bi-directional and transactional. In addition, Eisenberg et al., (2010) suggest that child gender and social support could affect parenting responsiveness and child temperament. Likewise, Meng (2012) proposed that child temperament has an influence on parenting styles and parenting goals. Since children characteristics have an effect on parenting styles, children's social-emotional competence will be affected by parenting styles. Future research should further examine the bi-directional relationship between parenting styles and child temperament and the dynamic parent-child interaction. It can be concluded that parental responsiveness may be a fundamental tool to determine how parents set up socialisation goals. Furthermore, other variables such as social network, cultural background and policy might have been included in the study. Future research

is therefore necessary to examine the relationship between other variables aside from parenting styles and social-emotional competence.

The theoretical implication of Baumrind's work is that it focuses on parents' effect on the child and fails to recognise the effect of the child in shaping the interaction between parent and the child. This study supports Bronfenbrenner's theory which emphasises that parents may choose a particular parenting style based on their cultural background. In addition, he believes that parenting styles can be influenced by several factors such as socio-economic status and some other factors within the macrosystem and chronosystem.

This study also shows that different ranges of parenting styles are in practice in Nigeria. This study contributes to knowledge of parenting styles which highlight that parenting styles vary across cultural settings. According to Ecological Theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), children develop according to the environment in which they live. This theory was used to explore the range of parenting styles and their relationship with socio-economic status. Occupational status was found to relate to parenting style. The implication of this result is that nature and nurture may have an influence on children's social-emotional competence. The effect of nurture (environmental factors) on children's social-emotional competence is explored in this study. It is however, equally important to explore the effect of nature (genetic factors) on social-emotional competence of children. Future research should examine the influence of genetic factors on social-emotional competence.

One reason for inconsistency in the relationship between parenting style and domains of social-emotional competence of children might be the type of measurement used in this study. Parents might have answered the questions in the questionnaires based on what they thought they should do rather than what they do currently. Furthermore, teachers may be biased on the interpretation of social-emotional competence. However, completion of questionnaires does not allow the researcher to determine if the parenting style reported is the same as the actual parenting style. Finally, inconsistency in the result might be due to the reversed question in the SDQ which might be confusing. Corroborating this, Essau et al. (2012) suggests that the reversed question in the SDQ should be removed in order to give a consistent result due to some cultural factors.

5.5. Limitation of the Study

Despite the interesting findings of this study, it is important to note some of the limitations. The study was carried out at a single point in time and the design was cross-sectional. Future research work should therefore conduct a longitudinal study to examine the relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence.

This study focused only on children between four and five years old. The sample size is small when compared to other surveys such as Dornbusch et al. (1987) and the sample size comprised a homogenous group. Large percentages of the participants who filled the questionnaire are educated. This makes it impossible to generalise the findings. In addition, this study was carried out in an urban area which has a high socio-economic status. Children from different age groups and socio-economic status may give different results, especially if the study is carried out in a rural area.

The lack of significance of the relationships between parenting styles and occupation indicates that parenting style might be influenced by other factors not included in the present research. Researchers have proposed that parenting style could also be based on marital stress, parent and child personality, mental health and child-rearing history (Belsky, 1985; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999). Further research on relations between parenting style and other individual variables is clearly needed.

Another limitation to this study is the use of questionnaires. Parents might have answered the questions in the questionnaires based on what they thought they should do rather than what they do currently (George, 2004). Parent's self-report questionnaire does not allow the researcher to determine if the parenting style reported is the same as the actual parenting style. It is believed that parents will answer parenting questions in interview format more truthfully than through the questionnaire format. Future research should consider completing this type of study through face-to-face contact with participants to increase the likelihood of obtaining true parenting styles.

The number of teachers used is five, which is not large enough when compared to the number of parents used. Future research should consider using parent's perception, if possible, or using both parents' and teachers' perception for triangulation. In addition, teachers' perception in assessing children's social-emotional competence might be biased due to the values, beliefs and cultural backgrounds of the teachers.

As only one parent filled each questionnaire, it is recommended that future research should use both parents. Furthermore, future research should consider using parents' perception if possible, or using both parents' and teachers' perception of social-emotional competence for triangulation. Nevertheless, Lamborn et al. (1991) argue that it will be difficult to assert statistically that parenting styles determine children outcome.

CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

6.1.   Introduction

This chapter presents the summary of the study, implications, contribution to knowledge, recommendations for future study, importance of the study and conclusion.

6.2.   Summary

The role of parents cannot be over-emphasised because they are the first and most important socialising agent. This study provides new insights into how different parenting styles play meaningful roles in the social-emotional competence of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria. Both Bronfenbrenner's theory and Baumrind's typology of parenting styles describe the theoretical framework of this study. Baumrind's styles of parenting were used to find out the range of parenting styles in practice in Abuja, Nigeria. Bronfenbrenner (1979) explains the developing children according to the environment in which they live (cultural background) - this theory was used to determine parenting styles based on the level of socio-economic status. It is believed that parents are likely to use parenting styles based on cultural background and social change. The ecological theory is vital in supporting this study because it was identified that parents use parenting styles based on their cultural belief system and modernisation.

Findings from this study indicate that different ranges of parenting styles are in practice in Abuja, Nigeria. There is a relationship between parents' occupational status and parenting style and there is no relationship between parents' educational status and parenting styles. The study also indicates that the sampled Nigerian children are social-emotionally competent and there is a relationship between parenting style and some domains of social-emotional competence and in general, parenting styles benefit children's social-emotional competence. This implies that various aspects of parenting styles have different effects on social-emotional competence.

This research shows that authoritative parenting styles have the highest mean score, followed by authoritarian and permissive parenting styles. Additionally, the results also show that parents in Abuja, Nigeria use mixed parenting styles. The findings are in line with that of several authors (Akinsola & Udoka, 2013; Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1989, 1991a & 2013; Buri,

1991; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Maccoby & Martins, 1983; Robinson et al., 1995, 2001) who are of the view that there exist diverse ranges of parenting styles. The results of the present study are similar to those relating to western culture in which parents scored higher on the authoritative parenting styles than authoritarian and permissive parenting styles (Baumrind, 1967; 1971, 1989, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c & 2013; Bluestone & Tamis-LeMonda, 1999; Kaufmann et. al., 2000; Kim & Chung 2003). However, from the result on the dimension of parenting styles, parents are low in autonomy granting dimension, implying that the sampled parents did not give their children opportunities in decision-making. This study confirms previous studies that state that African children are not given autonomy (Akinsola, 2011; Chao, 1994, 2001; Chen et al., 2005; Grusec & Hasting, 2008; Liu et al., 2005; Triandis, 2001).

The results also indicate a relationship between socio-economic status and parenting styles. Parenting styles do not have significant relationship with parent's educational level, but parent's occupation is significantly related to authoritative parenting styles. Sampled parents that are civil servants have the highest mean score of authoritative parenting style than the others. In addition, parents with higher level of education have the highest mean score of authoritative parenting while parents with lower level of education were with higher level of authoritarian parenting style. This study is related to other studies (Bornstein, 1993, 1995; Emmanuel, et al., 2012; McLoyd, 1990; Shumow, Vandell & Posner, 1998) which found a relationship between socio-economic status and parenting style. Studies have found a relationship between parental education and parenting styles. Dornbusch et al. (1987) confirm that parents with higher level of education are more likely to use authoritative parenting styles and less inclined towards both authoritarian and permissive parenting styles.

Parenting styles are significantly related to some of the domains of social-emotional competence. Authoritative, authoritarian and extreme permissive parenting styles are related to pro-social while authoritative, permissive, authoritative-permissive are related to hyperactivity. This study is similar to previous researches that show a relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence and academic achievements in children (Baumrind, 1972, 1991a; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Denham et al. 1991; Elias & Yee, 2009; Nixon, 2012; Spera, 2005). This findings support various studies which show a relationship between parenting styles and children's developmental outcome (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Baumrind, 1967, 1971, 1972, 1991a,

1991b, 1991c & 2013; Chen, 2010; Davies & Cummings, 1994; Denham et al., 2009; Degnan et al., 2008; Dunlop et al., 2008; Elias & Yee, 2009; Lamborn et al., 1991; Maccoby, 1992; Mildon, & Polimeni, 2012; Nixon, 2012; Steinberg, et al., 1992; Williams et al., 2009; Wu et al., 2002).

This result is in contrast with other studies, which state that authoritarian, and permissive parenting styles can be linked with children's aggression, lack of self-control, impulsiveness, delinquency and social incompetence (Baumrind, 1971, 1978, 1991a & 2013; Davies and Cummings, 1994; Denham et al., 2009). This implies that the effect of culture cannot be overlooked in the study of parenting styles and social-emotional competence.

This study enlightens us on the relationship between parenting styles and children's social-emotional competence.

6.3.   Contribution to knowledge

Notwithstanding the limitations of the study, the research has given an insight into parenting styles and social-emotional competence of pre-schoolers in Abuja, Nigeria. The environment in which the child grows plays a crucial role in his or her development.

This study has contributed to knowledge by finding that authoritative parenting styles is predominantly used among sample parents. This is against the belief that authoritarian parenting style is frequently used in Africa. In addition, the study indicates that sample parents give low autonomy to their children. This result provides more understanding on parenting styles that despite the parent's use of authoritative parenting style children are not allowed in decision-making. The lack of significant relationships between parenting styles and some of the domains of social-emotional competence in the present study provides interesting possibilities for future research.

The findings from this study serve as a guide for integrating dimensions of parenting styles and domains of social-emotional competence. The results of this study confirms that authoritarian parenting style has significant relationship with pro-social behaviour; this is in line with Chao's (1994) and Baumrind's (1972, 1996) studies that state that authoritarian parenting styles have positive influence on child development. Another contribution is the finding that educational status has no effect on parenting styles although higher education is linked with authoritative parenting and lower education is related to authoritarian parenting styles.

The current study used correlation analysis and regression analysis to determine the relationship between nine styles of parenting and five domains of social-emotional competence. This is very uncommon in previous studies and has thus added new knowledge to the body of research. Most studies that use SDQ used only percentages of the five domains of SDQ to calculate normal, borderline and abnormal ranges. Western researchers have frequently used SDQ as a tool to measure social-emotional development. However, this scale has not previously been used in Nigeria. This is the first study on parenting styles and social-emotional competence of pre-school children anywhere in Nigeria.

The research implication in terms of parenting styles is that children can be understood in a cultural setting.

6.4.   Suggestions for Future Research

Although parenting styles have been well researched over the years, clarification is still needed in many areas. The present study can be tested in different geographical settings such as rural and tribal areas so as to assess the parenting styles and social-emotional competence of 4 and 5 year olds. It is also recommended to identify the development of social-emotional competence across the culture in relation to parenting styles and social-emotional competence on other age groups.

Further studies need to study the effect of demographic variables such as parents' gender and the child's gender on children's social-emotional competence in relation to socio-economic status. More research works are needed to look into other factors that may influence social-emotional competence aside from parenting styles.

Future studies need to examine social interaction among peers in the context of social-emotional competence. Also, three variables of emotional competence (emotional knowledge, emotional expressiveness and emotional regulation) in relation to social competence could also be explored. This will give deeper insight into social-emotional competence of pre-schoolers.

Future researches should explore the four parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful) and incorporate both parents' and teachers' perspectives in investigating social-emotional competence. Future studies should also examine the most appropriate parenting styles that will really provide children with positive social-emotional

competence.

Finally, future researches should examine both parents' contribution to children's social-emotional competence. In addition, the interaction between parents and child within the home learning environment should be studied in Nigeria. Future research should consider various approaches to develop the relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional development. The issue of home learning could also be looked into in future work.

According to Fagot (1997), observation shows that toddlers who had quality secured attachment with their mothers had positive response towards their peers than toddlers with unsecured attachments. Future research can examine these possibilities, which could help to form an empirical link between secured attachment and social-emotional competence. In addition, it is important to explore the influence of genetic factors on social-emotional competence in future studies.

6.5. Significance of the Study

It is hoped that the study will create awareness among parents, educators and counsellors on parenting styles and social-emotional competence. The results reveal that majority of the sampled parents use authoritative method. In addition, the presence of mix parenting styles in the sample provides more understanding of different styles of parenting.

The study may serve as a contribution to the study of parenting styles and social-emotional competence of children, which may serve to prompt government policy makers to re-assess existing legislation in order to produce relevant policies and procedures that will establish programs for parenting and social-emotional competence as it is done in developed countries.

The study provides understanding on the new way of thinking about parenting styles and social-emotional competence, which brings about how we interpret a child's behaviour.

6.6. Conclusion

From theoretical perspectives, some psychologists believe that the environment shapes a child's social-emotional competence while others believe that social-emotional competence is inherent in the child. In the African context, specifically, in Nigeria, parents are the most influential in children's life. Most Nigerian children are dependent on their parents for food, clothing and

shelter from birth to adulthood. It implies that parental love as well as punishments could have strong influence on children.

In Nigeria, culture plays an important role in the type of parenting style that parents adopt. Nigerians operate a collectivist culture, which could impact on the way parents bring up their children. Nigerian children in general do not have much say when it comes to decision-making. Parents and the extended family make these decisions for them because of the fact that such decisions reflect the family as a whole.

This study has drawn from Bronfenbrenner's ecological theory in understanding the relationship between parenting styles and social-emotional competence of pre-school children. The study examined the range of parenting styles that is in practice and its relationship with social-emotional competence. In addition, the relationship between socio-economic status and parenting styles was examined. The results presented in this study are based on descriptive statistics, analysis of variance as well as correlation and regression analysis. It is important to exercise caution in interpreting the results for causality. The findings indicate that majority of the children have positive social-emotional competence. Nevertheless, in line with other studies, 11% - 22% borderline and abnormal range of SDQ scale indicates that some of the children have emotional behavioural problems as perceived by teachers. Moreover, it is worthwhile to exercise caution on the interpretation of the study because of the cultural meaning of SDQ scale in different countries. The author of SDQ scale has explained that different cultures may interpret the SDQ scale differently and this may affect the result of the study. In addition, this is the first time of using SDQ scale in Nigeria.

The results suggest that the sample of parents reported more authoritative parenting style. Although the percentage of authoritative parenting style is 46%, it nonetheless suggests that other parenting styles such as authoritarian and permissive parenting are also in practice.

The study also found that parental educational level is not significantly related to the three types of parenting style. Furthermore, parental occupation is significantly related to authoritative parenting style, with civil servants being the most significantly related.

In line of previous research, parenting styles are significantly related to some of the domains of social-emotional competence. Authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles are significantly associated with pro-social behaviour although authoritarian parenting style has

positive implication on the cultural type of parenting in Africa. In addition, the permissive above modal scores; which mean extreme permissive parenting style, is significantly related to pro-social behaviour while permissive, authoritative and mixed parenting styles (authoritative-permissive) are significantly related to hyperactivity behaviour. It is important to note that hyperactivity may have different socio-cultural meaning. For example, from the researcher's observation, hyperactive children are known to be full of energy and parents are always proud of them as active children. Teachers usually give them more attention and they are always allowed to sit near the teacher in the classroom. Teachers do not take an inattentive child as having a behavioural problem. Authoritarian parenting style, which is in high demand, is always used to curb children's behaviour. To buttress this, Baldwin et al. (1990) commented that authoritarian parenting style is used to control behavioural problems in children.

This study makes important contributions to current research, exploring the relationship between parenting styles and teacher's perception of social-emotional competence of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria.

The current study differs from previous ones in three ways. First, studies have shown that authoritative parenting styles are more frequently used in western culture whereas the authoritarian parenting style is believed to be prevalent in the African culture (Baumrind, 1972, 1996; Dwairy et al., 2006; George, 2004; Steinberg et al., 1992). Although authoritative parenting was found, it is different from that of the western culture because it is low in autonomy granting. Also, authoritative, authoritarian and extreme permissive parenting styles are positively related to pro-social behaviour in the regression model. Parents with high educational level have the highest mean scores of authoritative parenting style while parents with low educational background have the highest authoritarian parenting style.

Secondly, the current study used standardised parenting styles questionnaire rather than observational means to determine parenting styles and social-emotional competence. This is to have a wide knowledge of parenting styles in order to be able to generalise the sample. Although the sample size of the study is relatively small compared to total population of parents in Nigeria, it still provides general knowledge compared to the observation method.

Thirdly, the range of parenting styles was specifically measured by finding out the highest means and the most frequently used parenting styles. However, this is different from

other studies that have been carried out in Nigeria because it provides better understanding of parenting styles, explains parenting styles in a systematic way and gives room for new knowledge of parenting. More research is needed to gain better understanding of other factors that may influence children's social-emotional competence aside from parenting styles.

This research arrives at the conclusion that parents in Abuja, Nigeria practise authoritative parenting style followed by authoritarian and permissive parenting styles respectively. Despite the use of authoritative parenting style, the study indicates that parents are low in autonomy granting. This means that children are not encouraged in making decisions on their own. The results also show the presence of mixed parenting styles. This implies that parents use different styles of parenting based on situations. In addition, the study reveals that socio-economic status has little effect on parenting styles and parenting styles have an influence on social-emotional competence. The results show that the three types of parenting style have positive effect on children's pro-social behaviour. The study indicates that due to cultural bases, what is perceived as inappropriate parenting styles (permissive and authoritarian) that make children to be social-emotionally incompetent in the western culture does not have negative effect on the social-emotional competence of pre-school children on the sample size in Abuja, Nigeria.

REFERENCES

Abell, E., Clawson, M., Washington, W. N., Bost, K. K., & Vaughn, B. E. (1996). Parenting Values, Attitudes, Behaviours, and Goals of African American Mothers from a Low-Income Population in Relation to Social and Societal Contexts. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(5), 593-613.

Abu, P. B., & Akerele, E. O. (2006). Parental influence on adolescents' sexual behaviour in Ibadan North Local Government Area of Oyo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of African & African-American Studies, 5*(1), 41-56.

Abudullahi, O. E. (2009). Introducing Emotional Intelligence in Nigeria Higher Education. *Journal of Educational Review, 2*(2), 97-103.

Achenbach, T. M. (1991). *Manual for the Child Behaviour Checklist* 4-18 and 1991 profile. Burlington: University of Vermont, Department of Psychiatry.

Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2010). *Multicultural Supplement to the Manual for the ASEBA Pre-school Forms & Profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.

Adejuwon, G. A. (2005a). Parenting style in a changing society and identity formation among Nigerian youths. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, *8*(1), 154-171.

Adejuwon, G. A. (2005b). Mothers' self-evaluation attribution in parenting and coping strategies on child externalizing behaviour in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Ife Psychologia*, *13*(1), 101-112.

Adejuwon, G. A. (2014). Mothers' Self-Evaluation, Attribution in Parenting and Coping Strategies on Child Externalizing Behaviour in Ibadan, Nigeria. *Ife Psychologia, 13*(1), 74-100.

Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1973). The development of infant-mother attachment. In B. Cardwell & H. Ricciuti (Eds.), *Review of Child Development Research* (Vol. 3, pp. 1-94) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bell, S. M., (1972). Infant crying and maternal responsiveness. *Child Development*, *43*, 1171-1190.

Akinboye, J. O. (2003). *Creativity, innovation and success*. Ibadan: CYFO Behaviour Services.

Akinsola, E. F. (2010a). Correlation between Parenting Styles and Sexual attitudes of Young People in Nigeria: Comparison of two ethnic groups. *Gender and Behaviour*, *8*(1), 2771-2788.

Akinsola, E. F. (2010b). Self-esteem, perceived control and communal relationship strength as predictors of emotional distress in Nigerian University students: *Ife Psychologia*, *18*(2), 270 - 289.

Akinsola, E. F. (2011). Relationships between Parenting Style, Family Type, Personality Disposition and Academic Achievement of young People in Nigeria. *Ife Psychologia: An International Journal of Psychology in Africa*, *19*(2), 246-267.

Akinsola, E. F. (2012). Parenting styles and sexual attitudes of young people in Nigeria and Cameroon: A Comparative Study. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Akinsola, E. F., & Arnold Udoka, P. (2013). Parental influence on social anxiety in children and adolescents: Its assessment and management using psychodrama. *Psychology*: (Special Issue on Applied Psychology), *4*(3), 246-253.

Alizadeh, S., Abu Talib, M. B., Abdullah, R., & Mansor, M. (2011). Relationship between Parenting Style and Children's Behaviour Problems. *Asian Social Science*, *7*(12), 195-200.

Allport , G. W. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc.

Amoran, O. A., Onadeko, M. O., & Adeniyi, J. D. (2005). Parental influence on adolescent sexual initiation practices in Ibadan, Nigeria. *International Quarterly of Community Health Education*. *23*, 73-81.

Ang, R. P. & Goh, Dion H. (2006). Authoritarian parenting Style in Asian Societies: A Cluster – analytic Investigation. *Contemporary Family Therapy: An international Journal*. *28*(1), 132-151.

Ang, R. P. (2006). Effects of parenting style on personal and social variables for Asian adolescents. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 76*(4), 503-511.

Aremu, O. A., Tella, A., & Tella, A. (2006). "Relationship among Emotional Intelligence, Parental Involvement and Academic Achievement of Secondary School Students in

Ibadan, Nigeria." Retrieved March 17, 2013, from http://www.usca.edu/essays/vol182006/tella1.pdf

Asher, S. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1986). Identifying children who are rejected by their peers. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*, 444-449.

Atere, A. A., & Olagbemi, A. A. (1998). *Introduction to Basic Sociology* (pp. 114). Ibadan: Emmi Press.

Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. E. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behaviour. *Child Development*, *76*(6), 1144-1159.

Aunola, K., Stattin, H., & Nurmi, J. E. (2000). 'Parenting styles and adolescents' achievement strategies. *Journal of Adolescence*, *23*, 205-222.

Australian Institute of Family Studies (2011). Growing Up in Australia: The Longitudinal Study of Australian Children. [http://www.aifs.gov.au/growingup/].

Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) (2012). Social and emotional wellbeing: development of a children's headline indicator. Cat. no. PHE 158. Canberra: [http://www.aihw.gov.au/publication-detail/?id=10737421524].

Awoniyi, T.O. (1975) Omoluabi: The fundamental basis of Yoruba traditional education. In: Wande Abimbola, ed., *Yoruba Oral Tradition,* Department of African Languages and Literature, Ile-Ife, pp. 357-388; J. A. Majasan, Yoruba education: Its principles, practice and relevance to current educational development, unpublished PhD thesis, University of Ibadan, 1967.

Baldwin, A. L. (1948). Socialisation and the parent-child relationship. *Child Development*, *19*, 127-136.

Baldwin, A. L., Baldwin, C., & Cole, R. E. (1990). Stress-resistant Families and Stress-resistant Children. In J. Rolf, A. S. Masten, D. Cicchetti, K. H. Neuechterlein & S. Weintraub (Eds) *Risk and Protective Factors in the Development of Psychopathology* (pp. 257-280). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Balli, S. J., Demo, D. H., & Wedman, J. F. (1998). Family involvement with children's homework: An intervention in the middle grades. *Family Relations, 47*(2), 149–157.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1989). Social cognitive theory. In E. Barnouw (Ed.), *International encyclopaedia of communications* (Vol. 4, pp. 92-96). New York: Oxford University Press.

Bandura, A. (1996). Ontological and epistemological terrains revisited. *Journal of Behaviour Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 27*(4), 323-345.

Barber, B. K. (1994). Cultural, family, and personal predictors of parent-adolescent conflict. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *56*, 375-386.

Barber, B. K. (1996). Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*, *67*, 3296-3319.

Barber, B. K., & Olsen, J. (1997). Socialisation in context: Connection, regulation, and autonomy in the family, school, and neighbourhood and with peers. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *12*(2), 287-315.

Barber, B. K., Olsen, J. E., & Shagle, S. C. (1994). Associations between parental psychological and behavioral control and youth internalized and externalized behavior. *Child Development*, *65*, 1116-1132.

Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic psychology monographs, 75*(1) 43-88

Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology, 4*(1)*,* pp.1-103.

Baumrind, D. (1989*). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow* (pp. 349-378). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baumrind, D. (1991a). Parenting styles and adolescent development. In R. Lerner, A. C. Petersen, & J. Brooks-Gunn (Eds.), The encyclopedia on adolescence (pp. 746–758). New York: Garland.

Baumrind, D. (1991b). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance abuse. Journal of Early Adolescence, 11, 56–95.

Baumrind, D. (1991c). Effective parenting during the early adolescent transition. In P. E. Cowan & E. M. Hetherton (Eds.), Advances in family research, Vol. 2 (pp. 111–163). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Inc.

Baumrind, D. (1996). The discipline controversy revisited. *Family Relations, 45*, 405-414.

Baumrind, D. (2013). Authoritative parenting revisited: History and current status: *American Psychological Association*.

Baumrind, D., & Black, A. E. (1967) Socialisation practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child development, 38*(2), 291-327.

Baumrind, D., & Sorkhabi, N. (2009). Authority and Obedience. In R. Shweder, T. Bidell, A. Dailey, S. Dixon, P. Miller & J. Modell (Eds.) *The Child: An Encyclopedic Companion* (pp. 81-86). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R.E., & Owens, E. (2010). Effects of preschool parents' power assertive patterns and practices on adolescent development. *Parenting*: Science and Practice, 10(3), 157-201.

Becker, W. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M. Hoffman & L. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of child development research* (Vol. 1, pp. 169-208). New York: Russell Sage Found.

behaviour. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 75(1), 43-88.

Bell, K. & Calkins, S. D. (2000). Emotions as the inputs and outputs of relationships. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 160-163.

Bell, R. Q. (1968). A reinterpretation of the direction of effects in studies of socialisation. *Psychological Review*, *75*, 81-95.

Bell, R. Q., & Chapman, M. (1986). Child effects in studies using experimental or brief longitudinal approaches to socialisation. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*, 595-603.

Belsky, J. (1980). Child maltreatment: An ecological integration. *American Psychologist, 35*, 320-335.

Belsky, J. (1984). The determinants of parenting: A process model. *Child Development. 55*, 83-98.

Belsky, J. (1985). Experimenting with the family m the new born period. *Child Development*, *56*, 407-414.

Belsky, J., & Fearon, R. M. P. (2002). Early attachment security, subsequent maternal sensitivity, and later child development: Does continuity in development depend upon continuity of care giving? *Attachment and Human Development*, *4*, 361-387.

Belsky, J., Jaffee, S. R., Sligo, J., Woodward, L., & Silva, P. A. (2005). Intergenerational Transmission of Warm-Sensitive-Stimulating Parenting: A Prospective Study of Mothers and Fathers of 3-Year-Olds. *Child Development, 76*, 384–396.

Berg, C. A. (2008). Everyday problem solving in context. In S. Hofer & D. Alwin (Eds.), *Handbook of Cognitive Aging: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 207-223). Sage. Published.

Berk, L. (2009). *Child Development*. (6th Ed.) Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Bewick, V., Cheek, L., & Ball, J. (2004, June). Statistics review 10: Further nonparametric methods. Critical Care, 8(3), 198-199. doi:10.86/cc2857

Bewick, V., Cheek, L., & Ball, J. (2004, June). Statistics review 10: Further nonparametric methods. *Critical Care, 8*(3), 198-199. doi:10.86/cc2857

Biederman, J., Hirshfeld-Becker, D. R., Rosenbaum, J. F., Herot, C., Friedman, D., Snidman, N., Kagan, J., & Faraone, S.V. (2001). Further evidence of association between behavioural inhibition and social anxiety in children. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *158*(10), 1673–1679.

Black, M. M., Dubowitz, H., Starr, J. H. (1999). African American fathers in low-income, urban families: Development, Behaviour, and home environment of their three-year-old children. *Child Development, 70*, 967-978.

Blandon, A. Y., Calkins, S. D., & Keane, S. P. (2010). Predicting emotional and social competence during early childhood from toddler risk and maternal behaviour. *Development and Psychopathology, 22*(1), 119-132.

Block, J. (1961). *The Q-Sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research*. Palo Alto. CA: Consulting Psychology.

Bluestone, C. & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (1999). Correlates of parenting styles in predominantly working- and middle-class African American mothers. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 61*, 881-893.

Boivin, M., & Begin, G. (1989). Peer status and self-perception among early elementary school children: The case of rejected children. *Child Development, 60*, 591-596.

Bornstein, L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2007). Parenting Styles and Child Social Development. *Encyclopaedia on Early Childhood Development*.

181

Bornstein, M. H. (2002). *Handbook of Parenting*, Vols. 1-4, 2nd Ed. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Bornstein, M. H. (2006). Parenting science and practice. In W. Damon, K. A. Renninger, I. E. Sigel (Eds). Handbook of child psychology: Child psychology in practice (pp. 893–949). New York: Wiley.

Bornstein, M. H., (1993) Infancy, parenting, and culture. [Review of *The Cultural Context of Infancy: Multicultural and Interdisciplinary Approaches to Parent-Infant Relations* by J. K. Nugent, B. M. Lester, & T. B. Brazelton (Eds.)]. *Contemporary Psychology*, *38*, 616-618.

Bornstein, M. H., (1995). *Handbook of parenting: Status and social conditions of parenting*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Bornstein, M. H., Lansford, J. E. (2010). Parenting. In M. H. Bornstein (Ed). *The handbook of cross-cultural developmental science* (pp. 259–277). New York: Taylor & Francis.

Bowlby, J. (1982). Attachment and loss: retrospect and prospect. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 52*(4), 664.

Bowlby, J. (1988) *A Secure Base* London: Routledge

Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2002). Socioeconomic Status and Child Development. *Annual. Rev. Psychol.*, *53*, 371–99.

Bradley, R. H., & Corwyn, R. F. (2005). Caring for children around the world: A view from home. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 6*, 468-478.

Bradshaw, P. & Tipping, S. (2010). *Growing Up in Scotland: Children's social, emotional and behavioural characteristics at entry to primary school.* Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Brody, D. H., & Flor, G. L. (1998). Maternal Resources, Parenting Practices, and Child Competence in Rural, Single-Parent African American Families. *Child Development*, *69*, 803-816

Brody, G. H., McBride-Murray, Y., Kim, S., & Brown, A. C. (2002). Longitudinal pathways to competence and psychological adjustment among African-American children living in rural single-parent households. *Child Development*, *73*, 1505-1516.

Brody, G. H., Stoneman, Z., & Burke, M. (1987). Family system and individual child correlates of sibling behaviour. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 57*, 561-569.

Brody, G. H., Stoneman, Z., & Flor, D. (1995). Linking family processes and academic competence among rural African American youths. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 567–579.

Brody, G. H., Stoneman, Z., & MacKinnon, C. E. (1986). Contributions of maternal Child-Rearing Rearing Practices and play contexts to sibling interactions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology,7*(3), 225-236.

Brody, G. H., Stoneman, Z., Flor, D., McCrary, C., Hastings, L., & Conyers, O. (1994). Financial resources, parent psychological functioning, parent co- caregiving, and early adolescent competence in rural two-parent African- American families. *Child Development*, *65*, 590–605.

Brody, G. H., Murry, V. M., Kogan, S. M., Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., Molgaard, V.,… Wills T. A. (2006). The Strong African American Families Program: a cluster-randomized prevention trial of long-term effects and a mediational model. *Journal. Consult Clinical. Psychology*. *74*, 356-366.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1986). Ecology of the family as a context for human development: Research perspectives. *Developmental Psychology*, *22*(6), 723-742.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1998). Ecological Systems Theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of Child Development* (Vol. 6, pp.187-250). Greenwich CT, JAI.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (2005). *Making human beings human*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Crouter, A. C. (1983). The evolution of environmental models in developmental research. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & W. Kessen (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology, History, theory, methods* (*1*(4), pp. 357-414). New York: Wiley.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (2006). The bio-ecological model of human development. In W. Damon & R. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (Vol 1, pp. 793-828). Hoboken, N.J.: John Wiley & Sons.

Brooks, J. B. (1991). *The process of parenting* (3rd Ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Bryman A (2008) *Social Research Methods*, 3rd Edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2007). *Business Research Methods* (revised edition). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. Journal of Personality Assessment, 57, 110-119.

Caldarella, P. & Merrel, K. W. (1997). Common dimensions of social skills of children and adolescents: A taxonomy of positive behaviours. *School Psychology reviews*, *26*(*2)*, 265-279.

Calkins, S. D., Fox, N. A., & Marshall, T. R. (1996). Behavioural and physiological antecedents of inhibited and uninhibited behaviour. *Child Development, 67*, 523-540.

Campbell, S. (1979). Mother-infant interaction as a function of maternal ratings of temperament. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, *10*, 67-76.

Campbell, S. (1995) Behaviour problems in preschool children: A review of recent research. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry & Allied Disciplines*, *36*, 113-149.

Capaldi, D. M., & Patterson, G. R. (1991). Relation of parental transitions to boys' adjustment problems: I. A test of a linear hypothesis, and II. Mothers at risk for transitions and unskilled parenting. *Developmental Psychology*, *27*, 489-504.

Caplan, M. Z., Weissberg, R. P., Grober, J. S., Sivo, P. J., Grady, K., & Jacoby, C. (1992). Social competence promotion with inner-city and suburban young adolescents: Effects on social adjustment and alcohol use. *Journal. Consult. Clinical. Psychology, 60*, 56–63.

Carlo, G., McGinley, M., Hayes, R., Batenhorst, C., & Wilkinson, J. (2007). Parenting style or practices? Parenting, sympathy, and pro-social behaviours among adolescents. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 168*, 147-176.

Chan, S. M., Bowes, J., & Wyver, S. (2009). Parenting style as a context for emotion socialisation. *Early Education and Development 20*, 631-656.

Chang, L., Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., & McBride-Chang, C. (2003). Harsh parenting in relation to child emotion regulation and aggression. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *17*, 598-303.

Chao, R. K. (1994). Beyond parental control and authoritative parenting style: Understanding Chinese parenting through the cultural notion of training. *Child development*, *65*, 1111-1120.

Chao, R. K. (2000). The parenting of immigrant Chinese and European American mothers: Relations between parenting styles, socialisation goals, and parental practices. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *21*(2), 233-248.

Chao, R. K. (2001). Extending research on the consequences of parenting style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, *72*, 1832-1843.

Chao, R., & Tseng, V. (2002). Parenting of Asians. In M.H. Bornstein (Series ed.), *Handbook of parenting: Social conditions and applied parenting* (*4*(2), pp. 59-93). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Cheah, C., & Rubin, K. (2003). European American and Mainland Chinese Mothers Socialisation Beliefs. *Parenting: Science and Practice, 3*(*1*). doi: 103-384-278.

Chen, X. (2010). Socio-emotional development in Chinese children. In . M. H. Bond (Ed.) *Handbook of Chinese psychology* (pp 37-52). Oxford University Press.

Chen, X., & French, D. (2008). Children's social competence in cultural context. *Annual Review of Psychology, 59*, 591-616.

Chen, X., Chang, L., He, Y., & Liu, H. (2005). The peer group as a context: Moderating effects on relations between maternal parenting and social and school adjustment in Chinese children. *Child Development, 76*, 417-434.

Chen, X., Dong, Q., & Zhou, H. (1997). Authoritative and Authoritarian parenting practices and social and school performance in Chinese children. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, *21*(4), 855-873.

Chen, X., French, D., & Schneider, B. (2006). *Peer relationships in cultural context. A volume in Cambridge Studies in Social and Emotional Development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chen, X., Hastings, P., Rubin, K. H., Chen, H., Cen, G., & Stewart, S. L. (1998). Childrearing attitudes and behavioural inhibition in Chinese and Canadian toddlers: A cross-cultural study. *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 677-686.

Chen, X., Liu, M., & Li, D. (2000). Parental warmth, control and indulgence and their relations to adjustment in Chinese children: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Family Psychology 14*, 401-419.

Chen, X., Rubin, K. H., Liu, M., Chen, H., Wang, L.,… & Li, D. (2003): Compliance in Chinese and Canadian toddlers. International Journal of Behavioural Development. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 27,* 428-436.

Chin-Yau, L. & Cindy Lin, (2003). A Comparison of Child-Rearing Practices among Chinese, Immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American Parents. *Journal of Child Development, 61*(2), 429–433.

Ciarrochi, J., Chan, A., & Caputi, P. (2000). A critical evaluation of the emotional intelligence construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *28*, 539–561.

Cicchetti, D. (1990). A historical perspective on the discipline of developmental psychopathology. In J. Rolf, A. Masten, D. Cicchetti, K. Nuechterlein, & S. Weintraub (Eds.). *Risk and protective factors in the development of psychopathology* (pp. 2-28). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Cicchetti, D., & Cohen, D. (1995). *Developmental psychopathology: Risk, disorder and adaptation*. New York: Wiley.

Cicchetti, D., & Schneider-Rosen, K. (1986). An organisational approach to childhood depression. In M. Rutter, C. Izard, & P. Read (Eds.) *Depression in young people, clinical and developmental perspectives* (pp. 71-134). New York: Guildford.

Clark, K. E., & Ladd, G. W. (2000). Connectedness and autonomy support in parent-child relationships. *Developmental Psychology*, *36*, 485-498.

Cohen, D. A., & Rice, J. (1997). Parenting Styles, Adolescent Substance Use, and Academic Achievement. *Journal of Drug Education, 27*, 199-211.

Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2011) *Research Methods in Education* (seven edition). London: Routledge.

Cohen. J., Onunaku, N., Clothier, S., & Poppe, J. (September 2005). Helping young children succeed. Strategies to promote childhood social and emotional competence. *Washington: National Conference of State Legislatures*.

Cole P. M., & Dennis T. A. (1998). Variations on a theme: Culture and the meaning of socialisation practices and child competence. *Psychological Inquiry*, *9,* 276–278.

Cole, P. M., Teti L. O., & Zahn-Waxlerm C. (2003). Mutual emotion regulation and the stability of conduct problems between preschool and early school age. *Dev. Psychopathol*. *15*, 1–18.

Cook, A. (2012). Factors which influence pro-social behavior. Retrieved on December 17, 2012 from http://www.morefreeinformation.com/Art/ 50632/185/Factors-Which-Influence-Pro-social-Behavior.html

Coolahan, K., McWayne, C., Fantuzzo, J., & Grim, S. (2002). Validation of multidimensional assessment of parenting styles for low-income African-American families with preschool children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 17*(3), 356-373. doi:10.1016/S0885-2006(02)00169-2

Coplan, R. J., Arbeau, K. A., & Armer, M. (2008). Don't fret, be supportive! Maternal characteristics linking child shyness to psychosocial and school adjustment in kindergarten. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 36,* 359-371.

Coplan, R. J., Hastings, P. D., Lagace-Seguin, D. G., & Moulton, C. E. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing constructs. *Parenting: Science & Practice, 2*(1), 1-26.

Coryn, C. L. S. (2007). The holy trinity of methodological rigor: A skeptical view. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation, 4*(7), 26-31.

Cox, M. J., & Paley, B. (1997). Families as systems. *Annual Review of Psychology 48*, 243-267.

Crain, W. (2011). *Theories of development: Concepts and applications* (6th Ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Education, Inc.

Creswell, W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative and mixed methods approach.* Sage Publications.

Crews, F. (1996). The verdict on Freud [Review of Freud evaluation: The completed arc]. Psychology, *33*, 64-66.

Crockenberg, S. (1987). Predictors and correlates of anger toward and punitive control of toddlers by adolescent mothers. *Child Development*, *58*, 964-975.

Crockenberg, S., & Litman, C. (1990). Autonomy as a competence in two-year-olds: Maternal correlates of child defiance, compliance, and self-assertion. *Developmental Psychology*, *26*, 961-971.

Cummings, E. M., & Davies, P. T. (1994). Children and marital conflict: The impact of family dispute and resolution. *Guilford series on social and emotional development*. New York, NY, US: Guilford Press.

Cummings, E. M., Davies, P. T., Campbell, S. B. (2000). *Developmental psychopathology and family process: Theory, research, and clinical implications*. New York: Guilford.

Cunha, F., & Heckman, J., (2007). The Technology of Skill Formation. *American Economic Review*, *97*(2): 31-47.

Danielson, C. K., & Phelps, C. R. (2003). The assessment of children's social skills through self-report. A potential screening instrument for classroom use. *Measurement and evaluation in counselling and development, 35*(4), 218-229.

Darling, N. (March, 1999). Parenting style and its correlates. *ERIC Digest*. EDO-PS-99-3.

Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrated model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *113*, 487-496.

Davies, P. T., & Cummings, E. M. (1994). Marital conflict and child adjustment: An emotional security hypothesis. *Psychological Bulletin, 116,* 387–411.

Deater-Deckard, K., Dodge, K. A., Bates, J. E., & Pettit, G. S. (1996). Physical discipline among African American and European American mothers: Links to children's externalizing behaviours. *Developmental Psychology*, *32*, 1065-1072.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*. New York: Plenum Publishing Co.

Degnan, K. A., Henderson, H. A., Fox, N. A., & Rubin, K. H. (2008). Predicting social wariness in middle childhood: The moderating roles of child care history, maternal personality, and maternal behaviour. *Social. Development. 17,* 471–87

Demo, D. H., & Cox, M. J. (2000). Families with Young Children: A Review of Research in the 1990s. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *62*, 876-895.

Denham, S. A. (1986). Social cognition, social behaviour, and emotion in pre-schoolers: Contextual validation. *Child Development*, *57*, 194–201.

Denham, S. A. (1989). Maternal affect and toddlers' social-emotional competence. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 59,* 368-376.doi: 10.1111/j.1939-0025.1989.tb01672.x

Denham, S. A. (1998). Practicing what we preach: Giving away developmental knowledge for the betterment of children and adults. *Contemporary Psychology, 44,* 70-72.

Denham, S. A. (2006). Emotional competence in preschoolers: Implications for social functioning. In J. Luby (Ed.), *Handbook of preschool mental health: Development, disorders and treatment* (pp. 23-44). New York: Guilford.

Denham, S. A. (2007). Dealing with feelings: How children negotiate the worlds of emotions and social relationships. *Cognitie Creier Comportament, 11*, 1-48.

Denham, S. A. (2010). Emotion regulation: Now you see it, now you don't. *Emotion Review*. *2*, 297-299.

Denham, S. A., & Couchoud, E. A. (1990). Young pre-schoolers' understanding of emotion. *Child Study Journal*, *20*, 171–192.

Denham, S. A., & McKinley, M. J. (1993). Sociometric nominations of pre-schoolers: A psychometric analysis. *Early Education and Development*, *4*, 109-122.

Denham, S. A., & Warren, H. K. (2009). The development of affect in childhood. In K. Scherer & D. Sander (Eds.), *Oxford companion to the affective sciences* (pp. 84-85). London: Oxford University Press

Denham, S. A., Bailey, C., & Zinser, K. M. (2011). Emotional intelligence in the first 5 years of life. In Encyclopaedia on Early Childhood Development, R. E. Tremblay, R. DeV. Peters, M. Boivin, & R. G. Barr (Eds). Centre of Excellence for Early Childhood Development. www.child-encyclopedia.com

Denham, S. A., Bassett, H., Kalb, S. C., Mincic, M., Wyatt, T., Graling, K., & Warren, H. K. (2009). How preschoolers' social and emotional competence predicts their school-readiness: Development of competency-based assessments. *Advances in SEL Research Newsletter, 3*(1), 11-13.

Denham, S. A., Blair, K. A., DeMulder, E., Levitas, J., Sawyer, K., Auerbach-Major, S., & Queenan, P. (2003). Preschool Emotional Competence: Pathway to Social Competence? *Child Development, 74*, 238-256.

Denham, S. A., Mason, T., Caverly, S., Schmidt, M., Hackney, R., Caswell, C., & DeMulder, E. (2001). Pre-schoolers at play: Co-Socialisers of emotional and social competence. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 25*, 290-301.

Denham, S. A., McKinley, M., Couchoud, E. A., & Holt, R. (1990). Emotional and behavioural predictors of preschool peer ratings. *Child Development, 61*, 1145-1152.

Denham, S. A., von Salisch, M., Olthof, T., Kochanoff, A., & Caverly, S. (2002). Emotions and peer relationships. In C. Hart & P. K. Smith (Eds.), *Handbook of child social development*. New York: Blackwell Publishers.

Denham, S. A., Warren, H. K., von Salisch, M., Benga, O., Chin, J-C., & Geangu, E. (2011). Emotions and peer relationships. In C. Hart & P. K. Smith (Eds.), Wiley/Blackwell Handbook of childhood social development, 2nd edition (pp. 413-433). New York: Blackwell Publishers.

Denham, S. A., Workman, E., Cole, P. M., Weissbrod, C., Kendziora, K. T., & Zahn- Waxler, C. (2000). Prediction of externalizing behaviour problems from early to middle childhood: The role of parental socialisation and emotion expression. *Development and Psychopathology*, *12*, 23-45.

Denham, S. A., Workman, E., Cole, P.,Weissbrod, C., Kendziora, K., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (2000). Parental contributions to externalizing and internalizing patterns in young children at risk for conduct disorder. *Development and Psychopathology, 12,* 23-45.doi: 10.1017/S0954579400001024.

Denham, S. A., Wyatt, T., Bassett, H. H., Echeverria, D., & Knox, S. (2009). Assessing social-emotional development in children from a longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 63*, 37-52.

Denham, S. A., Zahn-Waxler, C., Cummings, E. M., & Iannotti, R. J. (1991). Social competence in young children's peer relationships: Patterns of development and change. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, *22*, 29-43.

Denham, S. A., Zinsser, K.M., & Brown, C. A. (2012). The emotional basis of learning and development in early childhood education. In B. Spodek & O. Saracho (Eds.), *Handbook of research on the education of young children* (pp. 67-88). New York: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Dix, T. (1992). Parenting on behalf of the child: Empathic goals in the regulation of responsive parenting. In I. E. Sigel, A. V. McGillicuddy-DeLisi, & J. J. Goodnow (Eds.), *Parental*

belief systems: The psychological consequences for children (2nd ed., pp. 319–346). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., & Roberts, D. F. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, *58*, 1244-1257.

Dunlop, A. W., Lee, P., Fee, J., Hughes, A., Grieve, A. and Marwick, H. (2008) Perceptions of staff, service providers, and parents in managing and promoting positive behaviour in early years and early primary settings, Edinburgh: Scottish Government.

Dwairy, M., & Menshar, K. E. (2006). Parenting style, individuation, and mental health of Egyptian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, *29*(1), 103-117

Dwairy, M., Achoui, M., Abouserie, R., & Farah A. (2006). Parenting styles, individuation, and mental health of Arab adolescents: A third cross-regional research study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *37*(3), 262-272.

Easterby-Smith, M., R., & Lowe, T. A. (1991*) Management Research.* London*:* Sage*.*

Eastin, M., Greenberg, B., & Hofschire, L. (2006). Parenting the Internet. *Journal of communication*, *56*, 486-504

Edwards, C. P., de Guzman, M. R. T., Brown, J., & Kumru, A. (2006). Children's social behaviours and peer interactions in diverse cultures. In X. Chen, D. French, & B. Schneider (Eds.), *Peer relationships in cultural context* (pp. 23-51). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Edwards, R. (2010). Parenting practice and class: change and continuity. In, Klett-Davies, Martina (ed.) *Is Parenting a Class Issue?* (pp. 62-76) London, GB, Family and Parenting Institute.

Eisenberg N., Liew, J., & Pidada, S. U. (2004). The longitudinal relations of regulation and emotionality to quality of Indonesian children's socio emotional functioning. *Developmental Psychology*. *40*(5), 790-804.

Eisenberg, N. Fabes, R.A., Bernzweig, J., Karbon, M., Poulin, R., & Hanish, L., (1993). The relations of emotionality and regulation to pre-schoolers' social skills and sociometric status. *Child development*., *64*(5), 1418-1438.

Eisenberg, N., & Fabes, R. A. (1992). Emotion, regulation, and the development of social competence. In M. Clark (Ed.), *Emotion and social behaviour, Vol. 14.* Review of *personality and social psychology* (pp. 119–150). Newbury Park, CA, Sage.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., & Spinrad, T. L., (1998) Parental Socialisation of Emotion. *Psychological Inquiry. 9*(4), 241-273.

Eisenberg, N., Cumberland, A., Spinrad, T. L., Fabes, R. A., Shepard, S. A., Reiser, M.,...& Guthrie, I. K. (2001). The relations of regulation and emotionality to children's externalizing and internalizing problem behaviour. *Child Dev. 72*, 1112-1134.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., & Spinrad, T. (2006). Pro-social development. In N. Eisenberg (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology, Social emotional, and personality development* (6th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 646-718). Hoboken, NJ, John Wiley & Sons.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R. A., Guthrie, I. K., & Reiser, M., (2000) Dispositional emotionality and regulation: Their role in predicting quality of social functioning. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 78*(1), 136-157.

Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R., A., & Murphy, B. C. (1996). Parents' reactions to children's negative emotions, Relations to children's social competence and comforting behaviour. *Child Development*, *67*, 2227–2247.

Eisenberg, N., Guthrie, I. K., Fabes, R. A., Reiser, M., Murphy, B. C., Holgren, R.,… & Losoya, S. (1997). The Relations of Regulation and Emotionality to Resiliency and Competent Social Functioning in Elementary School Children. *Child Development. 68*(2), 295-311.

Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T. L., & Eggum, N. D. (2010). Emotion-related self-regulation and its relation to children's maladjustment. Annual Review of *Clinical Psychology*,*6*,495-525. doi: 10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131208

Eisenberg, N., Valiente, C., & Eggum, N. D. (2010). Self-regulation and school readiness. *Early Education and Development, 21*, 681-698. doi: 10.1080/10409289.2010.497451.

Ekman, P. (1992). Are there basic emotions? *Psychological Review, 99* (3), 550-553.

Elander, J. & Rutter, M. (1996). Use and development of the Rutter parents' and teachers' scales. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, *6, * 63-78.

Elias, H., & Yee, T.H., (2009). Relationship between perceived paternal and maternal parenting styles and student academic achievement in selected secondary schools. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 9*, 181-192.

Elias, M. J., Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Frey, K. S., Greenberg, M. T., Haynes, N. M.,… & Shriver, T. P. (1997). *Promoting Social and Emotional Learning, Guidelines for Educators.* Alexandria, VA, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Emmanuel, A. O., Akinyemi, A. A., & Nimotalai, O. A. (2012). Changing Patterns of Child Rearing Practice in Badagry Area of Lagos State, Implication for Delinquent Behaviour.*8*. doi:http//eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/83

Engels, R. M. E., Dekovic, M., & Meeus, W. (2002). Parenting practices, social skills and peer relationships in adolescence. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, *30*, 3-18.

Ermisch, J. (2008). Origins of social immobility and inequality, Parenting and early child development. *National Institute Economic Review, 205*, 62-71.

Ermisch, J. (2009). Adult Child-Parent Relationships. In Brynin, M., & Ermisch, J. (eds.). *Changing Relationships.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Essau, C. A., Olaya, B., Anastassiou-Hadjicharalambous, X., Pauli, G., Gilvarry, C., Bray, D., Ollendick, T. H. (2012). Psychometric properties of the Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire from five European countries. *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research, 21*(3), 232-245.

Evangelou, M., Sylva, K., Wild, M., Glenny, G., & Kyriacou, M. (2009). *Early Years Learning and Development Literature Review*. DCSF RR 176

Fabes, R. A., Leonard, S. A., Kupanoff, K., & Martin, C. L. (2001). Parental coping with children's negative emotions, relations with children's emotional and social responding. *Child Development*, *72*(3), 907-920.

Fagot, B. I. (1997). Attachment, parenting, and peer interactions of toddler children. *Developmental Psychology*, *33*(3), 489-499.

Fakeye, O. D. (2008). Parenting styles and primary school pupils reading achievement in South-Western Nigeria. Pakistan *Journal of Social Sciences*. *5*, 209-214.

Farrar, E., Goldfield, S., & Moore, T. (2007). *School readiness. Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth*. Perth, Western Australia, Public Policy Matters.

Ferrari, A. M. (2002). The impact of culture upon child rearing practices and definitions of maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 26*(8), 793-813.

Field, T. M., Widmayer, S. M., Stringer, S., & Ignatoff, E. (1980). Teenage, lower- class, black mothers and their preterm infants, An intervention and developmental follow-up. *Child Development*. *51*, 426-436.

Foster, E. M., & Kalil, A. (2005). Developmental Psychology and public policy, progress and prospects, Developmental Psychology, *41*, 827-932.

Fox, N. A. (1998). Temperament and regulation of emotion in the first years of life. Pediatrics: 102, 1230–1235.

Fox, N. A., & Calkins, S. (2003). The Development of Self-Control of Emotion, Intrinsic and Extrinsic Influences. *Motivation & Emotion*, *27*, 1, 7-26.

Freud, S. (1923). The Ego and the Id. In A. Freud, *The Essentials of Psychoanalysis*. Penguin.

Freud, S. (1933). *New Introductory Lectures in Psychoanalysis.* New York: Norton & company.

Frommer, E., & O'Shea, G. (1973). The importance of childhood experiences in relation to problems of marriage and family building. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *123*, 157-160.

Frosch, C. A., & Johnson-Laird, P. N. (2011). Is everyday causation deterministic or probabilistic? *Acta psychologica*, *137*(3), 280-291.

GarcíaColl, C. T. & Pachter, L. (2002). Ethnic and Minority Parenting. In M. H. Bornstein, (Ed.), Handbook of Parenting, Volume 4, *Social Conditions and Applied Parenting*, (2nd Ed). Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Publishers.

Gaspar, M. F., & dos Santos e Paiva, P. (2004). Parenting practices and children's socio-emotional development: a study with Portuguese community preschool aged children. Retrieved 11 July 2010, from http://www.incredibleyears.com/Library/items/parenting-practices-lift-portuguese-04.pdf

Gauvain, M. (2001). *The Social Context of Cognitive Development*. New York, Guilford.

Gazelle, H., & Ladd, G. W. (2003). Anxious solitude and peer exclusion, A diathesis-stress model of internalizing trajectories in childhood. *Child Development, 74,* 257-278.

George, M. E. (2004). Relations Between Parenting Styles and the Social Status of School-Age Children with Their Peers. Published Masters thesis, Florida State University, College of Human Sciences.

Gesell, A. (1928). *Infancy and human growth*. New York, Macmillan.

Gilliom, M., Shaw, D. S., Beck J. E., Schonberg, M. A., & Lukon, J. L. (2002). Anger regulation in disadvantaged preschool boys, strategies, antecedents, and the development of self-control *Developmental Psychology*. *38*, 222–35.

Glasgow, K. L., Dornbusch, S. M., Troyer, L., Steinberg, L., & Ritter, P. L. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescents' attributions, and educational outcomes in nine heterogeneous high schools. *Child Development*, *68*, 507-529.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence* (pp. 20). New York, Bantam.

Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, A research note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *38*, 581–586.

Goodman, R. (2001). Psychometric properties of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *40*, 1337–1345.

Goodman, R., & Scott, S. (1999). Comparing the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire and the Child Behaviour Checklist, Is small beautiful? *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *27*, 17-24.

Goodman, R., Ford, T., Simmons, H., Gatward, R., & Meltzer, H. (2000). Using the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) to screen for child psychiatric disorders in a community sample. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *177*, 534-539.

Goodman, S.H. (2002). Early experiences and depression. In I. H. Gotlib & C. L. Hammen (Eds.), *Handbook of Depression and Its Treatment* (pp. 245-267). Guilford.

Gottman, J. M., Katz, L. F., & Hooven, C. (1997). *Meta-emotion*. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gottman, J. M., Katz, L. F., Hooven, C. (1996). Parental meta-emotion philosophy and the emotional life of families, Theoretical models and preliminary data. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *10*, 243-268.

Grantham-McGregor, S., Cheung, Y. B., Cueto, S., Glewwe, P., Richter, L., & Strupp, B. (2007). Development potential for children in the first five years in developing countries. *The Lancet*, *369*(9555), 60-70.

Greenberger, E. (1988). New measures for research on work, parenting and the socialisation of children. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Program in Social Ecology. Irvine, CA.

Greenberger, E., & Goldberg, W. A. (1989). Work, Parenting, and the Socialisation of Children. *Developmental Psychology, 25*(1), 22-35.

Greenfield, P. M., & Suzuki, L. K. (1998). Culture and human development: Implications for parenting, education, pediatrics, and mental health. *Handbook of child psychology, 4,* 1059-1109.

Greenfield, P. M., Keller, H., Fuligni, A., & Maynard, A. (2003). Cultural pathways through universal development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *54*, 461-490.

Greenfield, P. M., Trumbull, E., Keller, H., Rothstein-Fisch, C., Suzuki, L., & Quiroz, B. (2006). Cultural conceptions of learning and development. In P. Alexander & P. H. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (2nd Ed., pp. 675-692) Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum.

Grolnick, W., & Pomerantz, E. (2009). Issues and challenges in studying parental control, Toward a new conceptualization. *Child Development Perspectives*, *3*, 165-170.

Grusec, J. E. & Davidov, M. (2007). Socialisation in the family, The roles of parents. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.) *Handbook of Socialisation*. New York, Guilford Press.

Grusec, J. E., & Hastings, P. D. (2007*). Handbook of socialisation*. NY, Guilford Press.

Grusec, J. E., & Kuczynski, L. (1980) Direction of effect in socialisation, A comparison of the parent's versus the child's behaviour as determinants of disciplinary techniques. *Developmental Psychology, 16*(1), 1-9.

Gutman, L. and Schoon, I. (2013). *The Impact of Non-cognitive Skills on Outcomes for Young People.* Education Endowment Foundation. Retrieved from: http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/uploads/pdf/Non-cognitive_skills_literature_review.pdf.

Gutman, L., & Feinstein, L. (2007). *Parenting behaviours and children's development from infancy to early childhood: Changes, continuities, and contributions [Wider Benefits of Learning Research Report No. 22]*. London: Centre for Research on the Wider Benefits of Learning, Institute of Education, University of London.

Hall, F., Pawlby, S., & Wolkind, S. (1980). Early life experience and later mothering behaviour, A study of mothers and their 20-week-old babies. In D. Shaffer & J. Dunn (Eds.), *The first year of life*. New York, Wiley.

Hall, W. N., & Bracken, B. A. (1996). Relationship between maternal parenting styles and African American and White adolescents' interpersonal relations. *School Psychology International*, *17*, 253-267.

Halpenny, A. M., Nixon, E. & Watson, D. (2010). *Parents' Perspectives on Parenting Styles and Disciplining Children*. Dublin, Office of the Minister for Children and Youth Affairs.

Harkness, S., Super, C. M., Barry, O., Zeitlin, M., Long, J. (2009). Assessing the environment of children's learning: The developmental niche in Africa. In E. Grigorenko (Ed.), Multicultural psychoeducational assessment (pp.133-155). New York: Springer.

Härkönen, U. (2003). The new systems theory of early childhood education and preschool as a frame of reference for sustainable education. *Journal of Teacher Education and Training, 2,* 25-38.

Härkönen, U. (2007). *The impact of theories on the early childhood education culture: the impact of the new systems theory on the early childhood education culture*. In U. Härkönen & E. Savolainen (eds.). *International views on early childhood education.* Latvia: University of Joensuu. Savonlinna Department of Teacher Education.

Hart, C. H., Nelson, D. A., Robinson, C. C., Olson, S. F., & NcNeilly-Choque, M. K. (1998). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery-school-age children, Parenting style and marital linkages. *Developmental Psychology*, *34*, 687-697.

Hasting, P.D (2006). Children's Development of Social Competence across Family Types;availableat.samesexmarriage.ca/docs/Justice_Child_Development.pdf accessed on 15/09/2011

Hastings, P. D., & Grusec, J. E. (1998). Parenting goals as organisers of responses to parent–child disagreement. *Developmental psychology, 34*(3), 465-479.

Hastings, P., & Coplan, R. (1999). Conceptual and empirical links between children's social spheres, Relating maternal beliefs and pre-schoolers' behaviours with peers. *New Directions For Child and Adolescent Development*, *86*, 43-59.

Hertzman, C. (2004), Making early childhood development a priority, Lessons from Vancouver. S. Richardson & M. Priro (Eds) Ottawa, Canada, Institute of Medicine.

Hess, R. D., & McDevitt, T. M. (1984). Some cognitive consequences of maternal intervention techniques, A longitudinal study. *Child Development*, *55*, 2017-2030.

Ho, D. Y. (1989). Continuity and variation in Chinese patterns of socialisation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *51*, 149-163.

Hoff, E., Laursen, B., Tardif, T. (2002). Socioeconomic status and parenting. In M. Bomstein (Ed.), *Handbook of parenting Vol. 2*, Biology and ecology of parenting (2nd ed., pp. 231-252). Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Howes C., & James J. (2002) Children's social development within socialisation context of childcare and early childhood education. In P.K Smith & C. Hart (Eds), *Blackwell handbook of childhood social development*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Hymel, S., Rubin, K. H., Rowden, L., & Lemare, L. (1990). Children's peer relationships, longitudinal prediction of internalizing and externalizing problems from middle childhood. *Child Development,* 61, 2004-2021.

IBM Corporation. (2013). Related Samples Tests (nonparametric tests algorithms). *IBM SPSS Statistics Algorithms*.

Jackson, C. (2002). Perceived legitimacy of parental authority and tobacco and alcohol use during early adolescence. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 31*(5), 425-432.

Jaffari-Bimmel, N., Juffer, F., Van I. Jzendoorn, M. H., Bakermans-Kranenburg, M. J., & Mooijaart, A. (2006). Social Development from Infancy to Adolescence, Longitudinal and Concurrent Factors in an Adoption Sample. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*, 1143-1153.

Jones, F. A., Green, V., & Krauss, D. R. (1980). Maternal responsiveness of primiparous mo Kouros, C. D., Merrilees, C. E., & Cummings, E. M. (2008). Marital Conflict and Children's Emotional Security in the Context of Parental Depression. *Journal of Marriage Family, 70*(3), 684-697.

Joshi, D, & Dutta, I. (2015). A correlative study of mother parenting style and emotional intelligence of adolescent learner. *International Journal of Innovation and Scientific Research, 13*(*1),* 145-151.

Kagan, J., Reznick, J. S., Clarke, C., Snidman, N., & Garcia-Coll, C. (1984). Behavioural inhibition to the unfamiliar. *Child Development*, *55*, 2212-2225.

Kaiser, A. P.; Hancock, T. B.; Cai, X.; Foster, E. M.; & Hester, P. (2000). Parent-reported behaviour problems and language delays in boys and girls enrolled in 'Head Start' classrooms. *Behaviour Disorders, 26*(1), pp. 26-41.

Kanoy, K., Ulku-Steiner, B., Cox, M., & Burchinal, M. (2003). Marital relationship and individual psychological characteristics that predict physical punishment of children. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *17*, 20–28.

Kaufmann, D., Gesten, E., Santa Lucia, R.C., Salcedo, O., Rendina-Gobioff, G., & Gadd, R. (2000). The relationship between parenting style and children's adjustment. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, *9*, 231-245.

Kelley, M. L., Power, G. T., & Wimbush, D. D. (1992). Determinants of disciplinary practices in low-income Black mothers. *Child Development, 63*, 573–582.

Kelly, M. L., & Tseng, H. (1992). Cultural differences in child rearing, A comparison of immigrant Chinese and Caucasian American mothers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *23*, 444-455.

Kemph, J. P. (1969), Erik H. Erikson. Identity, youth and crisis. New York, W. W. Norton Company. *Syst. Res*., *14*, 154–159. doi, 10.1002/bs.3830140209

Keshavrz, S., & Baharudin, R. (2009). Parenting style in collectivist culture of Malaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences, 10*(1), 66.

Khalaj, G., Khabiri, M., & Sajjadi, N. (2011). The relationship between coaches leadership styles & player satisfaction in women skate championship. Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 15, 3596-3601. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.341.

Khalaj, G., Khabiri, M., & Sajjadi, N. (2011). The relationship between coaches leadership styles & player satisfaction in women skate championship. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 15*, 3596-3601. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.04.341.

Kiang, L., Moreno, A. J., & Robinson, J. L. (2004). Maternal preconceptions about parenting predict child temperament, maternal sensitivity, and children's empathy. *Developmental Psychology*, *40*, 1081-1092.

Kim E. (2005) Korean American parental control, acceptance or rejection? Ethos. *33*(3), 347-366.

Kim K., & Rohner R. P., (2002). Parental warmth, control, and involvement in schooling, Predicting academic achievement among Korean American adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 33, 127–140.

Kim, H., & Chung, R.H. (2003). Relationship of recalled parenting style to self-perception in Korean American college students. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, *164* (4), 481-492.

Kirkpatrick, L., & Hazan, C. (1994). Attachment styles and close relationship, A four year prospective Study. *Personal relationships 1*, 123-142.

Kitayama, S. , Markus, H. R., & Lieberman, C. (1995). The collective construction of self-esteem, Implications for culture, self, and emotion. In: J. Russell, J. Wellenkamp, T. Manstead, & J. M. F. Dols (Eds.), *Everyday conceptions of emotions* (pp. 523-550). Dordrecht, The Netherlands, Kluwer Academic.

Kochanska G. (1994). Beyond cognition, Expanding the search for the early roots of internalization and conscience, *Developmental psychology*, *30*, 20-22.

Kopp, C.B. (1989). Regulation of distress and negative emotions, A developmental view. *Developmental Psychology*. *25*, 343-354.

Kuczynski, L. (2003). Beyond bidirectionality, bilateral conceptual frameworks for understanding dynamics in parent-child relations (pp.1-24). In L. Kuczynski (Ed.) *Handbook of Dynamics in Parent-Child Relations*. Thousand Oaks CA, Sage.

Ladd G. W., & Pettit C. H. (2002) Parenting and the development of children's peer relationships. In, Bornstein M. H. (Ed.). *Handbook of parenting*, *Vol. 5*(1). Practical issues in parenting (pp. 269–304). Mahwah, NJ, Erlbaum.

Laerd Statistics. (2013). *Friedman Test in SPSS*. (Lund Research Limited) Retrieved from Laerd Statistics: https://statistics.laerd.com/spss-tutorials/friedman-test-using-spss-statistics.php

Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Steinberg, L. (1996). Ethnicity and community context as moderators of the relations between family decision making and adolescent adjustment. *Child Development*, *67*, 283-301.

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L. & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment of adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful homes. *Child Development*, *62*, 1049-1065.

Lareau, A. (1989). *Home advantage, Social class and parent intervention in elementary education*. New York, Falmer Press.

Lareau, A. (2002). Invisible inequality: Social class and childrearing in black families and white families. American Sociological Review, 67(5), 747-776.

Latouf, N. (2008). Parenting styles affecting the behaviour of five-year-olds. Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Africa, Pretoria, South Africa.

Lau S., & Ping, C. Cheung (1987). Relations between Chinese Adolescents' Perception of Parental Control and Organisation and Their Perception of Parental Warmth. *Developmental Psychology, 18*(2), 215–21.

Lengua, L. J. (2006). Growth in temperament and parenting as predictors of adjustment during children's transition to adolescence. *Developmental Psychology*, *42*, 819-832.

Leung, K., Lau, S. & Lam, W. L. (1998). Parenting styles and academic achievement: A cross-cultural study. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 44, 157-172.

Leung, P. W. L., & Kwan, K. S. F. (1998). Parenting Styles, Motivational Orientations, and Self-Perceived Academic Competence, A Mediational Model. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, *44*(1), 1-19.

Levine, R. A. (1988). Human parental care: Universal goals, cultural strategies, individual behavior. In R. A. Levine, P. M. Miller, & M. M. West (Eds.). *Parental behavior in diverse societies. New directions in child development.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

LeVine, R.A., & New, R.S. (2008). (Eds.). Anthropology and children development: A cross-cultural reader. New York: Blackwell.

Lewis, M. (1998). Emotional competence and development. In D. Pushkar, W. M. Bukowski, A. E. Schwartzman, D. M. Stack, & D. R. White (Eds.), *Improving competence across the lifespan* (pp. 27-36). New York, Plenum Press.

Li, Y. Q., & Hao, R. P. (1998). Logistic regression analysis of the factors influencing students' psychological well-being. *Educational Theory and Practice*, *118*, 49-52.

Lightfoot, Cole & Cole. (2013). *The Development of Children*, 7th ed. New York: Worth Publishers

Lin, Y. C., & Fu, V. R. (1990). A comparison of child rearing practices among Chinese, immigrant Chinese, and Caucasian-American parents. *Child Development*, *61*, 429-433

Lindahl, K. M., & Malik, N. M. (1999). Marital conflict, family processes, and boys' externalizing behavior in Hispanic American and European American families. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *28*, 12-24.

Lipsitt, L. P. (1990). Learning processes in the human newborn. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 608*(1), 113-127.

Liu, M., Chen, X., Rubin, K. H., Zheng, S., Cui, L., Li, D., Chen, H., & Wang, L.,M (2005) Autonomy- vs. connectedness-oriented parenting behaviours in Chinese and Canadian mothers. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 29*, 489-495.

Liu, X. (2003). Parenting practices and the psychological adjustment of children in rural China. Published doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.

Lochman, J. E., Barry, T. D., & Pardini, D. A. (2003). Anger control training for aggressive youths. In A. E. Kazdin & J. R. Weisz (Eds.), Evidence-based psychotherapies for children and adolescents (pp. 263-281). New York: Guilford Publications.

Locke, L. M., & Prinz, R. J. (2002).Measurement of parental discipline and nurturance. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 22, 895-929.

Louis, C. (2011). *Research methods in education*. Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon, England; New York, Routledge.

Lu, H. J., & Chang, L. (2013). Parenting and Socialisation of Only Children in Urban China, An Example of Authoritative Parenting. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 174*(3), 335-343.

Maccoby, E. E. (1992). Trends in the study of socialisation, Is there a Lewinian heritage? *Journal of Social Issues*, *48*, 171-185. doi: j.1540-4560.1992.tb00892.x

Maccoby, E. E. (2007). Historical overview of socialisation research and theory. In J. E. Grusec & P. D. Hastings (Eds.), *Handbook of socialisation, Theory and research* (pp. 13-41). New York, NY, Guilford Press.

Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialisation in the context of the family, Parent-child interaction. In Mussen, P. H. (Ed.) *Handbook of child psychology, Socialisation, personality and social development* (pp 1-101). New York, Wiley.

MacDonald, K., & Parke, R. (1984). Bridging the gap, Parent-child play interaction and peer interactive competence. *Child Development*, *55*, 1265-1277.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self, Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*(2), 224-253.

Martinez, C. R., Jr., & Forgatch, M. S. (2001). Preventing problems with boys' noncompliance, Effects of a parent training intervention for divorcing mothers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69,* 416-428. PMID, 11495171

Martínez, I., García, J. F., & Yubero, S. (2007). Parenting styles and adolescents' selfesteem in Brazil. *Psychological Reports*, *100*(3), 731-45.

Masten, A. S. (2006). Developmental psychopathology: Pathways to the future. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 30*(1), 47-54.

McBride-chang, C., & Chang, L. (1998). Adolescent-Parent Relations in Hong Kong, Parenting Styles, Emotional Autonomy, and School Achievement. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 159*(4), 421-436.

McDevitt, T. M., & Ormrod, J. E. (2013). *Child development and education.* Upper Saddle River, NJ, Pearson.

McElwain N. L., & Volling B. L. (2004). Attachment security and parental sensitivity during infancy, Associations with friendship quality and false belief understanding at age four. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. *21*, 639–66.

McLanahan, S. & Julia, A., (1989). "The Effects of Children on Adult's Psychological Well-Being, 1957–1976." *Social Forces 68*, 124–146.

McLoyd, V. C. (1990). The impact of economic hardship on black families and children: Psychological distress, parenting, and socioemotional development. *Child development, 61* (2), 311-346.

McWayne, C. M., Owsianik, M., Green, L. E., & Fantuzzo, J. W. (2008). Parenting behaviors and preschool children's social and emotional skills, A question of the consequential

validity of traditional parenting constructs for low-income African Americans. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 23*(2), 173-192.

Menaghan, E. G. & Parcel, T. L. (1990). Parental employment and family life. Research in the 1980s. *Journal of Health and Society Behaviour*, 29, 169-184.

Meng, C. (2012). A longitudinal perspective on parenting and school behaviour problems, Understanding the connection between home and school among 'Head Start' children [poster]. *Head Start's 11th National Research Conference*. Washington, DC.

Mensah, M., & Karuanchie, A. (2013, November). 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

Mensah, M., & Karuanchie, A. (2013, November). 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.

Mildon, R., & Polimeni, M. (2012). *Parenting in the early years: effectiveness of parenting support programs for Indigenous families* (No. 16). Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW).

Milliones, J. (1978). Relationship between perceived child temperament and maternal behaviour. *Child Development, 49*, 1255-1257.

Moore, T (2006). Early childhood and long term development, The importance of the early years. Perth, Western Australia, Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth.

Morelli, G. A., & Rothbaum, F. (2007). Situating the person in relationships, Attachment relationships and self-regulation in young children. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 500-527). New York, Guilford.

Mullis, R. L., Smith, D. W. & Vollmers, K. E. (1983) Pro-social behaviours in young children and parental guidance. *Child Study Journal*, *13*(1), 13-21.

Muris, P., Meesters, C., & van den Berg, F. (2003) The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), Further evidence for its reliability and validity in a community sample of Dutch children and adolescents. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, *12*, 1-8.

Muris, P., Meesters, C., Eijkelenboom, A., & Vincken, M. (2004). The self-report version of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire, It's psychometric properties in 8- to 13-year-old

non-clinical children. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *43*, 437–448. doi, 10.1348/0144665042388982.

Nelson, D. A., Nelson, L. J., Hart, C. H., Yang, C., & Jin, S. (2006). Parenting and peer-group behavior in cultural context. In X. Chen, B. Schneider, & D. French (Eds.), 570 Nelson, Hart, Yang, Olsen, and Jin Peer relations in cultural context (pp. 213 – 246). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nguyen, P.V., & Cheung, M. (2009). Parenting styles as perceived by Vietnamese American adolescents. Child & Adolescent Social Work Journal, 26(6), 505-518. doi:10.1007/s10560-009-0182-0

Niles, S. (1998). Achievement goals and means: A cultural comparison. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29(5), 656-667.

Nixon, E., (2012). *Growing up in Ireland: How families matter for social and emotional outcomes of 9-year-old children.* Dublin, Department of Health and Children.

Nsamenang, A. B. (2004). Cultures of human development and education: Challenge to growing up African. New York: Nova Science Publishers.

Nsamenang, A. B. (2006) Human ontogenesis: An indigenous African view on development and intelligence. International Journal of Psychology 41: 293-297.

Nsamenang, A. B. (2008). Agency in early childhood learning and development in Cameroon. Contemporary Issues in Early Childhood, 9(3), 211-223.

Nsamenang, A. B. (2009). Conceptualizing Developmental Assessment within Africa's Cultural Settings. In E. L. Grigorenko (Ed.) Multicultural psychoeducational assessment. United States of America: Hamilton Printing.

Nsamenang, A.B. (1992). Human Development in Cultural Context: A Third World Perspective. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Nsamenang, B.A. (2011). Towards a philosophy for African education. In Nsamenang, A.B. and Tchombe, T.M.S. (Eds). African educational theories and practices: A generative teacher education handbook. Yaoundé, Cameroon, Presses Universitaires d'Afrique.

Odubote, B. A. (2008). Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 69 (1-A), 2008. pp. 393.

Offord, D. R., Boyle, M. H., & Jones, B. R. (1987). Psychiatric disorder and poor school performance among welfare children in Ontario. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *32*, 518-525.

Ogbu, J. (1981). School ethnography, a multilevel approach, Anthropology and Education Quarterly, *12*(10), 3–29.

Ogundokun, M. O., & Adeyemo, D. A. (2010). Emotional intelligence and academic achievement: The moderating influence of age, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The African Symposium: An online journal of the African Educational Research Network, 10(2), 127-141.

Okonkwo, G. N. (2009). Parental training for academic success. *Unpublished PGDE project*, NTI Kaduna, Nigeria.

Okorodudu, G. N. (2010). Influence of parenting styles on adolescent delinquency in Delta Central Senatorial District. Edo Journal of Counselling, 3(1), 58-86.

Olaniyan, R. (1982). African history and culture: An overview (pp. 1-14). In R. Olaniyan (Ed.), African History and Culture. Lagos, Nigeria: Longman.

Omolola, L. A. (2011). The effects of parenting styles on student's disposition to violence in Osun State, Nigeria. *Revista de Cercetare si Interventie Sociala*, *32*, 86-94.

Omoluabi, P. F. (2002). Impact of parenting style and family relations on the development of psychopathology. Unpublished manuscript. Department of psychology, University of Lagos, Nigeria.

Onakoya, A. Y. (2002). Psychosocial factors influencing attitude towards cheating and cheating behaviour among university students. Unpublished Honour's Thesis, University of Ibadan.

Orvaschel, H., Weissman, M. M., & Kidd, K. K. (1980). Children and depression, The children of depressed parents; the childhood of depressed patients; depression in children. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, *2*, 1-16.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeir, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism, Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses, *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 3-72.

Pahl, K. M., & Barrett, P. M. (2007). The Development of Social–Emotional Competence in Preschool-Aged Children, An Introduction to the Fun Friends Program. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, *17*, 81-90. doi, 10.1375/ajgc.17.1.81.

Park, H. S., & Bauer, S., (2002). Parenting practices, ethnicity, socioeconomic status and Academic achievement in adolescents. *School Psychology International*, *23* (4), 386-396.

Parke, R. D, & Buriel, R. (1998). Socialisation in the family, Ethnic and ecological perspectives. In, Damon W, (Ed.) *Handbook of Child Psychology*. (pp. 463-552) New York , J. Wiley.

Parke, R. D. (1996). *Fatherhood. Cambridge* (pp. 48-60), MA, Harvard University Press.

Parke, R. D., & Clarke-Stewart, C. (2011). *Social development*. Hoboken, NJ, Wiley.

Parker G., Tupling H., & Brown L.B (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *Br J Med Psychol, 52*, 110.

Parker, J, & Bradley, G. (2003) *Social Work Practice, Assessment, Planning, Intervention and Review*, Exeter, Learning Matters Ltd.

Parker, J. D. A., Summerfeldt, L. J., Hogan, M. J., & Majeski, S. A. (2004). Emotional intelligence and academic success, examining the transition from high school to university. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36,* 163–172.

Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood, Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. *Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 611–62.

Pascoe, J. M., Loda, F. A., Jeffries, V., & Easp, J. A. (1981). The association between mother's social support and provision of stimulation to their children. *Developmental and Behavioural Paediatrics 2*, 15-19

Patterson, G. R. (1965). Responsiveness to social stimuli. In L. Krasner & L. P. Ullmann (Eds.), *Research in behaviour modification* (pp. 157-178). New York, Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Patterson, G. R., Reid, J. B., & Dishion, T. J. (1992). *Antisocial boys: A social interactional approach*. Eugene: Castalia Publisher & Co.

Pearson, E., & Rao, N. (2003). Socialisation goals, parenting practices, and peer competence in Chinese and English pre-schoolers. *Early Child Development and Care*, *173*, 131–146.

Penn, H. (2005). Understanding Early Childhood. Issues and controversies. Glasgow: Bell & Brain Ltd.

Piaget, J. (1967*). Six psychological studies*. New York, Vintage.

Pomerantz, E. M., & Wang, Q. (2009). The role of parental control in children's development in Western and East Asian countries. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*, 285-289.

Pomerantz, E. M., Moorman, E. A., & Litwack, S. D. (2007). The how, whom, and why of parents' involvement in children's academic lives: More is not always better. Review of Educational Research, 77, 373-410.

Powell, D. R. (1982). From child to parent, Changing conceptions of early childhood intervention. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, *416*, 135-144.

Pruett, M. K., Ebling, R & Insabella, G. (2004). Critical aspects of parenting plans for young children. FCR, *42*(1), 39-59.

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 & Adolescent Psychology, *31*(2), 272 – 277.

Raval, V. V., Ward, R. M., Raval, P. H., & Trivedi, S. S. (2013). Confirmatory and exploratory factor analysis of Parental Authority Questionnaire in urban India. Journal of Child and Family Studies, 22(5), 707-718.

Raver, C. (2002). Emotions matter: Making the case for the role of young children's emotional development for early school readiness. Social Policy Report of the Society for Research in Child Development, 16(3), 1-20.

Raver, C. C. and Knitze, J. (2002) Ready to Enter: What Research Tells Policymakers About Strategies to Promote Social and Emotional School Readiness Among Three-and Four-Year Old Children Policy Paper No. 3 Promoting the Emotional Well-Being of Children and Families National Center for Children in Poverty.

Raver, C. C., & Zigler, E. F. (2004). Public policy viewpoint. Another step back? Assessing readiness in 'Head Start'. Young Children, 59, 58-63.

Riegel, K. F. (1978) Psychology, mon amour; A countertext. Boston: Houghton Miffin.

Rimm-Kaufman S E, Pianta R C, Cox M J. (2000) Teachers' judgments of problems in the transition to kindergarten. Early Childhood Research Quarterly. 15:147–166.

Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Frost Olsen, S., & Hart, C. H. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. Psychological Reports, 77, 819–830.

Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Frost Olsen, S., & Hart, C. H. (2001). The parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire (PSDQ). In B. F. Perlmutter, J. Touliatos, & G. W. Holden (Eds.), *Handbook of family measurement techniques*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Robson, C. (2011). Real World Research, A Resource for Social Scientists and Practitioner-Researchers. Blackwell.

Rogers, C. R. (1960). A Therapist's View of Personal Goals. *Pendle Hill Pamphlet* (No. 108), Pendle Hill, Wallingford, PA.

Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: Cognitive development in social context.* New York: Oxford University press.

Rogoff, B. (2003). *The cultural nature of human development*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Rogoff, B., & Morelli, G. (1989) Perspectives on Children's Development from Cultural Psychology. *American Psychologist*, *44*, 343 – 348.

Rohner, R. P. (1986). *The warmth dimension, Foundations of parental acceptance-rejection*. Storrs, CT, Rohner Research.

Rohner, R. P. (1990). *Handbook for the study of parental acceptance and rejection*. Storrs, CT, Rohner Research.

Rohner, R. P., & Pettengill, S. M. (1985). Perceived parental acceptance-rejection and parental control among Korean adolescents. *Child Development*, *56*, 524-528.

Rohner, R.P., & Rohner, E.C. (Eds.). (1980). Parental acceptance-rejection and parental control, Cross-cultural codes. *Ethnology*, *20*, 245-260.

Rose-Krasnor, L., & Denham, S. A. (2008). Social and emotional competence in early childhood. In K., H. Rubin, W. Bukowski, & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Handbook of Peer Relationships* (pp. 613-637). New York, Guilford Press.

Rosen, L.D., Cheever, N.A., & Carrier, L.M. (2008). The Association of Parenting Style and Child Age with Parental Limit Setting and Adolescent MySpace Behaviour. *Journal of 6 Applied Developmental Psychology*, *29*, 459-471.

Rothbart, M. K., & Bates, J. E. (2006). Temperament. In W. Damon, R. Lerner, & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology. Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 99–166). New York, Wiley.

Rothrauff, T. C., Cooney, T. M., & An, J. S. (2009). Remembered parenting styles and adjustment in middle and late adulthood. The Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 64B(1), 137–146. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/geron/b/gbn008.

Rubin K. H, Bukowski W, & Parker J. G. (2006) Peer interactions, relationships, and groups. In: Eisenberg N, editor. Handbook of Child Psychology (pp. 571–645) Social, Emotional, and Personality Development. New York: Wiley.

Rubin, K. H., & Mills, R. S. L. (1991). Conceptualizing developmental pathways to internalizing disorders in childhood. Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, *19*, 86-100.

Rubin, K. H., Booth, C. L., Rose-Krasnor, L., & Mills, R. S. L. (1995). Social relationships and social skills, A conceptual and empirical analysis. Close relationships and socio-emotional development (pp. 63-94). Norwood, NJ, Ablex.

Rubin, K. H., Burgess, K. B., & Hastings, P. D. (2002) Stability and social-behavioural consequences of toddler's inhibited temperament and parenting. *Child Development*, *73*, 483-495.

Rubin, K. H., Burgess, K. B., Dwyer, K. M., & Hastings, P. D. (2003) Predicting pre-schooler's externalizing behaviours from toddler temperament, conflict, and maternal negativity. *Developmental Psychology*, 39, 164-176.

Rubin, R. H., Bukowski, W., & Parker, J. G. (1998). Peer interaction relationship and groups. In W. Damon (Eds.). *Handbook of child psychology* (pp 645) New York, Wiley.

Rudy, D., & Grusec, J. E. (2006). Authoritarian parenting in individualist and collectivist groups, Associations with maternal emotion and cognition and children's self-esteem. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*, 68-78.

Rutter, M. (1987) Temperament, personality and personality disorder. *British Journal of Psychiatry, 150*, 443 -458.

Rutter, M. (2007), Gene–environment interdependence. Developmental Science, 10: 12–18. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-7687.2007.00557.x

Saarinen, P., Ruoppila, I. & Korkiakangas, M. 1994. Kasvatuspsykologian kysymyksiä. Helsinginyliopisto: Lahden koulutus-ja tutkimuskeskus. [Problems in Educational Psychology. University of Helsinki: Lahti's Centrum of Education and Research]

Saarni C, (2011). Emotional Development in Childhood, *J. Encyclopaedia on Early Childhood Development* (pp. 1-7) CEECD / SKC-ECD.

Saarni C. (1998). Issues of cultural meaningfulness in emotional development. *Developmental Psychology*, *34*, 647–652.

Saarni, C. (1990). Emotional competence, How emotions and relationships become integrated. In R. A. Thompson (Ed*.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, Vol. 36.* Socioemotional development (pp. 115-182). Lincoln, University of Nebraska Press.

Saarni, C. (2008). The interface of emotional development with social context. In M. Lewis, J. Haviland-Jones & L. Feldman Barrett (Eds.), *The Handbook of Emotions* (pp. 332-347). New York, Guilford Press.

Saarni, C., Campos, J. J., Camras, L., A., & Witherington, D. (2008). Principles of emotion and emotional competence. In W. Damon & R. Lerner (Eds.), *Child and adolescent development: An advanced course* (pp. 361-405). Hoboken, New Jersey, John Wiley & Sons.

Sameroff, A. (1975). *Transactional models of early social relations*. Human Development, *18*, 65-79. doi: 10.1159/000271476

Sameroff, A. (1994). Developmental systems and family functioning. In R. D. Parke & S. G. Kellam (Eds.), *Exploring family relationships with other social contexts* (pp. 199-214). Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum.

Sameroff, A. (2009). The transactional model. In A. Sameroff (Ed.), *The transactional model of development, How children and contexts shape each other* (pp. 23–32). Washington, DC, American Psychological Association.

Sameroff, A. (2010). A unified theory of development, A dialectic integration of nature and nurture. *Child Development, 81*(1), 6–22.

Sameroff, A. J (2000). Developmental Systems and Psychopathology. *Journal of Development and Psychopathology, 12*, 297-312.

Sameroff, A. J., & Chandler, M. J. (1975). Reproductive risk and the continuum of caretaking casualty. In F. D. Horowitz, M. Hetherington, S. Scarr-Salapatek, & G. Siegel (Eds.), *Review of child development research* (*Vol. 4*, pp. 187–244). Chicago, University of Chicago Press.

Sanson, A. V., & Rothbart, M. K. (1995). Child temperament and parenting. In, M. H. Bornstein (Ed.). *Handbook of parenting* (pp. 299–321). Hillsdale, NJ, Erlbaum.

Schaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behaviour. *Journal of Abnormal and social Psychological*, *59*, 226-235.

Schaffer, H. R. (2011). Social interaction and the beginnings of communication. In A. Slater, & G. Bremner, *An Introduction to Developmental Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 217-242). Chichester: BPS Blackwell.

Schneider, B. H., Woodburn, S., del Pilar Soteras del Toro, M., & Udvari, S. J. (2005). Cultural and gender differences in the implications of competition for early adolescent friendship. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, *51*(2), 163 – 191.

Schultz, D., Izard, C. E., Ackerman, B. P., & Youngstrom, E. A. (2001). Emotion knowledge in economically disadvantaged children, Self-regulatory antecedents and relations to social difficulties and withdrawal. *Development & Psychopathology*, *13*, 53-67.

Sears, R. R., Macoby, E., and Levin, H. (1957). Patterns of Child Rearing, Row, Peterson, Evanston, IL.

Sharma, V. & Sandhu, G. K. (2006). A community study of association between parenting dimensions and externalizing behaviour. *Journal of Indian Association of Child Adolescent Mental Health, 2*(2), 48-58.

Shumow, L., Vandell, D. L., & Posner, J. K. (1998). Harsh, firm, and permissive parenting in low-income families. *Journal of Family Issues, 19,* 438-507.

Siddiqi A, Irwin L, & Hertzman C. (2007) Total environment assessment model for early child development: Evidence report for the World Health Organisation's Commission on the

Social Determinants of Health. Vancouver, BC: Human Early Learning Partnership (HELP).

Skinner, B. F. (1971). *Beyond Freedom and Dignity*. New York, Knopf.

Slater, A & Bremmer, G. (2011). *An Introduction to Developmental Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 41-243). Chichester: The British Psychological Society & Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Sorkhabi, N. (2005). Applicability of Baumrind's parent typology to collective cultures, Analysis of cultural explanations of parent socialisation effects. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, *29*, 552–563.

Sosna, T., & Mastergeorge, A. (2005). *The infant, preschool, family, mental health initiative*, *Compendium of screening tools for early childhood social-emotional development*. Sacramento, California Institute for Mental Health.

Spencer, J. P., Blumberg, M. S., McMurray, B., Robinson, S. R., Samuelson, L. K., & Tomblin, J. B. (2009). Short arms and talking eggs, Why we should no longer abide the nativist-empiricist debate. *Child Development Perspectives*, *3*(2), 79-87.

Spera, C. (2005). A Review of the Relationship among Parenting Practices, Parenting Styles, and Adolescent School Achievement. *Educational Psychology Review*, *17*(2), 125-146. http//dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10648-005-3950-1.

Spinrad, T. L, Eisenberg, N, Gaertner, B, Popp, T, Smith, C. L, et al. (2007). Relations of maternal socialisation and toddlers' effortful control to children's adjustment and social competence. Dev Psychol. 43:1170–86.

Squires, J., Bricker, D., and Twombly, E. (2003). *The ASQ, SE users guide*. Maryland, Paul H Brooks Publishing Co. p 3.

Sroufe, L. A. (1990). Considering normal and abnormal together: The essence of developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, *2*, 335-347.

Sroufe, L. A. (1996). *Emotional development: The organisation of emotional life in the early years*. New York, Cambridge University Press.

Starr, M. (2011). The relationship between parenting styles, learning autonomy, and scholastic achievement in undergraduate college students. *Master's Thesis*. Bucknell Digital Commons, Bucknell University. Pp 34.

Steinberg, L. (1990). Interdependency in the family, autonomy, conflict, and harmony in the parent-adolescent relationship. In S. S. Feldman & G. R. Elliot (Ed.) *At the Threshold, The Developing Adolescent*, (pp. 255-276). Cambridge, MA, Harvard Univ. Press.

Steinberg, L. (2008). A social neuroscience perspective on adolescent risk-taking. *Developmental Review*, *28*, 78 –106.

Steinberg, L., Blatt-Eisengart, I., & Cauffman, E. (2006). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful homes, Replication in a sample of serious juvenile offenders. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *16*, 47-58.

Steinberg, L., Dornbusch, S. M., & Brown, B. B. 1992. Ethnic differences in adolescent achievement. An ecological perspective. *Am Psychol.*, *47*(6), 723-9.

Steinberg, L., Elmen, J. D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychosocial maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development*, *60*, 1424-1436.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S., Darling, N., Mounts, N., & Dornbusch, S. (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development*, *65*, 754-770.

Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S., Dornbusch, S, & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement, Authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development*, *63*, 1266-1281.

Steinberg, L., Mounts, N. S., Lamborn, S. D., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment across varied ecological niches. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, *1*(1), 19-36.

Stipek, D. (2006) No child left behind comes to preschool. *The Elementary School Journal*, *106*(5), 455-465.

Sylva, K. (1994). School influences on children's development. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *35*, 135-170.

Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Taggart, B. (2008). Effective Pre-school and Primary Education 3-11 Project (EPPE 3-11) *Final report from the primary phase, pre-school, school and family Influences on children's development during Key Stage 2 (age 7-11)*. Nottingham, DCSF Publications [DCSF RR 061].

Sylva, K., Melhuish, E., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I., & Taggart, B. (2012*). Effective Pre-school, Primary and Secondary Education 3-14* (*EPPSE 3-14)*, Department for Children, Schools and Families/ESRC (TLRP Project), 2007-2011.

Sylva, K., Sammons, P., Siraj-Blatchford, I., Melhuish, E. & Taggart, B. (2004). *The EPPE Project, Second Parent Survey*, Department for Education and Skills, 2001-2003.

Symonds, P. M. (1939). *The Psychology of Parent-Child Relationships*, Appleton-Century-Crofts, New York.

Tam, V. C., & Lam, R. S. (2003). Parenting style of Chinese fathers in Hong Kong, Correlates with children's school-related performance. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, *15*(1), 51-62.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Cabrera, N. (2002). (Eds.). Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Shannon, J. D., Cabrera, N., & Lamb, M. E. (2004). Fathers and mothers at play with their 2- and 3-year-olds: Contributions to language and cognitive development. Child Development, 75, 1806–1820.

Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Way, N., Hughes, D., Yoshikawa, H., Kahana-Kalman, R. & Niwa, E. (2008). Parents' Goals for Children: The Dynamic Co-Existence of Collectivism and Individualism. Social Development, 17 (1), 183-209.

Tashakkori, A & Teddlie, C. (2003). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research* (pp. 297-319). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Tenibiaje, D. J., & Adegoroye, B-Smith (2010). *The Need for Curriculum Modules for Political Socialisation of Nigerian Youths, 2*(2), 87.

Thijs, J. T., Koomen, H. M., De Jong, P. F., Van der Leij, A., &Van Leeuwen, M. G. (2004). Internalizing behaviors among kindergarten children: Measuring dimensions of social withdrawal with a checklist. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*(4), 802–812.

Thomas, A. (1984). Temperament research, where we are, where we are going. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, *30*(2), 103–109.

Thomas, A., & Chess, S. (1977). *Temperament and development*. New York University Press.

Thomas, A., Chess. S., Birth, H. G., Hertzig. M. E., & Korn, S. (1963). *Behavioural individuality in early childhood*. New York, New York University Press.

Thompson K (1976). *Auguste Comte: The foundation of Sociology* London; Nelson

Thompson, R. A. (1994). Emotion regulation, A theme in search of definition. In N. A. Fox (Ed.), *The development of emotion regulation, Biological and behavioural considerations* (Vol. 59, pp. 25-52). (Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development).

Thompson, R. A., & Virmani, E. A. (2010). *Handbook of cultural developmental science* (pp. 195-207). New York, Psychology Press.

Tiller, A., Garrison, B., Benchea Block, E., Cramer, K., & Tiller, V. (2003). *The Influence of Parenting Styles on Children's Cognitive Development*. Retrieved on March 15, 2009.

Tizard, B., Blatchford, P., Burke, J., Farquhar, C., & Plewis, I. (1988). *Young Children at school in the inner city.* London, Erlbaum.

Topping, K. 1998, Peer Assessment Between Students in Colleges and Universities, *Review of Educational Research*, *68*, 3, 249-276.

Triandis (1997). *Cross-cultural perspectives on personality* (pp. 439-464). San Diego, Academic Press.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). The self and social behaviour differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, *96*, 506–520.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). The self and social practices in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, *96*, 506-520.

Triandis, H., (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality, *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 907-924.

Tunde-Ayinmode, M. F. & Adegunloye, O. A., (2011). Parenting style and conduct problems in children, A report of deliberate self-poisoning in a Nigerian child. *South African Journal of Psychiatry, 17*(2), 60-63.

Uwe, E. A. (1997). Parental Roles in Behaviour modification of youths. *The Calabar Counsellor*, *1*(1), 121-126.

Uwe, E. A., Asuquo, P. N., & Ekuri, E. E. (2008). Parenting and Responsibility, Holding Parents Accountable for Children's Antisocial Practices. *J. Hum. Ecol.*, *24*(1), 51-57.

Vahedi, M. (2010). A study of parents' participation in the high schools administration and its effect on school activities. Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 2, 359-363. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.025

Vahedi, M. (2010). A study of parents' participation in the high schools administration and its effect on school activities. *Procedia Social and Behavioural Sciences, 2*, 359-363. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.03.025

Villalobos, J. A., Cruz, A. V., & Sanchez, P. R. (2004). Parental styles and psychosocial development in high school students. *Revista Mexicana de Psicologia*, *21*, 119-129.

Vygotsky, L. (1978). Interaction between learning and development. *Mind and Society*, (pp 79-111). Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press.

Wakschlag, Lauren S., & Sydney L. Hans. (1999). Relation of maternal responsiveness during infancy to the development of behaviour problems in high-risk youths. *Developmental Psychology,* 35, 569-579.

Wang, L., Chen, X., Chen, H., Cui, L., & Li, M. (2006). Affect and maternal parenting as predictors of adaptive and maladaptive behaviours in Chinese children. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, *30*, 158–166.

Waters, E., & Sroufe, L. A. (1983). Social competence as a developmental construct. *Dev Rev.*, *3*, 79–97.

Watson, J. B. (1928). The *Psychological Care of Infant and Child*. New York, W.W. Norton Company, Inc.

Weare, K., & Gray, G. (2003). What works in developing children's emotional and social competence and wellbeing? *Research Report No 456*. Crown Printers, University of Southampton, Health Education Unit, Research and Graduate School of Education.

Whiting, B. B., & Edwards, C. P. (1988). *Children of Different Worlds*. Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Whiting, J. W. M., & Whiting, B. B. (1975). Children of six cultures: A psychocultural analysis. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Williams, L. R., Degnan K. A., Perez-Edgar, K. E., Henderson, H. A., Rubin, K. H., Pine, D. S.,… Fox, N. A. (2009). Impact of behavioural inhibition and parenting style on

internalizing and externalizing problems from early childhood through adolescence. *J Abnorm Child Psychol.*, *37*(8), 1063-75.

Winsler, A., Diaz, R. M., Atencio, D. J., McCarthy, E. M., & Chabay, L. A. (2000). Verbal self-regulation over time in preschool children at risk for attention and behaviour problems. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *41*, 875-886.

Winsler, A., Madigan, A. L., & Aquilino, S. A. (2005). Correspondence between maternal and paternal parenting styles in early childhood. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 20*, 1-12.

Wu, P., Robinson, C. C., Yang, C., Hart, C. H., Olsen, S. F., Porter, C. L.,… & Wu, X. (2002). Similarities and differences in mothers' parenting of pre-schoolers in China and the United States. *International Journal of Behavioural Development*, *26*, 481–491.

Xu, Y., Farver, J. M., Zhang, Z., Zeng, Z., Yu, L., & Cai, B. (2005). Mainland Chinese parenting styles and parent-child interaction. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 29,* 524-531.

Yorburg, (2002). *Family realities*: A global view Prentice-Hall, New Jersey.

Zigler, E. (1973). Project 'Head Start', Success or failure? *Learning*, *1,* 43-47.

Zimmerman, M. A, Copeland, Laurel, H., Shope, J. T, & Dielman, T. E. (1997). A longitudinal study of self-esteem, implications for Adolescent development. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *126*, 117-141.

Appendices

APPENDIX I: MAP OF NIGERIA SHOWING ABUJA

APPENDIX II: MAP OF ABUJA

APPENDIX III: COVER LETTER

Parenting Styles and Social-Emotional Competence of Pre-school Children in Abuja, Nigeria

Dear Sir/Ma,…………………………………………………………………………..

I am Adeyemi Abosede Eniola, an MPhil student of University of Strathclyde, School of Education. We are required to apply our knowledge of research as part of the fulfilment of a Postgraduate Studies in the department. Most researches conducted on parenting styles are on its influence on academic performance. Parenting style is known to affect social-emotional outcomes. This study aims to investigate parenting styles in Abuja and relate this to social-emotional outcomes.

In order to carry out this research, I hope to be able to recruit parents from four schools in two district areas in Abuja, and I am approaching you to ask if you would be willing to have this research carried out in your school. I am hoping to recruit parents of 100 pre-schoolers of which 25 will be from each of the four schools. Parents will be given questionnaires to complete and I will ask the teacher of that nursery class to complete a short questionnaire about the social behaviour of each child in the class where parents have agreed to participate. This will take about 5 minutes per child. The anonymity of the participants will be ensured throughout the study. The result will be treated confidentially and will only be published for academic purposes. I am planning to carry out the research in July 2012.

In order to ensure anonymity, I will need the help of the school in assigning an identity code to each child. All information gathered will be treated with paramount respect and confidentiality. I will be happy to come and explain more. I am enclosing the parent and teacher information and consent forms for your information. Please be assured that your decision to take part in this study is completely voluntary. If you agree to have the research carried out in your school, please fill in the consent form and reply by e-mail or phone, using the contact details below. I will then come to the school with the questionnaire packs.

If there is any enquiry, please contact me.

Adeyemi Abosede Eniola
University of Strathclyde

abosede.adeyemi@strath.ac.uk

APPENDIX IV A: CONSENT FORM (Head Teacher)

University of
Strathclyde

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

CONSENT FORM (Head teacher)

NAME OF DEPARTMENT: School of Education

TITLE OF STUDY: Parenting Style and Social and Emotional competence
Of Preschool Children in Abuja, Nigeria.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above project and the researcher has answered any queries to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that my decision to give permission is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw the school from the project at any time, without having to give a reason and without any consequences.

3. I confirm that I am the head teacher of the school on which information is being collected for the purpose of this research.

4. I consent to the use of information collected about the children in this study being used solely for the indicated research purpose.

5. I understand that the school can withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason and without any consequences.

6. I understand that any information collected in the investigation will remain confidential and no information that identifies the school will be made publicly available.

7. I give permission for this study to be carried out in this school.

(PRINT NAME)	Hereby give permission in this project
Pastor Wale Adebisi (SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT)	DATE

222

APPENDIX IV B: CONSENT FORM (Head Teacher)

University of
Strathclyde

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

CONSENT FORM (Head teacher)

NAME OF DEPARTMENT: School of Education

TITLE OF STUDY: Parenting Style and Social and Emotional competence
Of Preschool Children in Abuja, Nigeria.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above project and the researcher has answered any queries to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that my decision to give permission is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw the school from the project at any time, without having to give a reason and without any consequences.

3. I confirm that I am the head teacher of the school on which information is being collected for the purpose of this research.

4. I consent to the use of information collected about the children in this study being used solely for the indicated research purpose.

5. I understand that the school can withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason and without any consequences.

6. I understand that any information collected in the investigation will remain confidential and no information that identifies the school will be made publicly available.

7. I give permission for this study to be carried out in this school.

(PRINT NAME)	Hereby give permission in this project
Master Sunday EKPO (SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT)	Anunu. DATE 22-07-2022

223

APPENDIX IV C: CONSENT FORM (HEAD TEACHER)

University of
Strathclyde

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

CONSENT FORM (Head teacher)

NAME OF DEPARTMENT: School of Education

TITLE OF STUDY: Parenting Style and Social and Emotional competence
Of Preschool Children in Abuja, Nigeria.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above project and the researcher has answered any queries to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that my decision to give permission is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw the school from the project at any time, without having to give a reason and without any consequences.

3. I confirm that I am the head teacher of the school on which information is being collected for the purpose of this research.

4. I consent to the use of information collected about the children in this study being used solely for the indicated research purpose.

5. I understand that the school can withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason and without any consequences.

6. I understand that any information collected in the investigation will remain confidential and no information that identifies the school will be made publicly available.

7. I give permission for this study to be carried out in this school.

| (PRINT NAME) | Hereby give permission in this project *Mrs Aniekwure Joan* |
| (SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT) | DATE |

APPENDIX IV D: CONSENT FORM (HEAD TEACHER)

University of
Strathclyde

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

CONSENT FORM (Head teacher)

NAME OF DEPARTMENT: School of Education

TITLE OF STUDY: Parenting Style and Social and Emotional competence
Of Preschool Children in Abuja, Nigeria.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above project and the researcher has answered any queries to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that my decision to give permission is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw the school from the project at any time, without having to give a reason and without any consequences.

3. I confirm that I am the head teacher of the school on which information is being collected for the purpose of this research.

4. I consent to the use of information collected about the children in this study being used solely for the indicated research purpose.

5. I understand that the school can withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason and without any consequences.

6. I understand that any information collected in the investigation will remain confidential and no information that identifies the school will be made publicly available.

7. I give permission for this study to be carried out in this school.

AKINFOLARIN, G. F (MR)	Hereby give permission in this project
(PRINT NAME)	I am satisfied.
(SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT)	DATE SIGN 07-2012

APPENDIX IV E: CONSENT FORM (HEAD TEACHER)

University of
Strathclyde

UNIVERSITY OF STRATHCLYDE

CONSENT FORM (Head teacher)

NAME OF DEPARTMENT: School of Education

TITLE OF STUDY: Parenting Style and Social and Emotional competence
Of Preschool Children in Abuja, Nigeria.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for the above project and the researcher has answered any queries to my satisfaction.

2. I understand that my decision to give permission is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw the school from the project at any time, without having to give a reason and without any consequences.

3. I confirm that I am the head teacher of the school on which information is being collected for the purpose of this research.

4. I consent to the use of information collected about the children in this study being used solely for the indicated research purpose.

5. I understand that the school can withdraw from the study at any time, without giving a reason and without any consequences.

6. I understand that any information collected in the investigation will remain confidential and no information that identifies the school will be made publicly available.

7. I give permission for this study to be carried out in this school.

(PRINT NAME) MRS M. MANTEY	Hereby give permission in this project
	PERMITTED
SPRINGSVILLE INT'L SCHOOL ASOKORO ABUJA	SPRINGSVILLE INT'L SCHOOL ASOKORO ABUJA
(SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT) SIGN	SIGN 7th July 2012
DATE	DATE

APPENDIX V: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET (TEACHERS)

Participant Information Sheet (Teachers)

Name of department: **School of Education**

Title of the study: **Parenting Style and Social and Emotional Competence of Pre-school Children in Abuja, Nigeria**

Introduction

  My name is Abosede Eniola Adeyemi. I am currently an MPhil student from the School of Education at Strathclyde University. This research is being carried out as part fulfilment of a degree at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK. My contact details are provided at the end of this information sheet. You are cordially invited to take part in the research study, and before you decide, you need to have a clear understanding of the research- what the research entails and why it is being done. Please take time to read the information carefully.

  What is the Purpose of this Investigation?

  The aim of this research is to investigate parenting styles and social-emotional competence of pre-school children in Abuja, Nigeria. The purpose of the research is to find out what type of parenting style is being used by parents and to explore factors that affect parenting styles. In addition, the study will investigate the links between parenting style and social-emotional competence of pre-school children. .

  Do you have to take part?

  Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can choose; if you wish, to participate. You will be free to withdraw from the study at any stage without giving a reason and without any consequences. .

  What will you do in the project?

  The parents of the children who participate in the study in your class will be asked to fill out a questionnaire. You will be asked to fill in a short questionnaire about the social-emotional behaviour of the children whose parents have agreed to participate. This should take about 5 minutes to complete for each child.

  Why have you been invited to take part?

  You have been asked to take part in the study because you are the teacher of the child aged 4-5yrs old in a pre-school. Your school has given permission for this research to be carried

out in the school and for the teacher of the pre-school children to be invited to take part. The school has forwarded this information pack to you on my behalf.

What are the potential risks to you in taking part?

There are no potential risks involved in taking part in the study. All responses will be confidential and anonymous, and individuals and schools will not be identified in any publication. The researcher will be ready to discuss any concerns you may have about the questionnaire.

What happens to the information in the project?

All the information will be confidential, securely stored and anonymized. Information will be saved and stored on a coded file. After the results have been collated, the thesis will be written and submitted as part fulfilment of the degree. Only the researcher and the supervisors will have access to the study. Any quotations used will remain anonymous. There will be no information that will be included throughout the final writing up stage of the dissertation that will identify individual participants. After completion of the thesis, all the questionnaires used will be destroyed. The summary of the research findings will be made available if participants want a copy.

What happens next?

The researcher will be pleased to answer any questions you have about the research. If you decide to participate, please sign the consent form. You will be asked to fill in the questionnaire on the social-emotional competence of the children in your class after their parents have filled their parents' consent form. If you choose not to participate, then I thank you for your time in reading this.

Researcher Contact Details

Adeyemi Abosede Eniola

Research Student

Strathclyde University

School of Education

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Strathclyde

76, South Brae Drive

Email address, abosede.adeyemi@strath.ac.uk.

Tel: +44 (0) 7428108411

Chief Investigator Details,

Dr. Helen Marwick

Postgraduate Research Coordinator

School of Education

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Strathclyde

76, South Brae Drive

Glasgow G13 1PP

Tel. +44 (0) 141 950 3592.

The University of Strathclyde is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SCO15263. This investigation was granted ethical approval by the School of Education ethics committee. If you have any questions/concerns, during or after the investigation, or wish to contact an independent person to whom any questions may be directed or further information may be sought from, please contact

Allan Blake

Ethics Convener

School of Education

University of Strathclyde

Lord Hope Building

141 St James Road,

Glasgow, G4 0LT

Email, a.blake@strath.ac.uk

APPENDIX VI: PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET (PARENTS)

<div align="center">

Participant Information Sheet (Parents)

</div>

Name of department: **School of Education**

Title of the study: **Parenting Style and Social and Emotional Competence of Pre-school Children in Abuja, Nigeria**

Introduction

My name is Abosede Eniola Adeyemi. I am currently an MPhil student from school of Education at Strathclyde University. This research is being carried out as part fulfilment of a degree at the University of Strathclyde, Glasgow, UK. My contact details are provided at the end of the information sheet. You are cordially invited to take part in the research study, and before you decide, you need to have a clear understanding of the research, what the research entails and why it is being done. Please take time to read the information carefully.

What is the Purpose of this Investigation?

The aim of the study is to find out whether parental discipline and the way parents raise their children affect the social interaction or social behaviour of nursery school children in Abuja, Nigeria. The research will also look at some factors that might influence the ways parents raise their children. In addition, the study will explore possible links between the ways that parents raise their children and the social behaviour of pre-school children.

Do you have to take part?

Your participation is entirely voluntary and you can choose; if you wish, to participate. You will be free to withdraw from the study at any stage without giving a reason and without any consequences.

What will you do in the project?

You will be asked to fill in two questionnaires that are enclosed; one questionnaire will be about your educational background and occupation and the second questionnaire is about your parenting style. The questionnaires have been included in this pack, but you will only fill them in if you decide to take part in the research. Please be assured that even if you decide to take part in the research, you do not have to answer any question in the questionnaire that you are not comfortable with answering. Additionally, if you agree, your child's class teacher will be asked to fill a short questionnaire about your child's social and emotional behaviour.

Why have you been invited to take part?

You have been asked to take part in the study because you are the parent of a child aged 4-5yrs old in a pre-school. Your child's school has given permission for this research to be carried out in the school and for the parents of the pre-school children to be invited to take part. The school has forwarded this information pack to you on my behalf.

What are the potential risks to you in taking part?

There are no potential risks involved in taking part in the study. All responses will be confidential and anonymous, and individuals and schools will not be identified in any publication. The researcher will be ready to discuss any concerns you may have about the questionnaires.

What happens to the information in the project?

All the information will be confidential, securely stored and anonymized. Information will be saved and stored on a coded file. After the results have been collated, the thesis will be written and submitted as part fulfilment of the degree. Only the researcher and the supervisors will have access to the study. Any quotations used will remain anonymous. There will be no information that will be included throughout the final writing up stage of the dissertation that will identify individual participants. After completion of the thesis, all the questionnaires used will be destroyed. The summary of the research findings will be made available if participants want a copy. .

What happens next?

The researcher will be pleased to answer any questions you have about the research. If you decide you will participate, then please sign the consent form and also fill in the questionnaires. Please return both the consent form and questionnaires to the researcher by putting it in your child's bag to hand back to his/her class teacher. If you choose not to participate, then I thank you for your time in reading this

Researcher Contact Details

Adeyemi Abosede Eniola

Research Student

Strathclyde University

School of Education

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Strathclyde

76, South brae Drive

Email address, abosede.adeyemi@strath.ac.uk.

Tel. +44 (0) 7428108411

Chief Investigator Details,

Dr. Helen Marwick

Postgraduate Research Coordinator

School of Education

Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences

University of Strathclyde

76, South Brae Drive

Glasgow G13 1PP

Tel. +44 (0) 141 950 3592

The University of Strathclyde is a charitable body, registered in Scotland, with registration number SCO15263.

This investigation was granted ethical approval by the School of Education ethics committee.

If you have any questions/concerns, during or after the investigation, or wish to contact an independent person to whom any questions may be directed or further information may be sought from, please contact, .

Allan Blake

Ethics Convener

School of Education, University of Strathclyde

Lord Hope Building

141 St James Road, Glasgow. G4 0LT.

Email, a.blake@strath.ac.uk

APPENDIX VII: QUESTIONNAIRE (PSDQ)

PARENTING STYLES & DIMENSIONS QUESTIONNAIRE –
SHORT VERSION
(PSDQ-Short Version)

Directions,

This questionnaire is designed to measure how often you exhibit certain behaviours towards your child (name).

Example,

Please read each item on the questionnaire and think about how often you exhibit this behaviour and place your answer on the line to the left of the item.

3.1.   I allow my child to choose what to wear to school.

I EXHIBIT THIS BEHAVIOR,

1 = Never

2 = Once in a while

3 = About Half of the Time

4 = Very Often

5 = Always

Parent PSDQ

_____ 1. I am responsive to my child's feelings and needs.

_____ 2. I use physical punishment as a way of disciplining my child.

_____ 3. I take my child's desires into account before asking him/her to do something.

_____ 4. When my child asks why he/she has to conform, I state, because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to.

_____ 5. I explain to my child how I feel about the child's good and bad behavior.

_____ 6. I spank when my child is disobedient.

_____ 7. I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.

_____ 8. I find it difficult to discipline my child.

_____ 9. I encourage my child to freely express (himself/herself) even when disagreeing with me.

_____ 10. I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little if any explanations.

_____ 11. I emphasise the reasons for rules.

_____ 12. I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset.

_____ 13. I yell or shout when my child misbehaves.

_____ 14. I give praise when my child is good.

_____ 15. I give in to my child when the child causes a commotion about something.

_____ 16. I explode in anger towards my child.

_____ 17. I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it.

_____ 18. I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.

_____ 19. I grab my child when being disobedient.

_____ 20. I state punishments to my child and do not actually do them.

_____ 21. I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them.

_____ 22. I allow my child to give input into family rules.

_____ 23. I scold and criticize to make my child improve.

_____ 24. I spoil my child.

_____ 25. I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed.

_____ 26. I use threats as punishment with little or no justification.

_____ 27. I have warm and intimate times together with my child.

_____ 28. I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations.

_____ 29. I help my child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.

_____ 30. I scold or criticize when my child's behavior doesn't meet my expectations.

_____ 31. I explain the consequences of the child's behavior.

_____ 32. I slap my child when the child misbehaves

APPENDIX VIII: PARENTING STYLES & DIMENSIONS QUESTIONNAIRE

SHORT VERSION

(PSDQ-Short Version)

Constructs Scoring Key

AUTHORITATIVE PARENTING STYLE (FACTOR 1*)

Sub-factor 1 - Connection Dimension (Warmth & Support).

7.   Encourages child to talk about the child's troubles.

1.   Responsive to child's feelings or needs.

12.   Gives comfort and understanding when child is upset.

14.   Gives praise when child is good.

27.   Has warm and intimate times together with child.

[To obtain a Connection Dimension score - mean the above 5 items]

Sub-factor 2 - Regulation Dimension (Reasoning/Induction).

25.   Gives child reasons why rules should be obeyed.

29.   Helps child to understand the impact of behaviour by encouraging child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.

31.   Explains the consequences of the child's behaviour.

11.   Emphasises the reasons for rules.

5.   Explains to child how we feel about the child's good and bad behaviour.

[To obtain a Regulation Dimension score - mean the above 5 items]

Sub-factor 3 – Autonomy Granting Dimension (Democratic Participation).

21.   Shows respect for child's opinions by encouraging child to express them.

9.   Encourages child to freely express (him/herself) even when disagreeing with parents.

22.   Allows child to make input into family rules.

3.   Takes child's desires into account before asking the child to do something.

18.   Takes into account child's preferences in making plans for the family.

[To obtain an Autonomy Granting Dimension score - mean the above 5 items]

*Alpha=.86; Sample=1377

[To obtain an overall Authoritative Parenting Style score - mean all 15 items

AUTHORITARIAN PARENTING STYLE (FACTOR 2*)

Sub-factor 1 - Physical Coercion Dimension

2.   Uses physical punishment as a way of disciplining our child

6.   Spanks when our child is disobedient

32.   Slaps child when the child misbehaves

19.   Grabs child when being disobedient

[To obtain a Physical Coercion Dimension score - mean the above 4 items]

Sub-factor 2 - Verbal Hostility Dimension

16.   Explodes in anger towards child.

13.   Yells or shouts when child misbehaves.

23.   Scolds and criticizes to make child improve.

30.   Scolds and criticizes when child's behavior doesn't meet our expectations.

[To obtain a Verbal Hostility Dimension score - mean the above 4 items]

Sub-factor 3 - Non-Reasoning/Punitive Dimension

10.   Punishes by taking privileges away from child with little if any explanations.

26.   Uses threats as punishment with little or no justification.

28.   Punishes by putting child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations.

4.   When child asks why (he)(she) has to conform, states, because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to.

[To obtain a Non-Reasoning/Punitive Dimension score - mean the above 4 items]

Alpha=.82; Sample=1377

[To obtain an overall Authoritarian Parenting Style score - mean all 12 items.

PERMISSIVE PARENTING STYLE (FACTOR 3*)

Indulgent Dimension

20.   States punishments to child and does not actually do them.

17.   Threatens child with punishment more often than actually giving it.

15.   Gives in to child when (he)(she) causes a commotion about something.

8.   Finds it difficult to discipline child.

24.   Spoils child.

Alpha=.64; Sample=1377

[To obtain an overall Permissive Parenting Style score - mean all 5 items]

Note: Please use the following when referencing the PSDQ-Short Version,

Robinson, C. C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S. F. & Hart, C. H. (2001). The Parenting Styles and Dimensions Questionnaire (PSDQ). In B. F. Perlmutter, J. Touliatos & G. W. Holden (Eds.), *Handbook of Family Measurement Techniques, Vol. 3. Instruments & Index* (Pp. 319 - 321). Thousand Oaks, Sage.

APPENDIX IX: STRENGTHS AND DIFFICULTIES QUESTIONNAIRE

For each item, please mark the box for Not True, Somewhat True or Certainly True. It would help us if you answered all items as best you can even if you are not absolutely certain or the item seems daft! Please give your answers on the basis of the child's behaviour over the last six months or this school year.

Child's Name .... Male/Female

Date of Birth..

	Not true	Somewhat true	Certainly true
Considerate of other people's feelings ...	☐	☐	☐
Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long	☐	☐	☐
Often complains of headaches, stomach-aches or sickness	☐	☐	☐
Shares readily with other children (treats, toys, pencils etc.)	☐	☐	☐
Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers ...	☐	☐	☐
Rather solitary, tends to play alone ...	☐	☐	☐
Generally obedient, usually does what adults request ...	☐	☐	☐
Many worries, often seems worried ...	☐	☐	☐
Helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill	☐	☐	☐
Constantly fidgeting or squirming ...	☐	☐	☐
Has at least one good friend ...	☐	☐	☐
Often fights with other children or bullies them	☐	☐	☐
Often unhappy, down-hearted or tearful	☐	☐	☐
Generally liked by other children	☐	☐	☐
Easily distracted, concentration wanders ...	☐	☐	☐
Nervous or clingy in new situations, easily loses confidence	☐	☐	☐
Kind to younger children ...	☐	☐	☐
Often lies or cheats ...	☐	☐	☐
Picked on or bullied by other children ...	☐	☐	☐
Often volunteers to help others (parents, teachers, other children)	☐	☐	☐
Thinks things out before acting ...	☐	☐	☐

Steals from home, school or elsewhere ...	☐	☐	☐
Gets on better with adults than with other children ...	☐	☐	☐
Many fears, easily scared ...	☐	☐	☐
Sees tasks through to the end, good attention span ...	☐	☐	☐

Do you have any other comments or concerns?

Overall, do you think that this child has difficulties in one or more of the following areas: emotions, concentration, behaviour or being able to get on with other people?

No	Yes-minor difficulties	Yes-definite difficulties	Yes-severe difficulties
☐	☐	☐	☐

If you have answered "Yes", please answer the following questions about these difficulties,

How long have these difficulties been present?

Less than a month	1-5 months	6-12 months	Over a year
☐	☐	☐	☐

Do the difficulties upset or distress the child?

Not at all	Only a little	Quite a lot	A great deal
☐	☐	☐	☐

Do the difficulties interfere with the child's everyday life in the following areas?

	Not at all	Only a little	Quite a lot	A great deal
PEER RELATIONSHIPS	☐	☐	☐	☐
CLASSROOM LEARNING	☐	☐	☐	☐

Do the difficulties put a burden on you or the class as a whole?

Not at all	Only a little	Quite a lot	A great deal
☐	☐	☐	☐
☐	☐	☐	☐

Signature .... Date ....

Class Teacher/Form Tutor/Head of Year/Other (please specify).

Thank you very much for your help.

APPENDIX X: RESULTS

Frequencies

Frequency Table

Sex of child

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	36	36.0	36.0	36.0
	Female	25	25.0	25.0	61.0
	Sex not indicated	39	39.0	39.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Child's age (years) (binned)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	4	19	19.0	41.3	41.3
	5	27	27.0	58.7	100.0
	Total	46	46.0	100.0	
Missing	Age not indicated	54	54.0		
Total		100	100.0		

S1 Considerate of other people's feelings...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	5	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Somewhat true	44	44.0	44.0	49.0
	Certainly true	51	51.0	51.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S2 Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	19	19.0	19.0	19.0
	Somewhat true	43	43.0	43.0	62.0
	Certainly true	38	38.0	38.0	100.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S3 Often complains of headaches, stomach-aches or sickness...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	65	65.0	65.0	65.0
	Somewhat true	26	26.0	26.0	91.0
	Certainly true	9	9.0	9.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S4 Shares readily with other children (treats, toys, pencils etc.)

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	10	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Somewhat true	32	32.0	32.0	42.0
	Certainly true	58	58.0	58.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S5 Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	50	50.0	50.0	50.0
	Somewhat true	42	42.0	42.0	92.0
	Certainly true	8	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S6 Rather solitary, tends to play alone...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	57	57.0	57.0	57.0
	Somewhat true	36	36.0	36.0	93.0
	Certainly true	7	7.0	7.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S7 Generally obedient, usually does what adults request...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Certainly true	45	45.0	45.0	45.0
	Somewhat true	41	41.0	41.0	86.0
	Not true	14	14.0	14.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S8 Many worries, often seems worried...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	24	24.0	24.0	24.0
	Somewhat true	50	50.0	50.0	74.0
	Certainly true	26	26.0	26.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S9 Helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	7	7.0	7.0	7.0
	Somewhat true	40	40.0	40.0	47.0
	Certainly true	53	53.0	53.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S10 Constantly fidgeting or squirming...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	55	55.0	55.0	55.0
	Somewhat true	35	35.0	35.0	90.0
	Certainly true	10	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S11 Has at least one good friend...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Certainly true	70	70.0	70.0	70.0
	Somewhat true	20	20.0	20.0	90.0
	Not true	10	10.0	10.0	100.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S12 Often fights with other children or bullies them

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	62	62.0	62.0	62.0
	Somewhat true	30	30.0	30.0	92.0
	Certainly true	8	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S13 Often unhappy, down-hearted or tearful…

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	54	54.0	54.0	54.0
	Somewhat true	43	43.0	43.0	97.0
	Certainly true	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S14 Generally liked by other children...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Certainly true	66	66.0	66.0	66.0
	Somewhat true	31	31.0	31.0	97.0
	Not true	3	3.0	3.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S15 Easily distracted, concentration wanders...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	36	36.0	36.0	36.0
	Somewhat true	40	40.0	40.0	76.0
	Certainly true	24	24.0	24.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S16 Nervous or clingy in new situations, easily loses confidence...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	41	41.0	41.0	41.0
	Somewhat true	36	36.0	36.0	77.0
	Certainly true	23	23.0	23.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S17 Kind to younger children...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	7	7.0	7.0	7.0
	Somewhat true	37	37.0	37.0	44.0
	Certainly true	56	56.0	56.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S18 Often lies or cheats...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	70	70.0	70.0	70.0
	Somewhat true	26	26.0	26.0	96.0
	Certainly true	4	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S19 Picked on or bullied by other children...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	51	51.0	51.0	51.0
	Somewhat true	37	37.0	37.0	88.0
	Certainly true	12	12.0	12.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S20 Often volunteers to help others (parents, teachers, other children)...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	8	8.0	8.0	8.0
	Somewhat true	27	27.0	27.0	35.0
	Certainly true	65	65.0	65.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S21 Thinks things out before acting...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Certainly true	44	44.0	44.0	44.0
	Somewhat true	33	33.0	33.0	77.0
	Not true	23	23.0	23.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S22 Steals from home, school or elsewhere...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	88	88.0	88.0	88.0
	Somewhat true	10	10.0	10.0	98.0
	Certainly true	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S23 Gets on better with adults than with other children...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	39	39.0	39.0	39.0
	Somewhat true	52	52.0	52.0	91.0
	Certainly true	9	9.0	9.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S24 Many fears, easily scared...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Not true	34	34.0	34.0	34.0
	Somewhat true	51	51.0	51.0	85.0
	Certainly true	15	15.0	15.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

S25 Sees tasks through to the end, good attention span...

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Certainly true	46	46.0	46.0	46.0
	Somewhat true	34	34.0	34.0	80.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Not true	20	20.0	20.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Overall, do you think that this child has difficulties in emotions, concentration, behaviour or being able to get on with other people?

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	90	90.0	90.0	90.0
	Yes - minor difficulties	9	9.0	9.0	99.0
	Yes - severe difficulties	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Emotional Symptom Score

Frequency

Valid			
Normal	Borderline	Abnormal	Total
67	14	19	100

Conduct Problem Score

Frequency

Valid			
Normal	Borderline	Abnormal	Total
53	21	26	100

Peer Problem Score

Frequency

Valid			
Normal	Borderline	Abnormal	Total
72	15	13	100

Pro-social Score

Frequency

Valid			
Abnormal	Borderline	Normal	Total
5	11	84	100

Hyperactivity Score

Frequency

Valid			
Normal	Borderline	Abnormal	Total
73	9	18	100

Total Difficulties Score

Frequency

Valid			
Normal	Borderline	Abnormal	Total
40	34	26	100

Reliability.

Scale, Total Difficulties Scale.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	100	100.0
	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the

procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.798	20

.

Reliability.

Scale, Pro-social Scale.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
	Valid	100	100.0
Cases	Excluded	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.635	5

Reliability.

Scale, Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
	Valid	100	100.0
Cases	Excluded^a	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items

.669	31

Reliability.

Scale, Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
	Valid	46	46.0
Cases	Excluded[a]	54	54.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the

procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.690	33

Frequencies.

Frequency Table.

A1 I am responsive to my child's feelings and needs.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	3	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Once in a while	3	3.0	3.0	6.0
	About half of the time	7	7.0	7.0	13.0
Valid	Very often	24	24.0	24.0	37.0
	Always	63	63.0	63.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A2 I use physical punishment as a way of disciplining my child.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	19	19.0	19.0	19.0
	Once in a while	44	44.0	44.0	63.0
	About half of the time	8	8.0	8.0	71.0
	Very often	23	23.0	23.0	94.0
	Always	6	6.0	6.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A3 I take my child's desires into account before asking him/her to do something.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	25	25.0	25.0	25.0
	Once in a while	32	32.0	32.0	57.0
	About half of the time	13	13.0	13.0	70.0
	Very often	19	19.0	19.0	89.0
	Always	11	11.0	11.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A4 When my child asks why he/she has to conform, I state, because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	17	17.0	17.0	17.0
	Once in a while	46	46.0	46.0	63.0
	About half of the time	9	9.0	9.0	72.0
	Very often	21	21.0	21.0	93.0
	Always	7	7.0	7.0	100.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A5 I explain to my child how I feel about the child's good and bad behavior.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Once in a while	6	6.0	6.0	6.0
	About half of the time	5	5.0	5.0	11.0
	Very often	36	36.0	36.0	47.0
	Always	53	53.0	53.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A6 I spank when my child is disobedient.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	8	8.0	8.0	8.0
	Once in a while	28	28.0	28.0	36.0
	About half of the time	7	7.0	7.0	43.0
	Very often	35	35.0	35.0	78.0
	Always	22	22.0	22.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A7 I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	5	5.0	5.0	5.0
	Once in a while	16	16.0	16.0	21.0
	About half of the time	6	6.0	6.0	27.0
	Very often	35	35.0	35.0	62.0
	Always	38	38.0	38.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A8 I find it difficult to discipline my child.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	79	79.0	79.0	79.0
	Once in a while	10	10.0	10.0	89.0
	About half of the time	1	1.0	1.0	90.0

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Very often	2	2.0	2.0	92.0
	Always	8	8.0	8.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A9 I encourage my child to freely express (himself)(herself) even when disagreeing with me.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	Once in a while	33	33.0	33.0	42.0
	About half of the time	9	9.0	9.0	51.0
	Very often	20	20.0	20.0	71.0
	Always	29	29.0	29.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A10 I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little if any explanations.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	23	23.0	23.0	23.0
	Once in a while	52	52.0	52.0	75.0
	About half of the time	4	4.0	4.0	79.0
	Very often	20	20.0	20.0	99.0
	Always	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A11 I emphasise the reasons for rules.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Once in a while	15	15.0	15.0	16.0
	About half of the time	10	10.0	10.0	26.0
	Very often	28	28.0	28.0	54.0
	Always	46	46.0	46.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A12 I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Once in a while	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	About half of the time	23	23.0	23.0	32.0
	Very often	36	36.0	36.0	68.0
	Always	32	32.0	32.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A13 I yell or shout when my child misbehaves.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	Once in a while	28	28.0	28.0	37.0
	About half of the time	12	12.0	12.0	49.0
	Very often	36	36.0	36.0	85.0
	Always	15	15.0	15.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A14 I give praise when my child is good.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Once in a while	3	3.0	3.0	5.0
	Very often	32	32.0	32.0	37.0
	Always	63	63.0	63.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A15 I give in to my child when the child causes a commotion about something.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	30	30.0	30.0	30.0
	Once in a while	27	27.0	27.0	57.0
	About half of the time	13	13.0	13.0	70.0
	Very often	24	24.0	24.0	94.0
	Always	4	4.0	4.0	98.0
	Not indicated	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A16 I explode in anger towards my child.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	24	24.0	24.0	24.0
	Once in a while	48	48.0	48.0	72.0
	About half of the time	6	6.0	6.0	78.0
	Very often	21	21.0	21.0	99.0
	Always	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A17 I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	9	9.0	9.0	9.0
	Once in a while	37	37.0	37.0	46.0
	About half of the time	30	30.0	30.0	76.0
	Very often	20	20.0	20.0	96.0
	Always	4	4.0	4.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A18 I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	10	10.0	10.0	10.0
	Once in a while	29	29.0	29.0	39.0
	About half of the time	11	11.0	11.0	50.0
	Very often	16	16.0	16.0	66.0
	Always	32	32.0	32.0	98.0
	Not indicated	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A19 I grab my child when being disobedient.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	45	45.0	45.0	45.0
	Once in a while	29	29.0	29.0	74.0
	About half of the time	9	9.0	9.0	83.0
	Very often	9	9.0	9.0	92.0
	Always	7	7.0	7.0	99.0
	Not indicated	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A20 I state punishments to my child and do not actually do them.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	18	18.0	18.0	18.0
	Once in a while	44	44.0	44.0	62.0
	About half of the time	20	20.0	20.0	82.0
	Very often	14	14.0	14.0	96.0
	Always	3	3.0	3.0	99.0
	Not indicated	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A21 I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Once in a while	4	4.0	4.0	6.0
	About half of the time	14	14.0	14.0	20.0
	Very often	42	42.0	42.0	62.0
	Always	38	38.0	38.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A22 I allow my child to give input into family rules.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	8	8.0	8.0	8.0
	Once in a while	35	35.0	35.0	43.0
	About half of the time	9	9.0	9.0	52.0
Valid	Very often	26	26.0	26.0	78.0
	Always	21	21.0	21.0	99.0
	Not indicated	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A23 I scold and criticize to make my child improve.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	12	12.0	12.0	12.0
	Once in a while	24	24.0	24.0	36.0
	About half of the time	11	11.0	11.0	47.0
Valid	Very often	36	36.0	36.0	83.0
	Always	17	17.0	17.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A24 I spoil my child.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	90	90.0	90.0	90.0
	Once in a while	8	8.0	8.0	98.0
Valid	About half of the time	1	1.0	1.0	99.0
	Always	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A25 I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent

Valid		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	3	3.0	3.0	3.0
	Once in a while	4	4.0	4.0	7.0
	About half of the time	2	2.0	2.0	9.0
	Very often	29	29.0	29.0	38.0
	Always	62	62.0	62.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A26 I use threats as punishment with little or no justification.

Valid		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	35	35.0	35.0	35.0
	Once in a while	39	39.0	39.0	74.0
	About half of the time	12	12.0	12.0	86.0
	Very often	12	12.0	12.0	98.0
	Always	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A27 I have warm and intimate times together with my child.

Valid		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Once in a while	18	18.0	18.0	19.0
	About half of the time	17	17.0	17.0	36.0
	Very often	27	27.0	27.0	63.0
	Always	37	37.0	37.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A28 I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations.

Valid		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	Never	34	34.0	34.0	34.0
	Once in a while	50	50.0	50.0	84.0
	About half of the time	5	5.0	5.0	89.0
	Very often	9	9.0	9.0	98.0
	Always	2	2.0	2.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A29 I help my child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Once in a while	19	19.0	19.0	19.0
	About half of the time	9	9.0	9.0	28.0
	Very often	38	38.0	38.0	66.0
	Always	34	34.0	34.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A30 I scold or criticize when my child's behavior doesn't meet my expectations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	6	6.0	6.0	6.0
	Once in a while	32	32.0	32.0	38.0
	About half of the time	9	9.0	9.0	47.0
	Very often	31	31.0	31.0	78.0
	Always	21	21.0	21.0	99.0
	Not indicated	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A31 I explain the consequences of the child's behavior.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	2	2.0	2.0	2.0
	Once in a while	11	11.0	11.0	13.0
	About half of the time	6	6.0	6.0	19.0
	Very often	48	48.0	48.0	67.0
	Always	32	32.0	32.0	99.0
	Not indicated	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	100	100.0	100.0	

A32 I slap my child when the child misbehaves.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Never	41	41.0	41.0	41.0
	Once in a while	43	43.0	43.0	84.0
	About half of the time	8	8.0	8.0	92.0

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Very often	6	6.0	6.0	98.0
Always	1	1.0	1.0	99.0
Not indicated	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
Total	100	100.0	100.0	

Educational background of parent

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	None	1	1.0	1.0	1.0
	Primary School	4	4.0	4.1	5.1
	Junior Secondary School	6	6.0	6.1	11.2
	Senior Secondary School	12	12.0	12.2	23.5
	Tertiary Education	75	75.0	76.5	100.0
	Total	98	98.0	100.0	
Missing	Not indicated	2	2.0		
Total		100	100.0		

Occupation

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Self employed	13	13.0	13.4	13.4
	Trading	20	20.0	20.6	34.0
	Civil service	56	56.0	57.7	91.8
	International NGO	5	5.0	5.2	96.9
	Doctor	1	1.0	1.0	97.9
	Administrator	1	1.0	1.0	99.0
	Unemployed	1	1.0	1.0	100.0
	Total	97	97.0	100.0	

		3	3.0		
Missing No indication					
Total		100	100.0		

.

Reliability

Scale, PSDQ

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
	Valid	96	96.0
Cases	Excluded[a]	4	4.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the

procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.667	35

Reliability.

Scale, PSDQ_Only.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
	Valid	100	100.0
Cases	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the

procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.651	32

Reliability

Scale, Authoritative

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
	Valid	100	100.0
Cases	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.764	15

Reliability.

Scale, Authoritarian.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
	Valid	100	100.0
Cases	Excluded[a]	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.590	12

Reliability.

Scale, Permissive.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	100	100.0
	Excludedᵃ	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.507	5

Reliability.

Scale, Authoritarian.

Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	100	100.0
	Excludedᵃ	0	.0
	Total	100	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.570	11

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Authoritarian Parenting Score	Permissive Parenting Style	Emotional Symptom Score
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1	-.080	-.090	-.111
Authoritarian Parenting Score	-.080	1	.244*	.021
Permissive Parenting Style	-.090	.244*	1	.122
Emotional Symptom Score	-.111	.021	.122	1
Conduct Problem Score	-.059	-.046	.016	.343**
Peer Problem Score	.125	.019	.113	.332**
Pro-social Score	-.207*	.099	.131	-.222*
Hyperactivity Score	-.114	.078	.366**	.382**
Total Difficulties Score	-.013	.006	.083	.666**

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Conduct Problem Score	Peer Problem Score	Pro-social Score	Hyperactivity Score
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	-.059	.125	-.207	-.114
Authoritarian Parenting Score	-.046	.019	.099*	.078
Permissive Parenting Style	.016	.113*	.131	.366
Emotional Symptom Score	.343	.332	-.222	.382
Conduct Problem Score	1	.368	-.428	.533**
Peer Problem Score	.368	1	-.449	.119**
Pro-social Score	-.428*	-.449	1	-.213*
Hyperactivity Score	.533	.119	-.213**	1**
Total Difficulties Score	.741	.489	-.386	.598**

265

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Total Difficulties Score
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	-.013
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.006
Permissive Parenting Style	.083
Emotional Symptom Score	.666
Conduct Problem Score	.741
Peer Problem Score	.489
Pro-social Score	-.386[*]
Hyperactivity Score	.598
Total Difficulties Score	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Emotional Symptom Score	Conduct Problem Score	Peer Problem Score	Pro-social Score
Emotional Symptom Score	1	.343[**]	.332[**]	-.222[*]
Conduct Problem Score	.343[**]	1	.368[**]	-.428[**]
Peer Problem Score	.332[**]	.368[**]	1	-.449[**]
Pro-social Score	-.222[*]	-.428[**]	-.449[**]	1
Hyperactivity Score	.382[**]	.533[**]	.119	-.213[*]
Total Difficulties Score	.666[**]	.741[**]	.489[**]	-.386[**]

Authoritative-Authrotarian	-.072	-.078	.111	-.094
Autharitative-Permissive	.020	-.028	.175	-.039
Authoritarian-Permissive	.099	-.014	.091	.147

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Hyperactivity Score	Total Difficulties Score	Authoritative-Authoritarian	Authoritative-Permissive
Emotional Symptom Score	.382	.666[**]	-.072[**]	.020[*]
Conduct Problem Score	.533[**]	.741	-.078[**]	-.028[**]
Peer Problem Score	.119[**]	.489[**]	.111	.175[**]
Pro-social Score	-.213[*]	-.386[**]	-.094[**]	-.039
Hyperactivity Score	1[**]	.598[**]	-.036	.212[*]
Total Difficulties Score	.598[**]	1[**]	-.006[**]	.056[**]
Authoritative-Authoritarian	-.036	-.006	1	.577
Authoritative-Permissive	.212	.056	.577	1
Authoritarian-Permissive	.305	.062	.411	.597

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Authoritarian-Permissive
Emotional Symptom Score	.099
Conduct Problem Score	-.014[**]
Peer Problem Score	.091[**]
Pro-social Score	.147[*]

Hyperactivity Score	.305**
Total Difficulties Score	.062**
Authoritative-Authoritarian	.411
Authoritative-Permissive	.597
Authoritarian-Permissive	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Emotional Symptom Score	Conduct Problem Score	Peer Problem Score	Pro-social Score
Emotional Symptom Score	1	.343**	.332**	-.222*
Conduct Problem Score	.343**	1	.368**	-.428**
Peer Problem Score	.332**	.368**	1	-.449**
Pro-social Score	-.222*	-.428**	-.449**	1
Hyperactivity Score	.382**	.533**	.119	-.213*
Total Difficulties Score	.666**	.741**	.489**	-.386**
Authoritative (Above Modal)	-.184	.055	.274*	-.276*
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	.161	-.116	.028	.101
Permissive (Above Modal)	.059	-.132	-.022	.121

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Hyperactivity Score	Total Difficulties Score	Authoritative (Above Modal)	Authoritarian (Above Modal)
Emotional Symptom Score	.382	.666**	-.184**	.161*

Conduct Problem Score	.533[**]	.741	.055[**]	-.116[**]
Peer Problem Score	.119[**]	.489[**]	.274	.028[**]
Pro-social Score	-.213[*]	-.386[**]	-.276[**]	.101
Hyperactivity Score	1[**]	.598[**]	-.187	-.119[*]
Total Difficulties Score	.598[**]	1[**]	.006[**]	.039[**]
Authoritative (Above Modal)	-.187	.006	1[*]	.260[*]
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	-.119	.039	.260	1
Permissive (Above Modal)	-.016	.066	.037	1.000

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Permissive (Above Modal)
Emotional Symptom Score	.059
Conduct Problem Score	-.132[**]
Peer Problem Score	-.022[**]
Pro-social Score	.121[*]
Hyperactivity Score	-.016[**]
Total Difficulties Score	.066[**]
Authoritative (Above Modal)	.037
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	1.000
Permissive (Above Modal)	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Regression, Authoritative.

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Occupation, Parent's Education[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable, Authoritative Parenting Style Score

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.211[a]	.044	.024	.53695

a. Predictors, (Constant), Occupation, Parent's Education

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.247	2	.624	2.163	.121[b]
	Residual	26.813	93	.288		
	Total	28.060	95			

a. Dependent Variable, Authoritative Parenting Style Score

b. Predictors (Constant), Occupation, Parent's Education

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.218	.351		9.159	.000
	Parent's Education	.073	.067	.111	1.097	.276
	Occupation	.116	.066	.177	1.744	.084

a. Dependent Variable, Authoritative Parenting Style Score

Regression.

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Occupation, Parent's Education[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable, Authoritarian Parenting Score

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.050[a]	.002	-.019	.48874

a. Predictors (Constant), Occupation, Parent's Education

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.056	2	.028	.116	.890[b]
	Residual	22.215	93	.239		
	Total	22.271	95			

a. Dependent Variable, Authoritarian Parenting Score

b. Predictors, (Constant), Occupation, Parent's Education

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.274	.320		7.110	.000
	Parent's Education	.027	.061	.046	.441	.660
	Occupation	.011	.060	.019	.186	.853

a. Dependent Variable, Authoritarian Parenting Score

Regression.

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Occupation, Parent's Education[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable, Permissive Parenting Style

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.064[a]	.004	-.017	.62912

a. Predictors (Constant), Occupation, Parent's Education

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.149	2	.075	.188	.829[b]
	Residual	36.809	93	.396		
	Total	36.958	95			

a. Dependent Variable, Permissive Parenting Style

b. Predictors (Constant), Occupation, Parent's Education

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.163	.412		5.254	.000
	Parent's Education	.007	.078	.009	.084	.933
	Occupation	-.047	.078	-.063	-.610	.544

a. Dependent Variable, Permissive Parenting Style

Oneway.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	None/Primary School	5	4.0133	.65557
	Junior Secondary School	6	3.2778	.78815
	Senior Secondary School	12	3.8111	.58454
	Tertiary Education	75	3.9040	.48722
	Total	98	3.8599	.54181
Authoritarian Parenting Score	None/Primary School	5	2.2333	.51505
	Junior Secondary School	6	2.5694	.30008
	Senior Secondary School	12	2.3750	.56352
	Tertiary Education	75	2.4344	.48131
	Total	98	2.4252	.48155
Permissive Parenting Style	None/Primary School	5	2.0000	.40000
	Junior Secondary School	6	2.2333	.29439
	Senior Secondary School	12	1.9667	.50332
	Tertiary Education	75	2.0853	.68274
	Total	98	2.0755	.63149

Descriptives

		Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	None/Primary School	.29318	3.1993	4.8273
	Junior Secondary School	.32176	2.4507	4.1049
	Senior Secondary School	.16874	3.4397	4.1825
	Tertiary Education	.05626	3.7919	4.0161
	Total	.05473	3.7512	3.9685

Authoritarian Parenting Score	None/Primary School	.23034	1.5938	2.8729
	Junior Secondary School	.12251	2.2545	2.8844
	Senior Secondary School	.16267	2.0170	2.7330
	Tertiary Education	.05558	2.3237	2.5452
	Total	.04864	2.3286	2.5217
Permissive Parenting Style	None/Primary School	.17889	1.5033	2.4967
	Junior Secondary School	.12019	1.9244	2.5423
	Senior Secondary School	.14530	1.6469	2.2865
	Tertiary Education	.07884	1.9282	2.2424
	Total	.06379	1.9489	2.2021

Descriptives

		Minimum	Maximum
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	None/Primary School	3.20	4.53
	Junior Secondary School	2.07	4.27
	Senior Secondary School	3.27	5.00
	Tertiary Education	2.87	4.93
	Total	2.07	5.00
Authoritarian Parenting Score	None/Primary School	1.75	2.92
	Junior Secondary School	2.08	2.92
	Senior Secondary School	1.17	3.33
	Tertiary Education	1.33	3.50
	Total	1.17	3.50
Permissive Parenting Style	None/Primary School	1.60	2.60
	Junior Secondary School	1.80	2.60
	Senior Secondary School	1.00	2.80
	Tertiary Education	1.00	4.40
	Total	1.00	4.40

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1.074	3	94	.364
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.684	3	94	.564
Permissive Parenting Style	1.844	3	94	.145

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Between Groups	2.325	3	.775	2.786
	Within Groups	26.150	94	.278	
	Total	28.475	97		
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Between Groups	.346	3	.115	.489
	Within Groups	22.147	94	.236	
	Total	22.493	97		
Permissive Parenting Style	Between Groups	.327	3	.109	.267
	Within Groups	38.354	94	.408	
	Total	38.681	97		

ANOVA

		Sig.
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Between Groups	.045
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Between Groups	.691
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Permissive Parenting Style	Between Groups	.849
	Within Groups	
	Total	

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Mean Difference (I-J)
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.73556[*]
		Senior Secondary School	.20222
		Tertiary Education	.10933
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	-.73556[*]
		Senior Secondary School	-.53333[*]
		Tertiary Education	-.62622[*]
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	-.20222
		Junior Secondary School	.53333[*]
		Tertiary Education	-.09289
	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	-.10933
		Junior Secondary School	.62622[*]
		Senior Secondary School	.09289
Authoritarian Parenting Score	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	-.33611

Dependent Variable	(I)	(J)	
		Senior Secondary School	-.14167
		Tertiary Education	-.20111
		None/Primary School	.33611
	Junior Secondary School	Senior Secondary School	.19444
		Tertiary Education	.13500
		None/Primary School	.14167
	Senior Secondary School	Junior Secondary School	-.19444
		Tertiary Education	-.05944
		None/Primary School	.20111
	Tertiary education	Junior Secondary School	-.13500
		Senior Secondary School	.05944
		Junior Secondary School	-.23333
	None/Primary School	Senior Secondary School	.03333
		Tertiary Education	-.08533
		None/Primary School	.23333
Permissive Parenting Style	Junior Secondary School	Senior Secondary School	.26667
		Tertiary Education	.14800
		None/Primary School	-.03333
	Senior Secondary School	Junior Secondary School	-.26667
		Tertiary Education	-.11867

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Std. Error
		Junior Secondary School	.31938*
	None/Primary School	Senior Secondary School	.28075
		Tertiary Education	.24361
		None/Primary School	.31938*
	Junior Secondary School	Senior Secondary School	.26372*
		Tertiary Education	.22377*
Authoritative Parenting Style Score		None/Primary School	.28075
	Senior Secondary School	Junior Secondary School	.26372*
		Tertiary Education	.16399
		None/Primary School	.24361
	Tertiary Education	Junior Secondary School	.22377*
		Senior Secondary School	.16399

	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.29392
		Senior Secondary School	.25837
		Tertiary Education	.22420
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.29392
		Senior Secondary School	.24270
Authoritarian Parenting Score		Tertiary Education	.20594
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.25837
		Junior Secondary School	.24270
		Tertiary Education	.15092
	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	.22420
		Junior Secondary School	.20594
		Senior Secondary School	.15092
	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.38679
		Senior Secondary School	.34001
		Tertiary Education	.29503
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.38679
Permissive Parenting Style		Senior Secondary School	.31938
		Tertiary Education	.27100
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.34001
		Junior Secondary School	.31938
		Tertiary Education	.19860

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Sig.
	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.023[*]
		Senior Secondary School	.473
		Tertiary Education	.655
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.023[*]
Authoritative Parenting Style Score		Senior Secondary School	.046[*]
		Tertiary Education	.006[*]
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.473
		Junior Secondary School	.046[*]
		Tertiary Education	.572

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	.655
		Junior Secondary School	.006*
		Senior Secondary School	.572
	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.256
		Senior Secondary School	.585
		Tertiary Education	.372
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.256
		Senior Secondary School	.425
		Tertiary Education	.514
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.585
		Junior Secondary School	.425
		Tertiary Education	.695
	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	.372
		Junior Secondary School	.514
		Senior Secondary School	.695
Permissive Parenting Style	None/Primary School	Junior secondary school	.548
		Senior Secondary School	.922
		Tertiary Education	.773
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.548
		Senior Secondary School	.406
		Tertiary Education	.586
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.922
		Junior Secondary School	.406
		Tertiary Education	.552

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Lower Bound
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.1014*
		Senior Secondary School	-.3552
		Tertiary Education	-.3744
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	-1.3697*
		Senior Secondary School	-1.0570*
		Tertiary Education	-1.0705*

279

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	-.7597
		Junior Secondary School	.0097[*]
		Tertiary Education	-.4185
	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	-.5930
		Junior Secondary School	.1819[*]
		Senior Secondary School	-.2327
Authoritarian Parenting Score	None/Primary school	Junior Secondary School	-.9197
		Senior Secondary School	-.6547
		Tertiary Education	-.6463
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	-.2475
		Senior Secondary School	-.2874
		Tertiary Education	-.2739
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	-.3713
		Junior Secondary School	-.6763
		Tertiary Education	-.3591
	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	-.2440
		Junior Secondary School	-.5439
		Senior Secondary School	-.2402
	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	-1.0013
		Senior Secondary School	-.6418
		Tertiary Education	-.6711
Permissive Parenting Style	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	-.5346
		Senior Secondary School	-.3675
		Tertiary Education	-.3901
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary School	-.7084
		Junior Secondary School	-.9008
		Tertiary Education	-.5130

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Upper Bound
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	1.3697[*]
		Senior Secondary School	.7597
		Tertiary Education	.5930

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Mean Difference (I-J)
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary School	-.1014*
		Senior Secondary School	-.0097*
		Tertiary Education	-.1819*
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.3552
		Junior Secondary School	1.0570*
		Tertiary Education	.2327
	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	.3744
		Junior Secondary School	1.0705*
		Senior Secondary School	.4185
Authoritarian Parenting Score	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.2475
		Senior Secondary School	.3713
		Tertiary Education	.2440
	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.9197
		Senior Secondary School	.6763
		Tertiary Education	.5439
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.6547
		Junior Secondary School	.2874
		Tertiary Education	.2402
	Tertiary Education	None/Primary School	.6463
		Junior Secondary School	.2739
		Senior Secondary School	.3591
	None/Primary School	Junior Secondary School	.5346
		Senior Secondary School	.7084
		Tertiary Education	.5005
Permissive Parenting Style	Junior Secondary School	None/Primary School	1.0013
		Senior Secondary School	.9008
		Tertiary Education	.6861
	Senior Secondary School	None/Primary School	.6418
		Junior Secondary School	.3675
		Tertiary Education	.2757

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Permissive Parenting Style		None/Primary School	.08533[*]
	Tertiary Education	Junior Secondary School	-.14800
		Senior Secondary School	.11867

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Std. Error
Permissive Parenting Style		None/Primary School	.29503[*]
	Tertiary Education	Junior Secondary School	.27100
		Senior Secondary School	.19860

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Sig.
Permissive Parenting Style		None/Primary School	.773[*]
	Tertiary Education	Junior Secondary School	.586
		Senior Secondary School	.552

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Lower Bound
Permissive Parenting Style		None/Primary School	-.5005[*]
	Tertiary Education	Junior Secondary School	-.6861
		Senior Secondary School	-.2757

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval

			Upper Bound
Permissive Parenting Style		None/Primary School	.6711[*]
	Tertiary Education	Junior Secondary School	.3901
		Senior Secondary School	.5130

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Oneway.

Descriptives

	Self employed				
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean
					Lower Bound
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	14	3.6810	.66983	.17902	3.2942
Authoritarian Parenting Score	14	2.3929	.54344	.14524	2.0791
Permissive Parenting Style	14	2.0714	.47463	.12685	1.7974

Descriptives

	Self employed			Trading	
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Minimum	Maximum	N	Mean
	Upper Bound				
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	4.0677	2.07	4.60	20	3.6133
Authoritarian Parenting Score	2.7066	1.17	3.33	20	2.4500
Permissive Parenting Style	2.3455	1.40	2.80	20	2.2300

Descriptives

	Trading				
	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.40442	.09043	3.4241	3.8026	2.93
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.30992	.06930	2.3050	2.5950	1.83
Permissive Parenting Style	.72917	.16305	1.8887	2.5713	1.00

Descriptives

	Trading	Civil service			
	Maximum	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	4.47	56	4.0131	.50395	.06734
Authoritarian Parenting Score	2.92	56	2.4301	.54048	.07222
Permissive Parenting Style	3.40	56	2.0143	.63344	.08465

Descriptives

	Civil service				Private Employee
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum	N
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	3.8781	4.1481	3.13	5.00	7
Authoritarian Parenting Score	2.2853	2.5748	1.33	3.50	7
Permissive Parenting Style	1.8446	2.1839	1.00	4.40	7

Descriptives

	Private Employee				
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	3.5905	.53115	.20075	3.0992	4.0817
Authoritarian Parenting Score	2.4762	.39298	.14853	2.1127	2.8396
Permissive Parenting Style	2.0857	.44508	.16822	1.6741	2.4973

Descriptives

	Private Employee		Total			
	Minimum	Maximum	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	2.93	4.47	97	3.8522	.54085	.05492
Authoritarian Parenting Score	1.75	2.92	97	2.4321	.48626	.04937
Permissive Parenting Style	1.40	2.80	97	2.0722	.62061	.06301

Descriptives

	Total		Minimum	Maximum
	95% Confidence Interval for Mean			
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	3.7432	3.9612	2.07	5.00
Authoritarian Parenting Score	2.3341	2.5301	1.17	3.50
Permissive Parenting Style	1.9471	2.1972	1.00	4.40

.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1.223	3	93	.306
Authoritarian Parenting Score	2.064	3	93	.110
Permissive Parenting Style	1.172	3	93	.325

.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Between Groups	3.481	3	1.160	4.386
	Within Groups	24.601	93	.265	
	Total	28.082	96		
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Between Groups	.042	3	.014	.057
	Within Groups	22.657	93	.244	
	Total	22.699	96		
Permissive Parenting Style	Between Groups	.687	3	.229	.587
	Within Groups	36.288	93	.390	
	Total	36.975	96		

ANOVA

		Sig.
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Between Groups	.006
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Between Groups	.982
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Permissive Parenting Style	Between Groups	.625
	Within Groups	
	Total	

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Self Employed	Trading	.06762	.17922
		Civil Service	-.33214*	.15368
		Private Employee	.09048	.23809
	Trading	Self Employed	-.06762	.17922
		Civil Service	-.39976*	.13398
		Private Employee	.02286	.22587
	Civil Service	Self Employed	.33214*	.15368
		Trading	.39976*	.13398
		Private Employee	.42262*	.20619
	Private Employee	Self Employed	-.09048	.23809
		Trading	-.02286	.22587
		Civil Service	-.42262*	.20619
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Self Employed	Trading	-.05714	.17200
		Civil Service	-.03720	.14749
		Private Employee	-.08333	.22849
	Trading	Self Employed	.05714	.17200
		Civil Service	.01994	.12858
		Private Employee	-.02619	.21676
	Civil Service	Self Employed	.03720	.14749
		Trading	-.01994	.12858
		Private Employee	-.04613	.19787
	Private Employee	Self Employed	.08333	.22849
		Trading	.02619	.21676
		Civil Service	.04613	.19787
Permissive Parenting Style	Self Employed	Trading	-.15857	.21767

	Civil Service	.05714	.18665
	Private Employee	-.01429	.28916
	Self Employed	.15857	.21767
Trading	Civil Service	.21571	.16272
	Private Employee	.14429	.27432
	Self Employed	-.05714	.18665
Civil Service	Trading	-.21571	.16272
	Private Employee	-.07143	.25042

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound
		Trading	.707	-.2883
	Self Employed	Civil Service	.033*	-.6373
		Private Employee	.705	-.3823
		Self Employed	.707	-.4235
	Trading	Civil Service	.004*	-.6658
		Private Employee	.920	-.4257
Authoritative Parenting Style Score		Self Employed	.033*	.0270
	Civil Service	Trading	.004*	.1337
		Private Employee	.043*	.0132
		Self Employed	.705	-.5633
	Private Employee	Trading	.920	-.4714
		Civil Service	.043*	-.8321
		Trading	.740	-.3987
	Self Employed	Civil Service	.801	-.3301
		Private Employee	.716	-.5371
		Self Employed	.740	-.2844
	Trading	Civil Service	.877	-.2354
Authoritarian Parenting Score		Private Employee	.904	-.4566
		Self Employed	.801	-.2557
	Civil Service	Trading	.877	-.2753
		Private Employee	.816	-.4391
		Self Employed	.716	-.3704
	Private Employee	Trading	.904	-.4043

		Civil Service	.816	-.3468
		Trading	.468	-.5908
	Self Employed	Civil Service	.760	-.3135
		Private Employee	.961	-.5885
		Self Employed	.468	-.2737
Permissive Parenting Style	Trading	Civil Service	.188	-.1074
		Private Employee	.600	-.4005
		Self Employed	.760	-.4278
	Civil service	Trading	.188	-.5388
		Private Employee	.776	-.5687

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
		Trading	.4235
	Self Employed	Civil Service	-.0270*
		Private Employee	.5633
		Self Employed	.2883
	Trading	Civil Service	-.1337*
		Private Employee	.4714
Authoritative Parenting Style Score		Self Employed	.6373*
	Civil Service	Trading	.6658*
		Private Employee	.8321*
		Self Employed	.3823
	Private Employee	Trading	.4257
		Civil Service	-.0132*
		Trading	.2844
	Self Employed	Civil Service	.2557
		Private Employee	.3704
		Self Employed	.3987
	Trading	Civil Service	.2753
Authoritarian Parenting Score		Private Employee	.4043
		Self Employed	.3301
	Civil Service	Trading	.2354
		Private Employee	.3468
	Private Employee	Self Employed	.5371

		Trading	.4566
		Civil Service	.4391
		Trading	.2737
	Self Employed	Civil Service	.4278
		Private Employee	.5599
		Self Employed	.5908
Permissive Parenting Style	Trading	Civil Service	.5388
		Private Employee	.6890
		Self Employed	.3135
	Civil Service	Trading	.1074
		Private Employee	.4259

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error
Permissive Parenting Style		Self Employed	.01429	.28916
	Private Employee	Trading	-.14429[*]	.27432
		Civil Service	.07143	.25042

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	
Permissive Parenting Style		Self Employed	.961	-.5599	
	Private Employee	Trading	.600[*]	-.6890	
		Civil Service	.776	-.4259	

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	95% Confidence Interval
			Upper Bound

Permissive Parenting Style		Self Employed	.5885
	Private Employee	Trading	.4005[*]
		Civil Service	.5687

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

.

Oneway.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Self Employed	14	3.0369	.44321	.11845
	Trading	20	3.0317	.22109	.04944
	Civil Service	56	3.2216	.36344	.04857
	Private Employee	7	3.0333	.14183	.05361
	Total	97	3.1422	.34916	.03545
Authoritative-Permissive	Self Employed	14	2.8762	.42030	.11233
	Trading	20	2.9217	.38605	.08632
	Civil Service	56	3.0137	.38809	.05186
	Private Employee	7	2.8381	.26347	.09958
	Total	97	2.9622	.38489	.03908
Authoritarian-Permissive	Self Employed	14	2.2321	.38933	.10405
	Trading	20	2.3400	.39659	.08868
	Civil Service	56	2.2222	.48389	.06466
	Private Employee	7	2.2810	.38964	.14727
	Total	97	2.2521	.44446	.04513

Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Self Employed	2.7810	3.2928	2.08
	Trading	2.9282	3.1351	2.75
	Civil Service	3.1242	3.3189	2.55
	Private Employee	2.9022	3.1645	2.89
	Total	3.0718	3.2126	2.08
Authoritative-Permissive	Self Employed	2.6335	3.1189	2.13
	Trading	2.7410	3.1023	2.23
	Civil Service	2.9098	3.1176	2.23
	Private Employee	2.5944	3.0818	2.53
	Total	2.8846	3.0398	2.13
Authoritarian-Permissive	Self Employed	2.0073	2.4569	1.66
	Trading	2.1544	2.5256	1.58
	Civil Service	2.0926	2.3518	1.33
	Private Employee	1.9206	2.6413	1.78
	Total	2.1626	2.3417	1.33

Descriptives

		Maximum
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Self Employed	3.93
	Trading	3.51
	Civil Service	4.00
	Private Employee	3.24
	Total	4.00
Authoritative-Permissive	Self Employed	3.67
	Trading	3.50
	Civil Service	3.90
	Private Employee	3.17
	Total	3.90
Authoritarian-Permissive	Self Employed	3.07
	Trading	2.87
	Civil Service	3.74
	Private Employee	2.82
	Total	3.74

.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Authoritative-Authoritarian	3.228	3	93	.026
Authoritative-Permissive	.366	3	93	.778
Authoritarian-Permissive	.856	3	93	.467

.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Between Groups	.835	3	.278	2.383
	Within Groups	10.868	93	.117	
	Total	11.703	96		
Authoritative-Permissive	Between Groups	.393	3	.131	.880
	Within Groups	13.829	93	.149	
	Total	14.221	96		
Authoritarian-Permissive	Between Groups	.216	3	.072	.357
	Within Groups	18.748	93	.202	
	Total	18.964	96		

ANOVA

	Sig.

Authoritative-Authoritarian	Between Groups	.074
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritative-Permissive	Between Groups	.454
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritarian-Permissive	Between Groups	.784
	Within Groups	
	Total	

.

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Self employed	Trading	.00524	.11912
		Civil service	-.18467	.10215
		Private employee	.00357	.15824
	Trading	Self employed	-.00524	.11912
		Civil service	-.18991[*]	.08905
		Private employee	-.00167	.15012

		Self employed	.18467	.10215
	Civil service	Trading	.18991[*]	.08905
		Private employee	.18824	.13704
		Self employed	-.00357	.15824
	Private employee	Trading	.00167	.15012
		Civil service	-.18824	.13704
		Trading	-.04548	.13437
	Self employed	Civil service	-.13750	.11522
		Private employee	.03810	.17850
		Self employed	.04548	.13437
	Trading	Civil service	-.09202	.10045
		Private employee	.08357	.16934
Authoritative-Permissive		Self employed	.13750	.11522
	Civil service	Trading	.09202	.10045
		Private employee	.17560	.15459
		Self employed	-.03810	.17850
	Private employee	Trading	-.08357	.16934
		Civil service	-.17560	.15459
		Trading	-.10786	.15646
	Self employed	Civil service	.00997	.13416
		Private employee	-.04881	.20784
		Self employed	.10786	.15646
Authoritarian-Permissive	Trading	Civil service	.11783	.11696
		Private employee	.05905	.19718
		Self employed	-.00997	.13416
	Civil service	Trading	-.11783	.11696
		Private employee	-.05878	.18000

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval
				Lower Bound
		Trading	.965	-.2313
	Self employed	Civil service	.074	-.3875
Authoritative-Authoritarian		Private employee	.982	-.3107
		Self employed	.965	-.2418
	Trading	Civil service	.036[*]	-.3667

		Private employee	.991	-.2998
		Self employed	.074	-.0182
	Civil service	Trading	.036*	.0131
		Private employee	.173	-.0839
		Self employed	.982	-.3178
	Private employee	Trading	.991	-.2964
		Civil service	.173	-.4604
		Trading	.736	-.3123
	Self employed	Civil service	.236	-.3663
		Private employee	.831	-.3164
		Self employed	.736	-.2214
	Trading	Civil service	.362	-.2915
		Private employee	.623	-.2527
Authoritative-Permissive		Self employed	.236	-.0913
	Civil service	Trading	.362	-.1074
		Private employee	.259	-.1314
		Self employed	.831	-.3926
	Private employee	Trading	.623	-.4199
		Civil service	.259	-.4826
		Trading	.492	-.4186
	Self employed	Civil service	.941	-.2564
		Private employee	.815	-.4615
		Self employed	.492	-.2028
Authoritarian-Permissive	Trading	Civil service	.316	-.1144
		Private employee	.765	-.3325
		Self employed	.941	-.2764
	Civil service	Trading	.316	-.3501
		Private employee	.745	-.4162

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	95% Confidence Interval
			Upper Bound
	Self employed	Trading	.2418
Authoritative-Authoritarian		Civil service	.0182
		Private employee	.3178
	Trading	Self employed	.2313

296

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Value
Authoritative-Permissive		Civil service	-.0131[*]
		Private employee	.2964
		Self employed	.3875
	Civil service	Trading	.3667[*]
		Private employee	.4604
		Self employed	.3107
	Private employee	Trading	.2998
		Civil service	.0839
		Trading	.2214
	Self employed	Civil service	.0913
		Private employee	.3926
		Self employed	.3123
	Trading	Civil service	.1074
		Private employee	.4199
		Self employed	.3663
	Civil service	Trading	.2915
		Private employee	.4826
		Self employed	.3164
	Private employee	Trading	.2527
		Civil service	.1314
		Trading	.2028
	Self employed	Civil service	.2764
		Private employee	.3639
		Self employed	.4186
Authoritarian-Permissive	Trading	Civil service	.3501
		Private employee	.4506
		Self employed	.2564
	Civil service	Trading	.1144
		Private employee	.2987

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error

Authoritarian-Permissive		Self employed	.04881	.20784
	Private employee	Trading	-.05905	.19718
		Civil service	.05878	.18000

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound
Authoritarian-Permissive		Self employed	.815	-.3639
	Private employee	Trading	.765	-.4506
		Civil service	.745	-.2987

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Authoritarian-Permissive		Self employed	.4615
	Private employee	Trading	.3325
		Civil service	.4162

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Oneway.

Descriptives

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation

Authoritative-Authoritarian	None/Primary school	5	3.1233	.15234
	Junior secondary school	6	2.9236	.49734
	Senior secondary school	12	3.0931	.36572
	Tertiary education	75	3.1692	.34007
	Total	98	3.1425	.34776
Authoritative-Permissive	None/Primary school	5	3.0067	.18012
	Junior secondary school	6	2.7556	.37337
	Senior secondary school	12	2.8889	.40808
	Tertiary education	75	2.9947	.39733
	Total	98	2.9677	.38992
Authoritarian-Permissive	None/Primary school	5	2.1167	.45192
	Junior secondary school	6	2.4014	.22239
	Senior secondary school	12	2.1708	.37879
	Tertiary education	75	2.2599	.46563
	Total	98	2.2503	.44253

Descriptives

		Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Authoritative-Authoritarian	None/Primary school	.06813	2.9342	3.3125
	Junior secondary school	.20304	2.4017	3.4455
	Senior secondary school	.10557	2.8607	3.3254
	Tertiary education	.03927	3.0910	3.2475
	Total	.03513	3.0728	3.2122
Authoritative-Permissive	None/Primary school	.08055	2.7830	3.2303
	Junior secondary school	.15243	2.3637	3.1474
	Senior secondary school	.11780	2.6296	3.1482
	Tertiary education	.04588	2.9032	3.0861
	Total	.03939	2.8895	3.0459
Authoritarian-Permissive	None/Primary school	.20211	1.5555	2.6778
	Junior secondary school	.09079	2.1680	2.6348
	Senior secondary school	.10935	1.9302	2.4115
	Tertiary education	.05377	2.1528	2.3670
	Total	.04470	2.1616	2.3391

Descriptives

		Minimum	Maximum
Authoritative-Authoritarian	None/Primary school	2.89	3.32
	Junior secondary school	2.08	3.43
	Senior secondary school	2.62	4.00
	Tertiary education	2.55	3.93
	Total	2.08	4.00
Authoritative-Permissive	None/Primary school	2.70	3.13
	Junior secondary school	2.13	3.20
	Senior secondary school	2.23	3.53
	Tertiary education	2.23	3.90
	Total	2.13	3.90
Authoritarian-Permissive	None/Primary school	1.68	2.76
	Junior secondary school	2.14	2.66
	Senior secondary school	1.58	2.87
	Tertiary education	1.33	3.74
	Total	1.33	3.74

.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Authoritative-Authoritarian	1.335	3	94	.268
Authoritative-Permissive	1.833	3	94	.146
Authoritarian-Permissive	1.406	3	94	.246

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Between Groups	.372	3	.124	1.027
	Within Groups	11.359	94	.121	
	Total	11.731	97		
Authoritative-Permissive	Between Groups	.407	3	.136	.889
	Within Groups	14.341	94	.153	
	Total	14.748	97		
Authoritarian-Permissive	Between Groups	.309	3	.103	.518
	Within Groups	18.686	94	.199	
	Total	18.995	97		

ANOVA

		Sig.
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Between Groups	.384
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritative-Permissive	Between Groups	.450
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritarian-Permissive	Between Groups	.671
	Within Groups	
	Total	

.

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons
LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Mean Difference (I-J)
Authoritative-Authoritarian	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.19972
		Senior secondary school	.03028
		Tertiary education	-.04589
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.19972
		Senior secondary school	-.16944
		Tertiary education	-.24561
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.03028
		Junior secondary school	.16944
		Tertiary education	-.07617
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.04589
		Junior secondary school	.24561
		Senior secondary school	.07617
Authoritative-Permissive	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.25111
		Senior secondary school	.11778
		Tertiary education	.01200
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.25111
		Senior secondary school	-.13333
		Tertiary education	-.23911
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.11778
		Junior secondary school	.13333
		Tertiary education	-.10578
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	-.01200
		Junior secondary school	.23911
		Senior secondary school	.10578
Authoritarian-Permissive	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	-.28472
		Senior secondary school	-.05417
		Tertiary education	-.14322

302

		None/Primary school	.28472
	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.23056
		Tertiary education	.14150
		None/Primary school	.05417
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	-.23056
		Tertiary education	-.08906

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Std. Error
Authoritative-Authoritarian	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.21049
		Senior secondary school	.18503
		Tertiary education	.16056
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.21049
		Senior secondary school	.17381
		Tertiary education	.14748
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.18503
		Junior secondary school	.17381
		Tertiary education	.10808
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.16056
		Junior secondary school	.14748
		Senior secondary school	.10808
Authoritative-Permissive	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.23652
		Senior secondary school	.20791
		Tertiary education	.18041
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.23652
		Senior secondary school	.19530
		Tertiary education	.16571
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.20791
		Junior secondary school	.19530
		Tertiary education	.12144
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.18041
		Junior secondary school	.16571
		Senior secondary school	.12144
Authoritarian-Permissive	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.26998
		Senior secondary school	.23733

303

		Tertiary education	.20593
		None/Primary school	.26998
	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.22293
		Tertiary education	.18916
		None/Primary school	.23733
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.22293
		Tertiary education	.13862

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Sig.
		Junior secondary school	.345
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.870
		Tertiary education	.776
		None/Primary school	.345
	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.332
		Tertiary education	.099
Authoritative-Authoritarian		None/Primary school	.870
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.332
		Tertiary education	.483
		None/Primary school	.776
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.099
		Senior secondary school	.483
		Junior secondary school	.291
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.572
		Tertiary education	.947
		None/Primary school	.291
	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.496
Authoritative-Permissive		Tertiary education	.152
		None/Primary school	.572
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.496
		Tertiary education	.386
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.947
		Junior secondary school	.152

		Senior secondary school	.386
		Junior secondary school	.294
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.820
		Tertiary education	.488
		None/Primary school	.294
Authoritarian-Permissive	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.304
		Tertiary education	.456
		None/Primary school	.820
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.304
		Tertiary education	.522

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Lower Bound
	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	-.2182
		Senior secondary school	-.3371
		Tertiary education	-.3647
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.6177
		Senior secondary school	-.5145
		Tertiary education	-.5384
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.3977
		Junior secondary school	-.1757
		Tertiary education	-.2908
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	-.2729
		Junior secondary school	-.0472
		Senior secondary school	-.1384
	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	-.2185
		Senior secondary school	-.2950
		Tertiary education	-.3462
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.7207
		Senior secondary school	-.5211
Authoritative-Permissive		Tertiary education	-.5681
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.5306
		Junior secondary school	-.2544
		Tertiary education	-.3469
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	-.3702

(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	
	Junior secondary school	-.0899
	Senior secondary school	-.1353
None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	-.8208
	Senior secondary school	-.5254
	Tertiary education	-.5521
Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.2513
	Senior secondary school	-.2121
	Tertiary education	-.2341
Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.4171
	Junior secondary school	-.6732
	Tertiary education	-.3643

(Dependent Variable: Authoritarian-Permissive)

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Authoritative-Authoritarian	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.6177
		Senior secondary school	.3977
		Tertiary education	.2729
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.2182
		Senior secondary school	.1757
		Tertiary education	.0472
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.3371
		Junior secondary school	.5145
		Tertiary education	.1384
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.3647
		Junior secondary school	.5384
		Senior secondary school	.2908
Authoritative-Permissive	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.7207
		Senior secondary school	.5306
		Tertiary education	.3702
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.2185
		Senior secondary school	.2544
		Tertiary education	.0899
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.2950

306

		Junior secondary school	.5211
		Tertiary education	.1353
		None/Primary school	.3462
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.5681
		Senior secondary school	.3469
		Junior secondary school	.2513
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.4171
		Tertiary education	.2657
		None/Primary school	.8208
Authoritarian-Permissive	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.6732
		Tertiary education	.5171
		None/Primary school	.5254
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.2121
		Tertiary education	.1862

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Mean Difference (I-J)
Authoritarian-Permissive		None/Primary school	.14322
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	-.14150
		Senior secondary school	.08906

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Std. Error
Authoritarian-Permissive		None/Primary school	.20593
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.18916
		Senior secondary school	.13862

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Sig.
Authoritarian-Permissive	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.488

| | | Junior secondary school | .456 |
| | | Senior secondary school | .522 |

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

| Dependent Variable | (I) Parent's Education | (J) Parent's Education | 95% Confidence Interval |
			Lower Bound
Authoritarian-Permissive		None/Primary school	-.2657
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	-.5171
		Senior secondary school	-.1862

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

| Dependent Variable | (I) Parent's Education | (J) Parent's Education | 95% Confidence Interval |
			Upper Bound
Authoritarian-Permissive		None/Primary school	.5521
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.2341
		Senior secondary school	.3643

.

Oneway.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Authoritative (Above Modal)	None/Primary school	4	4.2167	.54535
	Junior secondary school	2	4.1333	.18856
	Senior secondary school	8	4.0833	.53184
	Tertiary education	66	4.0040	.42710

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Total	80	4.0258	.43561
	None/Primary school	2	2.7500	.23570
	Junior secondary school	5	2.6667	.20412
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	8	2.6771	.32865
	Tertiary education	50	2.6900	.34505
	Total	65	2.6885	.32652
	None/Primary school	2	2.7500	.23570
	Junior secondary school	5	2.5667	.33541
Permissive (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	8	2.4688	.66359
	Tertiary education	43	2.5349	.53305
	Total	58	2.5359	.52406

Descriptives

		Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
	None/Primary school	.27268	3.3489	5.0844
	Junior secondary school	.13333	2.4392	5.8275
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	.18803	3.6387	4.5280
	Tertiary education	.05257	3.8990	4.1090
	Total	.04870	3.9289	4.1228
	None/Primary school	.16667	.6323	4.8677
	Junior secondary school	.09129	2.4132	2.9201
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	.11620	2.4023	2.9518
	Tertiary education	.04880	2.5919	2.7881
	Total	.04050	2.6076	2.7694
	None/Primary school	.16667	.6323	4.8677
	Junior secondary school	.15000	2.1502	2.9831
Permissive (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	.23461	1.9140	3.0235
	Tertiary education	.08129	2.3708	2.6989
	Total	.06881	2.3981	2.6737

Descriptives

		Minimum	Maximum

	None/Primary school	3.40	4.53
	Junior secondary school	4.00	4.27
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	3.47	5.00
	Tertiary education	3.33	4.93
	Total	3.33	5.00
	None/Primary school	2.58	2.92
	Junior secondary school	2.42	2.92
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	2.33	3.33
	Tertiary education	2.33	3.50
	Total	2.33	3.50
	None/Primary school	2.58	2.92
	Junior secondary school	2.08	2.92
Permissive (Above Modal)	Senior secondary school	1.17	3.33
	Tertiary education	1.33	3.50
	Total	1.17	3.50

.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Authoritative (Above Modal)	.822	3	76	.486
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	.921	3	61	.436
Permissive (Above Modal)	1.062	3	54	.373

.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
	Between Groups	.227	3	.076	.389
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Within Groups	14.764	76	.194	
	Total	14.991	79		
	Between Groups	.011	3	.004	.033
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Within Groups	6.812	61	.112	
	Total	6.823	64		
Permissive (Above Modal)	Between Groups	.133	3	.044	.154

Within Groups	15.522	54	.287
Total	15.654	57	

ANOVA

		Sig.
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Between Groups	.761
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Between Groups	.992
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Permissive (Above Modal)	Between Groups	.927
	Within Groups	
	Total	

.

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Mean Difference (I-J)
Authoritative (Above Modal)	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.08333
		Senior secondary school	.13333
		Tertiary education	.21263
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.08333
		Senior secondary school	.05000
		Tertiary education	.12929
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.13333
		Junior secondary school	-.05000
		Tertiary education	.07929
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	-.21263
		Junior secondary school	-.12929

311

Authoritarian (Above Modal)		Senior secondary school	-.07929
		Junior secondary school	.08333
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.07292
		Tertiary education	.06000
		None/Primary school	-.08333
	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	-.01042
		Tertiary education	-.02333
		None/Primary school	-.07292
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.01042
		Tertiary education	-.01292
		None/Primary school	-.06000
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.02333
		Senior secondary school	.01292
		Junior secondary school	.18333
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.28125
		Tertiary education	.21512
		None/Primary school	-.18333
Permissive (Above Modal)	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.09792
		Tertiary education	.03178
		None/Primary school	-.28125
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	-.09792
		Tertiary education	-.06613

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Std. Error
		Junior secondary school	.38171
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.26991
		Tertiary education	.22696
		None/Primary school	.38171
	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	.34845
Authoritative (Above Modal)		Tertiary education	.31635
		None/Primary school	.26991
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.34845
		Tertiary education	.16501
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.22696

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	
		Junior secondary school	.31635
		Senior secondary school	.16501
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.27959
		Senior secondary school	.26419
		Tertiary education	.24098
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.27959
		Senior secondary school	.19051
		Tertiary education	.15674
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.26419
		Junior secondary school	.19051
		Tertiary education	.12725
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.24098
		Junior secondary school	.15674
		Senior secondary school	.12725
Permissive (Above Modal)	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.44856
		Senior secondary school	.42385
		Tertiary education	.38782
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.44856
		Senior secondary school	.30564
		Tertiary education	.25332
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.42385
		Junior secondary school	.30564
		Tertiary education	.20643

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Sig.
Authoritative (Above Modal)	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.828
		Senior secondary school	.623
		Tertiary education	.352
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.828
		Senior secondary school	.886
		Tertiary education	.684
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.623

		Junior secondary school	.886
		Tertiary education	.632
		None/Primary school	.352
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.684
		Senior secondary school	.632
	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.767
		Senior secondary school	.783
		Tertiary education	.804
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.767
		Senior secondary school	.957
		Tertiary education	.882
Authoritarian (Above Modal)		None/Primary school	.783
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	.957
		Tertiary education	.919
		None/Primary school	.804
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.882
		Senior secondary school	.919
	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.684
		Senior secondary school	.510
		Tertiary education	.581
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.684
Permissive (Above Modal)		Senior secondary school	.750
		Tertiary education	.901
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.510
		Junior secondary school	.750
		Tertiary education	.750

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Lower Bound
	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	-.6769
		Senior secondary school	-.4042
Authoritative (Above Modal)		Tertiary education	-.2394
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	-.8436
		Senior secondary school	-.6440
		Tertiary education	-.5008

314

		None/Primary school	-.6709
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	-.7440
		Tertiary education	-.2493
		None/Primary school	-.6647
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	-.7594
		Senior secondary school	-.4079
		Junior secondary school	-.4757
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	-.4554
		Tertiary education	-.4219
		None/Primary school	-.6424
	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	-.3914
Authoritarian (Above Modal)		Tertiary education	-.3368
		None/Primary school	-.6012
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	-.3705
		Tertiary education	-.2674
		None/Primary school	-.5419
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	-.2901
		Senior secondary school	-.2415
		Junior secondary school	-.7160
	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	-.5685
		Tertiary education	-.5624
		None/Primary school	-1.0826
Permissive (Above Modal)	Junior secondary school	Senior secondary school	-.5149
		Tertiary education	-.4761
		None/Primary school	-1.1310
	Senior secondary school	Junior secondary school	-.7107
		Tertiary education	-.4800

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Upper Bound
		Junior secondary school	.8436
Authoritative (Above Modal)	None/Primary school	Senior secondary school	.6709
		Tertiary education	.6647

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	
	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.6769
		Senior secondary school	.7440
		Tertiary education	.7594
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.4042
		Junior secondary school	.6440
		Tertiary education	.4079
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.2394
		Junior secondary school	.5008
		Senior secondary school	.2493
	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	.6424
		Senior secondary school	.6012
		Tertiary education	.5419
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.4757
		Senior secondary school	.3705
		Tertiary education	.2901
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.4554
		Junior secondary school	.3914
		Tertiary education	.2415
	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	.4219
		Junior secondary school	.3368
		Senior secondary school	.2674
	None/Primary school	Junior secondary school	1.0826
		Senior secondary school	1.1310
		Tertiary education	.9927
Permissive (Above Modal)	Junior secondary school	None/Primary school	.7160
		Senior secondary school	.7107
		Tertiary education	.5397
	Senior secondary school	None/Primary school	.5685
		Junior secondary school	.5149
		Tertiary education	.3477

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Mean Difference (I-J)
Permissive (Above Modal)	Tertiary education	None/Primary school	-.21512
		Junior secondary school	-.03178

		Senior secondary school	.06613

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Std. Error
Permissive (Above Modal)		None/Primary school	.38782
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.25332
		Senior secondary school	.20643

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Sig.
Permissive (Above Modal)		None/Primary school	.581
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.901
		Senior secondary school	.750

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Lower Bound
Permissive (Above Modal)		None/Primary school	-.9927
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	-.5397
		Senior secondary school	-.3477

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval

			Upper Bound
Permissive (Above Modal)		None/Primary school	.5624
	Tertiary education	Junior secondary school	.4761
		Senior secondary school	.4800

.

Oneway.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Self employed	12	3.8833	.43403	.12529
	Trading	14	3.7952	.33636	.08990
	Civil service	49	4.1224	.43935	.06276
	Private employee	4	3.9333	.42164	.21082
	Total	79	4.0186	.43585	.04904
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Self employed	9	2.7037	.32035	.10678
	Trading	15	2.5778	.22596	.05834
	Civil service	36	2.7431	.37711	.06285
	Private employee	5	2.6667	.20412	.09129
	Total	65	2.6936	.33010	.04094
Permissive (Above Modal)	Self employed	8	2.3958	.68393	.24181
	Trading	13	2.5128	.28022	.07772
	Civil service	32	2.5911	.59619	.10539
	Private employee	5	2.6667	.20412	.09129
	Total	58	2.5532	.52536	.06898

Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Self employed	3.6076	4.1591	3.40

	Trading	3.6010	3.9894	3.40
	Civil service	3.9963	4.2486	3.33
	Private employee	3.2624	4.6043	3.53
	Total	3.9209	4.1162	3.33
	Self employed	2.4575	2.9499	2.33
	Trading	2.4526	2.7029	2.33
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Civil service	2.6155	2.8707	2.33
	Private employee	2.4132	2.9201	2.42
	Total	2.6118	2.7754	2.33
	Self employed	1.8241	2.9676	1.17
	Trading	2.3435	2.6822	1.92
Permissive (Above Modal)	Civil service	2.3762	2.8061	1.33
	Private employee	2.4132	2.9201	2.42
	Total	2.4150	2.6913	1.17

Descriptives

		Maximum
	Self employed	4.60
	Trading	4.47
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Civil service	5.00
	Private employee	4.47
	Total	5.00
	Self employed	3.33
	Trading	2.92
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Civil service	3.50
	Private employee	2.92
	Total	3.50
	Self employed	3.33
	Trading	2.92
Permissive (Above Modal)	Civil service	3.50
	Private employee	2.92
	Total	3.50

.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Authoritative (Above Modal)	.534	3	75	.661
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	3.403	3	61	.023
Permissive (Above Modal)	4.719	3	54	.005

.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
	Between Groups	1.476	3	.492	2.765
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Within Groups	13.342	75	.178	
	Total	14.817	78		
	Between Groups	.294	3	.098	.894
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Within Groups	6.680	61	.110	
	Total	6.974	64		
	Between Groups	.330	3	.110	.385
Permissive (Above Modal)	Within Groups	15.402	54	.285	
	Total	15.732	57		

ANOVA

		Sig.
	Between Groups	.048
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Within Groups	
	Total	
	Between Groups	.449
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Within Groups	
	Total	
	Between Groups	.764
Permissive (Above Modal)	Within Groups	
	Total	

.

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error
		Trading	.08810	.16592
	Self employed	Civil service	-.23912	.13585
		Private employee	-.05000	.24351
		Self employed	-.08810	.16592
	Trading	Civil service	-.32721*	.12782
		Private employee	-.13810	.23912
Authoritative (Above Modal)		Self employed	.23912	.13585
	Civil service	Trading	.32721*	.12782
		Private employee	.18912	.21932
		Self employed	.05000	.24351
	Private employee	Trading	.13810	.23912
		Civil service	-.18912	.21932
		Trading	.12593	.13953
	Self employed	Civil service	-.03935	.12333
		Private employee	.03704	.18458
		Self employed	-.12593	.13953
	Trading	Civil service	-.16528	.10170
		Private employee	-.08889	.17089
Authoritarian (Above Modal)		Self employed	.03935	.12333
	Civil service	Trading	.16528	.10170
		Private employee	.07639	.15793
		Self employed	-.03704	.18458
	Private employee	Trading	.08889	.17089
		Civil service	-.07639	.15793
		Trading	-.11699	.23999
	Self employed	Civil service	-.19531	.21111
		Private employee	-.27083	.30446
		Self employed	.11699	.23999
Permissive (Above Modal)	Trading	Civil service	-.07833	.17565
		Private employee	-.15385	.28104
		Self employed	.19531	.21111
	Civil service	Trading	.07833	.17565
		Private employee	-.07552	.25682

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval
				Lower Bound
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Self employed	Trading	.597	-.2424
		Civil service	.082	-.5097
		Private employee	.838	-.5351
	Trading	Self employed	.597	-.4186
		Civil service	.012*	-.5818
		Private employee	.565	-.6144
	Civil service	Self employed	.082	-.0315
		Trading	.012*	.0726
		Private employee	.391	-.2478
	Private employee	Self employed	.838	-.4351
		Trading	.565	-.3383
		Civil service	.391	-.6260
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Self employed	Trading	.370	-.1531
		Civil service	.751	-.2860
		Private employee	.842	-.3320
	Trading	Self employed	.370	-.4049
		Civil service	.109	-.3686
		Private employee	.605	-.4306
	Civil service	Self employed	.751	-.2073
		Trading	.109	-.0381
		Private employee	.630	-.2394
	Private employee	Self employed	.842	-.4061
		Trading	.605	-.2528
		Civil service	.630	-.3922
Permissive (Above Modal)	Self employed	Trading	.628	-.5981
		Civil service	.359	-.6186
		Private employee	.378	-.8812
	Trading	Self employed	.628	-.3642
		Civil service	.657	-.4305
		Private employee	.586	-.7173
	Civil service	Self employed	.359	-.2279
		Trading	.657	-.2738

		Private employee	.770	-.5904

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	95% Confidence Interval
			Upper Bound
Authoritative (Above Modal)		Trading	.4186
	Self employed	Civil service	.0315
		Private employee	.4351
		Self employed	.2424
	Trading	Civil service	-.0726[*]
		Private employee	.3383
		Self employed	.5097
	Civil service	Trading	.5818[*]
		Private employee	.6260
		Self employed	.5351
	Private employee	Trading	.6144
		Civil service	.2478
Authoritarian (Above Modal)		Trading	.4049
	Self employed	Civil service	.2073
		Private employee	.4061
		Self employed	.1531
	Trading	Civil service	.0381
		Private employee	.2528
		Self employed	.2860
	Civil service	Trading	.3686
		Private employee	.3922
		Self employed	.3320
	Private employee	Trading	.4306
		Civil service	.2394
Permissive (Above Modal)		Trading	.3642
	Self employed	Civil service	.2279
		Private employee	.3396
	Trading	Self employed	.5981
		Civil service	.2738

		Private employee	.4096
		Self employed	.6186
	Civil service	Trading	.4305
		Private employee	.4394

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error
Permissive (Above Modal)		Self employed	.27083	.30446
	Private employee	Trading	.15385	.28104
		Civil service	.07552	.25682

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound
Permissive (Above Modal)		Self employed	.378	-.3396
	Private employee	Trading	.586	-.4096
		Civil service	.770	-.4394

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound
Permissive (Above Modal)		Self employed	.8812
	Private employee	Trading	.7173
		Civil service	.5904

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Authoritative Parenting Style Score		Authoritarian Parenting Score	
	Sex of Child		Sex of Child	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1	1	-.269	-.323
Authoritarian Parenting Score	-.269	-.323	1	1
Permissive Parenting Style	.016	-.017	.104	.191
Emotional Symptom Score	-.015	-.152	-.032	.271
Conduct Problem Score	.223	.017	-.205	.137
Peer Problem Score	.229	.041	-.012	.025
Pro-social Score	-.274	-.197	.048	.046
Hyperactivity Score	.221	.052	.041	.157
Total Difficulties Score	.200	-.107	-.210	.162

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Permissive Parenting Style		Emotional Symptom Score		Conduct Problem Score
	Sex of Child		Sex of Child		Sex of Child
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.016	-.017	-.015	-.152	.223
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.104	.191	-.032	.271	-.205
Permissive Parenting Style	1	1	.335	.226	.140
Emotional Symptom Score	.335	.226	1	1	.654[*]
Conduct Problem Score	.140	-.111	.654	.509	1

Peer Problem Score	.432	.074	.505	.506	.509[**]
Pro-social Score	-.078	-.044	-.538	-.601	-.384
Hyperactivity Score	.217	-.180	.604	.487	.590
Total Difficulties Score	.210	-.121	.767	.691	.797

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Conduct Problem Score	Peer Problem Score		Pro-social Score		Hyperactivity Score
	Sex of Child	Sex of Child		Sex of Child		Sex of Child
	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.017	.229	.041	-.274	-.197	.221
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.137	-.012	.025	.048	.046	.041
Permissive Parenting Style	-.111	.432	.074	-.078	-.044	.217
Emotional Symptom Score	.509	.505	.506	-.538	-.601[*]	.604
Conduct Problem Score	1	.509	.516	-.384	-.652	.590
Peer Problem Score	.516	1	1	-.378	-.549[**]	.400
Pro-social Score	-.652	-.378	-.549	1	1	-.546
Hyperactivity Score	.774	.400	.454	-.546	-.744	1
Total Difficulties Score	.856	.654	.650	-.538	-.605	.641

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Hyperactivity Score	Total Difficulties Score	
	Sex of Child	Sex of Child	
	Female	Male	Female
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.052	.200	-.107
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.157	-.210	.162
Permissive Parenting Style	-.180	.210	-.121
Emotional Symptom Score	.487	.767	.691
Conduct Problem Score	.774	.797	.856

	.454	.654	.650
Peer Problem Score	.454	.654	.650
Pro-social Score	-.744	-.538	-.605
Hyperactivity Score	1	.641	.718
Total Difficulties Score	.718	1	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Sex of Child	Authoritative (Above Modal)	Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Permissive (Above Modal)
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Male	1	.227	.061
	Female	1	-.142	-.075
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Male	.227	1	1.000**
	Female	-.142	1	1.000**
Permissive (Above Modal)	Male	.061	1.000**	1
	Female	-.075	1.000**	1
Emotional Symptom Score	Male	.023	-.028	-.062
	Female	-.237	.298	.168
Conduct Problem Score	Male	.089	-.107	-.288
	Female	.159	-.163	-.011
Peer Problem Score	Male	.358	.002	-.058
	Female	.195	.200	.110
Pro-social Score	Male	-.175	.120	-.012
	Female	-.133	-.037	.175
Hyperactivity Score	Male	.044	-.055	-.023
	Female	.168	-.030	.034
Total Difficulties Score	Male	.129	-.158	-.195
	Female	.030	.073	.117

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Sex of Child	Emotional Symptom Score	Conduct Problem Score	Peer Problem Score
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Male	.023	.089	.358
	Female	-.237	.159	.195
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Male	-.028	-.107	.002[**]
	Female	.298	-.163	.200[**]
Permissive (Above Modal)	Male	-.062	-.288[**]	-.058
	Female	.168	-.011[**]	.110
Emotional Symptom Score	Male	1	.654	.505
	Female	1	.509	.506
Conduct Problem Score	Male	.654	1	.509
	Female	.509	1	.516
Peer Problem Score	Male	.505	.509	1
	Female	.506	.516	1
Pro-social Score	Male	-.538	-.384	-.378
	Female	-.601	-.652	-.549
Hyperactivity Score	Male	.604	.590	.400
	Female	.487	.774	.454
Total Difficulties Score	Male	.767	.797	.654

	Female	.691	.856	.650

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Sex of Child	Pro-social Score	Hyperactivity Score	Total Difficulties Score
Authoritative (Above Modal)	Male	-.175	.044	.129
	Female	-.133	.168	.030
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	Male	.120	-.055	-.158[**]
	Female	-.037	-.030	.073[**]
Permissive (Above Modal)	Male	-.012	-.023[**]	-.195
	Female	.175	.034[**]	.117
Emotional Symptom Score	Male	-.538	.604	.767
	Female	-.601	.487	.691
Conduct Problem Score	Male	-.384	.590	.797
	Female	-.652	.774	.856
Peer Problem Score	Male	-.378	.400	.654
	Female	-.549	.454	.650
Pro-social Score	Male	1	-.546	-.538
	Female	1	-.744	-.605

	Sex of Child			
Hyperactivity Score	Male	-.546	1	.641
	Female	-.744	1	.718
Total Difficulties Score	Male	-.538	.641	1
	Female	-.605	.718	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Sex of Child	Authoritative-Authoritarian	Authoritative-Permissive	Authoritarian-Permissive
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Male	1	.527**	.433**
	Female	1	.525**	.455*
Authoritative-Permissive	Male	.527**	1	.407*
	Female	.525**	1	.420*
Authoritarian-Permissive	Male	.433**	.407*	1
	Female	.455*	.420*	1
Emotional Symptom Score	Male	-.039	.221	.211
	Female	.098	.057	.321
Conduct Problem Score	Male	.029	.256	-.038

	Female	.131	-.068	.012

	Female	.131	-.068	.012
Peer Problem Score	Male	.187	.462**	.291
	Female	.056	.082	.065
Pro-social Score	Male	-.198	-.249	-.023
	Female	-.133	-.170	-.001
Hyperactivity Score	Male	.222	.307	.176
	Female	.178	-.094	-.021
Total Difficulties Score	Male	.006	.288	.008
	Female	.044	-.162	.021

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Sex of Child	Emotional Symptom Score	Conduct Problem Score	Peer Problem Score
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Male	-.039	.029**	.187**
	Female	.098	.131**	.056*
Authoritative-Permissive	Male	.221**	.256	.462*
	Female	.057**	-.068	.082*
Authoritarian-Permissive	Male	.211**	-.038*	.291
	Female	.321*	.012*	.065
Emotional Symptom Score	Male	1	.654	.505

	Female	1	.509	.506
Conduct Problem Score	Male	.654	1	.509
	Female	.509	1	.516
Peer Problem Score	Male	.505	.509**	1
	Female	.506	.516	1
Pro-social Score	Male	-.538	-.384	-.378
	Female	-.601	-.652	-.549
Hyperactivity Score	Male	.604	.590	.400
	Female	.487	.774	.454
Total Difficulties Score	Male	.767	.797	.654
	Female	.691	.856	.650

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Sex of Child	Pro-social Score	Hyperactivity Score	Total Difficulties Score
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Male	-.198	.222**	.006**
	Female	-.133	.178**	.044*
Authoritative-Permissive	Male	-.249**	.307	.288*
	Female	-.170**	-.094	-.162*
Authoritarian-Permissive	Male	-.023**	.176*	.008

		Pro-social Score	Hyperactivity Score	Total Difficulties Score
	Female	-.001*	-.021*	.021
Emotional Symptom Score	Male	-.538	.604	.767
	Female	-.601	.487	.691
Conduct Problem Score	Male	-.384	.590	.797
	Female	-.652	.774	.856
Peer Problem Score	Male	-.378	.400**	.654
	Female	-.549	.454	.650
Pro-social Score	Male	1	-.546	-.538
	Female	1	-.744	-.605
Hyperactivity Score	Male	-.546	1	.641
	Female	-.744	1	.718
Total Difficulties Score	Male	-.538	.641	1
	Female	-.605	.718	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

.

AutoCorrelations for SES.

Correlations

		Parent's Education	Occupation
Parent's Education	Pearson Correlation	1	.021
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.842
	N	98	96
Occupation	Pearson Correlation	.021	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.842	
	N	96	97

.

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Authoritarian Parenting Score	Permissive Parenting Style	Authoritative-Authoritarian

Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1	-.080	-.090	.728**
Authoritarian Parenting Score	-.080	1	.244*	.625**
Permissive Parenting Style	-.090	.244*	1	.098
Authoritative-Authoritarian	.728**	.625**	.098	1
Authoritative-Permissive	.616**	.138	.729**	.577**
Authoritarian-Permissive	-.108	.720**	.849**	.411**
Authoritative (Above Modal)	1.000**	-.002	-.149	.645**
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	.224	1.000**	.263*	.650**
Permissive (Above Modal)	-.004	1.000**	.051	.678**

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Authoritative-Permissive	Authoritarian-Permissive	Authoritative (Above Modal)	Authoritarian (Above Modal)
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.616	-.108	1.000	.224**
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.138	.720	-.002*	1.000**
Permissive Parenting Style	.729	.849*	-.149	.263
Authoritative-Authoritarian	.577**	.411**	.645	.650
Authoritative-Permissive	1**	.597	.457**	.357**
Authoritarian-Permissive	.597	1**	-.108**	.622**
Authoritative (Above Modal)	.457**	-.108	1	.260**
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	.357	.622**	.260*	1**
Permissive (Above Modal)	.033	.738**	.037	1.000**

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Permissive (Above Modal)
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	-.004
Authoritarian Parenting Score	1.000

Permissive Parenting Style	.051
Authoritative-Authoritarian	.678**
Authoritative-Permissive	.033**
Authoritarian-Permissive	.738
Authoritative (Above Modal)	.037**
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	1.000
Permissive (Above Modal)	1

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

.

Factor Analysis.

Communalities

	Initial	Extraction
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1.000	1.000
Authoritarian Parenting Score	1.000	1.000
Permissive Parenting Style	1.000	1.000
Authoritative-Authoritarian	1.000	1.000
Authoritative-Permissive	1.000	1.000
Authoritarian-Permissive	1.000	1.000
Authoritative (Above Modal)	1.000	1.000
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	1.000	1.000
Permissive (Above Modal)	1.000	1.000

Extraction Method, Principal Component Analysis.

.

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings	
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance
1	4.356	48.405	48.405	4.356	48.405
2	2.883	32.029	80.434	2.883	32.029
3	1.761	19.566	100.000	1.761	19.566
4	4.581E-016	5.090E-015	100.000		
5	3.578E-017	3.975E-016	100.000		
6	1.829E-017	2.032E-016	100.000		
7	-9.998E-017	-1.111E-015	100.000		
8	-2.027E-016	-2.252E-015	100.000		
9	-2.946E-016	-3.273E-015	100.000		

Total Variance Explained

Component	Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings	Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	48.405	3.662	40.693	40.693
2	80.434	3.027	33.638	74.331
3	100.000	2.310	25.669	100.000
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				

Extraction Method, Principal Component Analysis.

.

Scree Plot

Component Matrix[a]

	Component		
	1	2	3
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.675	-.564	.475
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.871	.391	-.297
Permissive Parenting Style	-.406	.811	.421
Authoritative-Authoritarian	.977	-.154	.149
Authoritative-Permissive	.140	.417	.898
Authoritarian-Permissive	.167	.966	.197
Authoritative (Above Modal)	.675	-.564	.475
Authoritarian (Above Modal)	.871	.391	-.297
Permissive (Above Modal)	.871	.391	-.297

337

Extraction Method, Principal Component Analysis.[a]

a. 3 components extracted.

Regression.

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Total Difficulties Score	1.86	.804	100
Authoritative-Authoritarian	3.1417	.34996	100
Authoritative-Permissive	2.9590	.39898	100
Authoritarian-Permissive	2.2507	.44127	100

Correlations

		Total Difficulties Score	Authoritative-Authoritarian	Authoritative-Permissive
Total Difficulties Score	Pearson Correlation	1.000	-.006	.056
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.	.476	.289
	N	100	100	100
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Pearson Correlation	-.006	1.000	.577
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.476	.	.000
	N	100	100	100
Authoritative-Permissive	Pearson Correlation	.056	.577	1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.289	.000	.
	N	100	100	100
Authoritarian-Permissive	Pearson Correlation	.062	.411	.597
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.269	.000	.000
	N	100	100	100

Correlations

		Authoritarian-Permissive
Total Difficulties Score	Pearson Correlation	.062
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.269
	N	100
Authoritative-Authoritarian	Pearson Correlation	.411
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000
	N	100
Authoritative-Permissive	Pearson Correlation	.597
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000

Authoritarian-Permissive	N	100
	Pearson Correlation	1.000
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.
	N	100

.

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Authoritarian-Permissive, Authoritative-Authoritarian, Autharitative-Permissive[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.084[a]	.007	-.024	.814

a. Predictors (Constant), Authoritarian-Permissive, Authoritative-Authoritarian, Authoritative-Permissive

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.453	3	.151	.228	.877[b]
	Residual	63.587	96	.662		
	Total	64.040	99			

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

b. Predictors (Constant), Authoritarian-Permissive, Authoritative-Authoritarian, Authoritative-Permissive

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	1.733	.772		2.245
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	-.145	.288	-.063	-.502
	Authoritative-Permissive	.125	.287	.062	.437
	Authoritarian-Permissive	.093	.232	.051	.401

Coefficients[a]

Model		Sig.
1	(Constant)	.027
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	.617
	Authoritative-Permissive	.663
	Authoritarian-Permissive	.689

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

Regression.

Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Pro-social Score	2.79	.518	100
Authoritative-Authoritarian	3.1417	.34996	100
Authoritative-Permissive	2.9590	.39898	100
Authoritarian-Permissive	2.2507	.44127	100

Correlations

		Pro-social Score	Authoritative-Authoritarian	Authoritative-Permissive
Pearson Correlation	Pro-social Score	1.000	-.094	-.039
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	-.094	1.000	.577

	Authoritative-Permissive	-.039	.577	1.000
	Authoritarian-Permissive	.147	.411	.597
	Pro-social Score	.	.176	.351
Sig. (1-tailed)	Authoritative-Authoritarian	.176	.	.000
	Authoritative-Permissive	.351	.000	.
	Authoritarian-Permissive	.072	.000	.000
	Pro-social Score	100	100	100
N	Authoritative-Authoritarian	100	100	100
	Authoritative-Permissive	100	100	100
	Authoritarian-Permissive	100	100	100

Correlations

		Authoritarian-Permissive
Pearson Correlation	Pro-social Score	.147
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	.411
	Authoritative-Permissive	.597
	Authoritarian-Permissive	1.000
Sig. (1-tailed)	Pro-social Score	.072
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	.000
	Authoritative-Permissive	.000
	Authoritarian-Permissive	.
N	Pro-social Score	100
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	100
	Authoritative-Permissive	100
	Authoritarian-Permissive	100

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Authoritarian-Permissive, Authoritative-Authoritarian, Autharitative-Permissive[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable, Pro-social Score

b. All requested variables entered.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.242[a]	.059	.029	.511

a. Predictors (Constant), Authoritarian-Permissive, Authoritative-Authoritarian,

Authoritative-Permissive

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.559	3	.520	1.993	.120[b]
	Residual	25.031	96	.261		
	Total	26.590	99			

a. Dependent Variable, Pro-social Score

b. Predictors (Constant), Authoritarian-Permissive, Authoritative-Authoritarian, Authoritative-Permissive

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	3.171	.485		6.545
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	-.200	.181	-.135	-1.110
	Authoritative-Permissive	-.165	.180	-.127	-.916
	Authoritarian-Permissive	.327	.146	.278	2.244

Coefficients[a]

Model	Sig.

		Sig.
1	(Constant)	.000
	Authoritative-Authoritarian	.270
	Authoritative-Permissive	.362
	Authoritarian-Permissive	.027

a. Dependent Variable, Pro-social Score

T-Test.

Group Statistics

	Total Difficulties Score	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Normal	40	3.8483	.49499
	Borderline/Abnormal	60	3.8511	.58511
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Normal	40	2.4229	.44713
	Borderline/Abnormal	60	2.4403	.50657
Permissive Parenting Style	Normal	40	1.9900	.45506
	Borderline/Abnormal	60	2.1200	.72458

Group Statistics

	Total Difficulties Score	Std. Error Mean
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Normal	.07826
	Borderline/Abnormal	.07554
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Normal	.07070
	Borderline/Abnormal	.06540
Permissive Parenting Style	Normal	.07195
	Borderline/Abnormal	.09354

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	1.285	.260	-.025
	Equal variances not assumed			-.026
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	.813	.369	-.176
	Equal variances not assumed			-.180
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	11.492	.001	-1.009
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.102

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	98	.980	-.00278
	Equal variances not assumed	92.464	.980	-.00278
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	98	.861	-.01736
	Equal variances not assumed	90.499	.857	-.01736
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	98	.316	-.13000
	Equal variances not assumed	97.719	.273	-.13000

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	.11247	-.22598

	Equal variances not assumed	.10877	-.21879
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	.09875	-.21333
	Equal variances not assumed	.09631	-.20868
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	.12886	-.38571
	Equal variances not assumed	.11801	-.36420

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	.22043
	Equal variances not assumed	.21324
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	.17861
	Equal variances not assumed	.17395
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	.12571
	Equal variances not assumed	.10420

.

Oneway.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Abnormal	5	4.3600	.28519	.12754
	Borderline	11	3.9152	.62900	.18965
	Normal	84	3.8111	.53772	.05867
	Total	100	3.8500	.54822	.05482
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Abnormal	5	2.4000	.40995	.18333
	Borderline	11	2.2424	.41240	.12434
	Normal	84	2.4603	.49215	.05370
	Total	100	2.4333	.48142	.04814
Permissive Parenting Style	Abnormal	5	2.2000	.66332	.29665
	Borderline	11	1.5636	.26560	.08008
	Normal	84	2.1262	.63836	.06965
	Total	100	2.0680	.63132	.06313

Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
		Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Abnormal	4.0059	4.7141	4.07	4.67
	Borderline	3.4926	4.3377	3.27	5.00
	Normal	3.6944	3.9278	2.07	4.93
	Total	3.7412	3.9588	2.07	5.00
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Abnormal	1.8910	2.9090	1.92	2.92
	Borderline	1.9654	2.5195	1.50	2.83
	Normal	2.3535	2.5671	1.17	3.50
	Total	2.3378	2.5289	1.17	3.50
Permissive Parenting Style	Abnormal	1.3764	3.0236	1.40	3.20
	Borderline	1.3852	1.7421	1.40	2.20
	Normal	1.9877	2.2647	1.00	4.40
	Total	1.9427	2.1933	1.00	4.40

.

Test of Homogeneity of Variances

	Levene Statistic	df1	df2	Sig.
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1.910	2	97	.154
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.349	2	97	.706
Permissive Parenting Style	2.571	2	97	.082

.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Between Groups	1.474	2	.737	2.528
	Within Groups	28.280	97	.292	
	Total	29.754	99		
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Between Groups	.468	2	.234	1.009
	Within Groups	22.477	97	.232	
	Total	22.944	99		

Permissive Parenting Style	Between Groups	3.170	2	1.585	4.237
	Within Groups	36.288	97	.374	
	Total	39.458	99		

ANOVA

		Sig.
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Between Groups	.085
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Between Groups	.368
	Within Groups	
	Total	
Permissive Parenting Style	Between Groups	.017
	Within Groups	
	Total	

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Pro-social Score	(J) Pro-social Score	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Abnormal	Borderline	.44485	.29123
		Normal	.54889[*]	.24856
	Borderline	Abnormal	-.44485	.29123
		Normal	.10404	.17313
	Normal	Abnormal	-.54889[*]	.24856
		Borderline	-.10404	.17313
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Abnormal	Borderline	.15758	.25963
		Normal	-.06032	.22159

	Borderline	Abnormal	-.15758	.25963
		Normal	-.21789	.15435
	Normal	Abnormal	.06032	.22159
		Borderline	.21789	.15435
	Abnormal	Borderline	.63636	.32989
		Normal	.07381	.28156
Permissive Parenting Style	Borderline	Abnormal	-.63636	.32989
		Normal	-.56255*	.19612
	Normal	Abnormal	-.07381	.28156
		Borderline	.56255*	.19612

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Pro-social Score	(J) Pro-social Score	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval
				Lower Bound
	Abnormal	Borderline	.130	-.1332
		Normal	.030*	.0556
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Borderline	Abnormal	.130	-1.0229
		Normal	.549	-.2396
	Normal	Abnormal	.030*	-1.0422
		Borderline	.549	-.4477
	Abnormal	Borderline	.545	-.3577
Authoritarian Parenting Score		Normal	.786	-.5001
	Borderline	Abnormal	.545	-.6729

348

		Normal	.161	-.5242
	Normal	Abnormal	.786	-.3795
		Borderline	.161	-.0884
	Abnormal	Borderline	.057	-.0184
		Normal	.794	-.4850
Permissive Parenting Style	Borderline	Abnormal	.057	-1.2911
		Normal	.005[*]	-.9518
	Normal	Abnormal	.794	-.6326
		Borderline	.005[*]	.1733

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Pro-social Score	(J) Pro-social Score	95% Confidence Interval
			Upper Bound
	Abnormal	Borderline	1.0229
		Normal	1.0422[*]
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Borderline	Abnormal	.1332
		Normal	.4477
	Normal	Abnormal	-.0556[*]
		Borderline	.2396
	Abnormal	Borderline	.6729
		Normal	.3795
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Borderline	Abnormal	.3577
		Normal	.0884
	Normal	Abnormal	.5001
		Borderline	.5242
	Abnormal	Borderline	1.2911
		Normal	.6326
Permissive Parenting Style	Borderline	Abnormal	.0184
		Normal	-.1733[*]
	Normal	Abnormal	.4850
		Borderline	.9518[*]

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

.

T-Test.

Group Statistics

	Pro-social	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1.00	5	4.3600	.28519	.12754
	2.00	95	3.8232	.54636	.05606
Authoritarian Parenting Score	1.00	5	2.4000	.40995	.18333
	2.00	95	2.4351	.48670	.04993
Permissive Parenting Style	1.00	5	2.2000	.66332	.29665
	2.00	95	2.0611	.63251	.06489

.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means
		F	Sig.	t
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	2.443	.121	2.174
	Equal variances not assumed			3.853
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	.205	.651	-.158
	Equal variances not assumed			-.185
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	.003	.954	.478
	Equal variances not assumed			.458

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	98	.032	.53684
	Equal variances not assumed	5.686	.009	.53684

Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	98	.875	-.03509
	Equal variances not assumed	4.614	.861	-.03509
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	98	.634	.13895
	Equal variances not assumed	4.392	.669	.13895

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
			Lower
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	.24694	.04680
	Equal variances not assumed	.13932	.19133
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	.22198	-.47561
	Equal variances not assumed	.19001	-.53606
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	.29080	-.43814
	Equal variances not assumed	.30366	-.67532

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference
		Upper
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Equal variances assumed	1.02688
	Equal variances not assumed	.88236
Authoritarian Parenting Score	Equal variances assumed	.40543
	Equal variances not assumed	.46589
Permissive Parenting Style	Equal variances assumed	.71604
	Equal variances not assumed	.95322

.

Frequencies.

Statistics

	N		Mean
	Valid	Missing	
A1 I am responsive to my child's feelings and needs.	100	0	4.41
A2 I use physical punishment as a way of disciplining my child.	100	0	2.53
A3 I take my child's desires into account before asking him/her to do something.	100	0	2.59
A4 When my child asks why he/she has to conform, I state, because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to.	100	0	2.55
A5 I explain to my child how I feel about the child's good and bad behavior.	100	0	4.36
A6 I spank when my child is disobedient.	100	0	3.35
A7 I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.	100	0	3.85
A8 I find it difficult to discipline my child.	100	0	1.50
A9 I encourage my child to freely express (himself)(herself) even when disagreeing with me.	100	0	3.27

A10 I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little if any explanations.	100	0	2.24
A11 I emphasise the reasons for rules.	100	0	4.03
A12 I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset.	100	0	3.91
A13 I yell or shout when my child misbehaves.	100	0	3.20
A14 I give praise when my child is good.	100	0	4.51
A15 I give in to my child when the child causes a commotion about something.	100	0	2.53
A16 I explode in anger towards my child.	100	0	2.27
A17 I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it.	100	0	2.73
A18 I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.	100	0	3.39
A19 I grab my child when being disobedient.	100	0	2.08
A20 I state punishments to my child and do not actually do them.	100	0	2.44
A21 I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them.	100	0	4.10
A22 I allow my child to make input into family rules.	100	0	3.21
A23 I scold and criticize to make my child improve.	100	0	3.22
A24 I spoil my child.	100	0	1.14

Statistics

	Std. Deviation
A1 I am responsive to my child's feelings and needs.	.965
A2 I use physical punishment as a way of disciplining my child.	1.210
A3 I take my child's desires into account before asking him/her to do something.	1.342
A4 When my child asks why he/she has to conform, I state, because I said so, or I am your parent and I want you to.	1.201
A5 I explain to my child how I feel about the child's good and bad behavior.	.835
A6 I spank when my child is disobedient.	1.313
A7 I encourage my child to talk about his/her troubles.	1.234
A8 I find it difficult to discipline my child.	1.168
A9 I encourage my child to freely express (himself)(herself) even when disagreeing with me.	1.413

A10 I punish by taking privileges away from my child with little if any explanations.	1.055
A11 I emphasise the reasons for rules.	1.123
A12 I give comfort and understanding when my child is upset.	.954
A13 I yell or shout when my child misbehaves.	1.255
A14 I give praise when my child is good.	.823
A15 I give in to my child when the child causes a commotion about something.	1.410
A16 I explode in anger towards my child.	1.081
A17 I threaten my child with punishment more often than actually giving it.	1.014
A18 I take into account my child's preferences in making plans for the family.	1.524
A19 I grab my child when being disobedient.	1.338
A20 I state punishments to my child and do not actually do them.	1.131
A21 I show respect for my child's opinions by encouraging my child to express them.	.927
A22 I allow my child to make input into family rules.	1.380
A23 I scold and criticize to make my child improve.	1.315
A24 I spoil my child.	.513

Statistics

	N		Mean
	Valid	Missing	
A25 I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed.	100	0	4.43
A26 I use threats as punishment with little or no justification.	100	0	2.07
A27 I have warm and intimate times together with my child.	100	0	3.81
A28 I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations.	100	0	1.95
A29 I help my child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.	100	0	3.87
A30 I scold or criticize when my child's behavior doesn't meet my expectations	100	0	3.33
A31 I explain the consequences of the child's behavior.	100	0	4.01
A32 I slap my child when the child misbehaves.	100	0	1.87

Statistics

	Std. Deviation
A25 I give my child reasons why rules should be obeyed.	.946
A26 I use threats as punishment with little or no justification.	1.066
A27 I have warm and intimate times together with my child.	1.152

A28 I punish by putting my child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations.	.968
A29 I help my child to understand the impact of behavior by encouraging my child to talk about the consequences of his/her own actions.	1.089
A30 I scold or criticize when my child's behavior doesn't meet my expectations	1.334
A31 I explain the consequences of the child's behavior.	1.049
A32 I slap my child when the child misbehaves.	1.031

.

Frequencies.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
Connection Dimension	100	0	4.0980	.59526
Regulation Dimension	100	0	4.1400	.62571
Autonomy Dimension	100	0	3.3120	.87309
Physical Coercion Dimension	100	0	2.4575	.63071
Verbal Hostility Dimension	100	0	3.0050	.74956
Non-Reasoning/Punitive Dimension	100	0	2.2025	.67951
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	100	0	3.8500	.54822
Authoritarian Parenting Score	100	0	2.4333	.48142
Permissive Parenting Style	100	0	2.0680	.63132

.

Frequencies.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation	Range
	Valid	Missing			
Connection Dimension	100	0	4.0980	.59526	3.40
Regulation Dimension	100	0	4.1400	.62571	3.20
Autonomy Dimension	100	0	3.3120	.87309	3.40
Physical Coercion Dimension	100	0	2.4575	.63071	2.75
Verbal Hostility Dimension	100	0	3.0050	.74956	2.75
Non-Reasoning/Punitive Dimension	100	0	2.2025	.67951	3.25
Permissive Parenting Style	100	0	2.0680	.63132	3.40
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	100	0	3.8500	.54822	2.93
Authoritarian Parenting Score	100	0	2.4333	.48142	2.33

Statistics

	Minimum	Maximum
Connection Dimension	1.60	5.00
Regulation Dimension	2.20	5.40
Autonomy Dimension	1.60	5.00
Physical Coercion Dimension	1.00	3.75
Verbal Hostility Dimension	1.50	4.25
Non-Reasoning/Punitive Dimension	1.00	4.25
Permissive Parenting Style	1.00	4.40
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	2.07	5.00
Authoritarian Parenting Score	1.17	3.50

.

Frequencies, Emotional Symptoms.

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
S3 Often complains of headaches, stomach-aches or sickness...	100	0	.44	.656
S8 Many worries, often seems worried...	100	0	1.02	.710
S13 Often unhappy, down-hearted or tearful…	100	0	.49	.559
S16 Nervous or clingy in new situations, easily loses confidence...	100	0	.82	.783
S24 Many fears, easily scared...	100	0	.81	.677

.

Frequencies, Conduct Problem.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
S5 Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers...	100	0	.58	.638
S7 Generally obedient, usually does what adults request...	100	0	.69	.706
S12 Often fights with other children or bullies them	100	0	.46	.642
S18 Often lies or cheats...	100	0	.34	.555
S22 Steals from home, school or elsewhere...	100	0	.14	.403

.

Frequencies, Peer Problem.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
S6 Rather solitary, tends to play alone...	100	0	.50	.628
S11 Has at least one good friend...	100	0	.40	.667
S14 Generally liked by other children...	100	0	.37	.544
S19 Picked on or bullied by other children...	100	0	.61	.695
S23 Gets on better with adults than with other children...	100	0	.70	.628

.

Frequencies, Pro-social.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
S1 Considerate of other people's feelings...	100	0	1.46	.593
S4 Shares readily with other children (treats, toys, pencils etc.)	100	0	1.48	.674
S9 Helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill	100	0	1.46	.626
S17 Kind to younger children...	100	0	1.49	.628
S20 Often volunteers to help others (parents, teachers, other children)...	100	0	1.57	.640

.

Frequencies; Hyperactivity.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
S2 Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long	100	0	1.19	.734
S10 Constantly fidgeting or squirming...	100	0	.55	.672
S15 Easily distracted, concentration wanders...	100	0	.88	.769
S21 Thinks things out before acting...	100	0	.79	.795
S25 Sees tasks through to the end, good attention span...	100	0	.74	.774

.

Frequencies.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
COMPUTE EmotSympScore=S3 + S8 + S13 + S16 + S24	100	0	3.58	1.981
COMPUTE CondProbScore=S5 + S7 + S12 + S18 + S22	100	0	2.21	2.017

	100	0	2.58	1.577
COMPUTE PeerProScore=S6 + S11 + S14 + S19 + S23	100	0	2.58	1.577
COMPUTE ProSocScore=S1 + S4 + S9 + S17 + S20	100	0	7.46	2.017
COMPUTE HyperScore=S2 + S10 + S15 + S21 + S25	100	0	4.15	2.455

.

Frequencies.

Statistics

	N		Mean	Std. Deviation
	Valid	Missing		
COMPUTE EmotSympScore=S3 + S8 + S13 + S16 + S24	100	0	3.58	1.981
COMPUTE CondProbScore=S5 + S7 + S12 + S18 + S22	100	0	2.21	2.017
COMPUTE PeerProScore=S6 + S11 + S14 + S19 + S23	100	0	2.58	1.577
COMPUTE ProSocScore=S1 + S4 + S9 + S17 + S20	100	0	7.46	2.017
COMPUTE HyperScore=S2 + S10 + S15 + S21 + S25	100	0	4.15	2.455
COMPUTE TotalDS=EmotSympScore + CondProbScore + PeerProScore + HyperScore	100	0	12.52	6.083

.

Regression.

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Permissive Parenting Style, Authoritative Parenting Style Score, Authoritarian Parenting Score[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

b. All requested variables entered.

.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.084[a]	.007	-.024	.814

a. Predictors (Constant), Permissive Parenting Style, Authoritative Parenting Style Score, Authoritarian Parenting Score

.

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	.453	3	.151	.228	.877[b]
	Residual	63.587	96	.662		
	Total	64.040	99			

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

b. Predictors (Constant), Permissive Parenting Style, Authoritative Parenting Style Score, Authoritarian Parenting Score

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	1.733	.772		2.245
	Authoritative Parenting Style Score	-.010	.150	-.006	-.063
	Authoritarian Parenting Score	-.026	.176	-.015	-.147
	Permissive Parenting Style	.109	.134	.086	.816

Coefficients[a]

Model	Sig.

(Constant)	.027
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.950
Authoritarian Parenting Score	.884
Permissive Parenting Style	.417

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

Correlations.

Correlations

Pearson Correlation

	Authoritative Parenting Style Score	Authoritarian Parenting Score	Permissive Parenting Style
Authoritative Parenting Style Score	1	-.080	-.090
Authoritarian Parenting Score	-.080	1	.244[*]
Permissive Parenting Style	-.090	.244[*]	1

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Regression.

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	Permissive Parenting Style, Authoritative Parenting Style Score, Authoritarian Parenting Score[b]	.	Enter

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

b. All requested variables entered.

.

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.160[a]	.026	-.005	6.098

a. Predictors (Constant), Permissive Parenting Style, Authoritative Parenting
Style Score, Authoritarian Parenting Score

ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	93.523	3	31.174	.838	.476[b]
	Residual	3569.437	96	37.182		
	Total	3662.960	99			

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

b. Predictors (Constant), Permissive Parenting Style, Authoritative Parenting Style Score, Authoritarian
Parenting Score

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardised Coefficients		Standardised Coefficients	t
		B	Std. Error	Beta	
1	(Constant)	7.098	5.786		1.227
	Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.716	1.124	.065	.637
	Authoritarian Parenting Score	-.170	1.315	-.013	-.129

Permissive Parenting Style	1.488	1.004	.154	1.483	

Coefficients[a]

Model		Sig.
1	(Constant)	.223
	Authoritative Parenting Style Score	.526
	Authoritarian Parenting Score	.898
	Permissive Parenting Style	.141

a. Dependent Variable, Total Difficulties Score

T-Test.

Group Statistics

	Parent's Education	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Authoritative	Secondary Education and below	23	3.7159	.68379	.14258
	Tertiary education	75	3.9040	.48722	.05626
Authoritarian	Secondary Education and below	23	2.3949	.49186	.10256
	Tertiary education	75	2.4344	.48131	.05558
Permissive	Secondary Education and below	23	2.0435	.43466	.09063
	Tertiary education	75	2.0853	.68274	.07884

.

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means	
		F	Sig.	t	df
Authoritative	Equal variances assumed	5.150	.025	-1.465	96
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.227	29.174
Authoritarian	Equal variances assumed	.002	.967	-.343	96
	Equal variances not assumed			-.339	35.897
Permissive	Equal variances assumed	4.243	.042	-.277	96
	Equal variances not assumed			-.348	58.012

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means		
		Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Authoritative	Equal variances assumed	.146	-.18806	.12839
	Equal variances not assumed	.230	-.18806	.15328
Authoritarian	Equal variances assumed	.733	-.03952	.11530
	Equal variances not assumed	.737	-.03952	.11665
Permissive	Equal variances assumed	.783	-.04186	.15124
	Equal variances not assumed	.729	-.04186	.12012

Independent Samples Test

		t-test for Equality of Means	
		95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper
Authoritative	Equal variances assumed	-.44290	.06679
	Equal variances not assumed	-.50146	.12535
Authoritarian	Equal variances assumed	-.26839	.18936
	Equal variances not assumed	-.27612	.19709
Permissive	Equal variances assumed	-.34206	.25835
	Equal variances not assumed	-.28231	.19860

.

Oneway.

Descriptives

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound
Authoritative	Self employed	34	3.6412	.52159	.08945	3.4592
	Civil service	56	4.0131	.50395	.06734	3.8781
	Private employee	7	3.5905	.53115	.20075	3.0992
	Total	97	3.8522	.54085	.05492	3.7432
Authoritarian	Self employed	34	2.4265	.41528	.07122	2.2816
	Civil service	56	2.4301	.54048	.07222	2.2853
	Private employee	7	2.4762	.39298	.14853	2.1127
	Total	97	2.4321	.48626	.04937	2.3341
Permissive	Self employed	34	2.1647	.63336	.10862	1.9437
	Civil service	56	2.0143	.63344	.08465	1.8446
	Private employee	7	2.0857	.44508	.16822	1.6741
	Total	97	2.0722	.62061	.06301	1.9471

Descriptives

		95% Confidence Interval for Mean Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
Authoritative	Self employed	3.8232	2.07	4.60
	Civil service	4.1481	3.13	5.00
	Private employee	4.0817	2.93	4.47
	Total	3.9612	2.07	5.00
Authoritarian	Self employed	2.5714	1.17	3.33
	Civil service	2.5748	1.33	3.50
	Private employee	2.8396	1.75	2.92
	Total	2.5301	1.17	3.50
Permissive	Self employed	2.3857	1.00	3.40
	Civil service	2.1839	1.00	4.40
	Private employee	2.4973	1.40	2.80
	Total	2.1972	1.00	4.40

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Authoritative	Between Groups	3.443	2	1.722	6.568	.002
	Within Groups	24.639	94	.262		
	Total	28.082	96			
Authoritarian	Between Groups	.015	2	.007	.031	.970
	Within Groups	22.684	94	.241		
	Total	22.699	96			
Permissive	Between Groups	.480	2	.240	.618	.541
	Within Groups	36.495	94	.388		
	Total	36.975	96			

Post Hoc Tests.

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Authoritative	Self employed	Civil service	-.37192[*]	.11131	.001
		Private employee	.05070	.21250	.812
	Civil service	Self employed	.37192[*]	.11131	.001
		Private employee	.42262[*]	.20525	.042
	Private employee	Self employed	-.05070	.21250	.812
		Civil service	-.42262[*]	.20525	.042
Authoritarian	Self employed	Civil service	-.00359	.10680	.973
		Private employee	-.04972	.20389	.808
	Civil service	Self employed	.00359	.10680	.973
		Private employee	-.04613	.19694	.815
	Private employee	Self employed	.04972	.20389	.808
		Civil service	.04613	.19694	.815
Permissive	Self employed	Civil service	.15042	.13547	.270
		Private employee	.07899	.25862	.761
	Civil service	Self employed	-.15042	.13547	.270
		Private employee	-.07143	.24979	.776
	Private employee	Self employed	-.07899	.25862	.761
		Civil service	.07143	.24979	.776

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Occupation	(J) Occupation	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Authoritative	Self employed	Civil service	-.5929*	-.1509
		Private employee	-.3712	.4726
	Civil service	Self employed	.1509*	.5929
		Private employee	.0151*	.8301
	Private employee	Self employed	-.4726	.3712
		Civil service	-.8301*	-.0151
Authoritarian	Self employed	Civil service	-.2156	.2085
		Private employee	-.4546	.3551
	Civil service	Self employed	-.2085	.2156
		Private employee	-.4372	.3449
	Private employee	Self employed	-.3551	.4546
		Civil service	-.3449	.4372
Permissive	Self employed	Civil service	-.1186	.4194
		Private employee	-.4345	.5925
	Civil service	Self employed	-.4194	.1186
		Private employee	-.5674	.4245
	Private employee	Self employed	-.5925	.4345
		Civil service	-.4245	.5674

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

.

Means Plots.

Oneway.

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Authoritative	Between Groups	.850	2	.425	1.461	.237
	Within Groups	27.626	95	.291		
	Total	28.475	97			
Authoritarian	Between Groups	.037	2	.019	.079	.924
	Within Groups	22.455	95	.236		
	Total	22.493	97			
Permissive	Between Groups	.179	2	.089	.221	.802
	Within Groups	38.502	95	.405		
	Total	38.681	97			

.

Post Hoc Tests

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error
Authoritative	Basic Education	Secondary Education	-.19899	.22510
		Tertiary education	-.29188	.17411
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	.19899	.22510
		Tertiary education	-.09289	.16766
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.29188	.17411
		Secondary Education	.09289	.16766
Authoritarian	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.04167	.20294
		Tertiary education	-.01778	.15697
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	-.04167	.20294
		Tertiary education	-.05944	.15116
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.01778	.15697
		Secondary Education	.05944	.15116
Permissive	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.16061	.26574
		Tertiary education	.04194	.20554
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	-.16061	.26574
		Tertiary education	-.11867	.19793
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	-.04194	.20554
		Secondary Education	.11867	.19793

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	
Authoritative	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.379	-.6459	
		Tertiary education	.097	-.6375	
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	.379	-.2479	
		Tertiary education	.581	-.4257	
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.097	-.0538	
		Secondary Education	.581	-.2400	
Authoritarian	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.838	-.3612	
		Tertiary education	.910	-.3294	
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	.838	-.4446	
		Tertiary education	.695	-.3595	
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.910	-.2939	
		Secondary Education	.695	-.2406	
Permissive	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.547	-.3670	
		Tertiary education	.839	-.3661	
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	.547	-.6882	
		Tertiary education	.550	-.5116	
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.839	-.4500	
		Secondary Education	.550	-.2743	

Multiple Comparisons

LSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Parent's Education	(J) Parent's Education	95% Confidence Interval
			Upper Bound
Authoritative	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.2479
		Tertiary education	.0538
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	.6459
		Tertiary education	.2400
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.6375
		Secondary Education	.4257
Authoritarian	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.4446
		Tertiary education	.2939
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	.3612
		Tertiary education	.2406
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.3294
		Secondary Education	.3595
Permissive	Basic Education	Secondary Education	.6882
		Tertiary education	.4500
	Secondary Education	Basic Education	.3670
		Tertiary education	.2743
	Tertiary education	Basic Education	.3661
		Secondary Education	.5116