

IMPACT OF PARENT'S CHILD-REARING STYLES ON DISRUPTIVE BEHAVIOUR DISORDER OF PRIMARY SCHOOL PUPILS IN NSUKKA EDUCATION AUTHORITY

**Dr. Dorothy Ebere Adimora; Dr. Friday Mumudu Adene;
Edmund Eberechukwu Offordile & Prof. Elsie Chizua Umeano**

Department of Educational Foundations, Educational Psychology,
Faculty of Education,
University of Nigeria, Nsukka

Abstract

This study examined the impact of parents' child-rearing styles on pupils' disruptive behaviour in Nsukka education authority. Two research questions and one null hypothesis (tested at $P < 0.05$) guided the study. The design of the study is ex-post facto or causal comparative research design. The sample was made up of forty (40) pupils drawn from primary five in Nsukka education authority, Enugu State, Nigeria. Two instruments were used by the researchers to collect the data for the study; two questionnaires titled Parents' Child-Rearing Styles Questionnaire (PCRSQ) used to collect data on pupils' perception of their parents' child-rearing styles and Pupils' Behaviour Problems measuring scale (PBPMS) used to assess the Pupils' disruptive behaviour. The questionnaires were validated by experts from Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The internal consistency reliability measures of the Parents' Child-Rearing Styles Questionnaire (PCRSQ) and the Pupils' Behaviour Problems Measuring Scale (PBPMS) were ascertained using Cronbach Alpha. Cronbach Alpha is applied to instruments that are not scored dichotomously. For the PCRSQ, an internal consistency reliability estimate of 0.805, 0.695, 0.945 0.85 and 0.85 was obtained respectively for authoritarian, authoritative, permissive styles and Pupils' Behaviour Problems Measuring scale (PBPMS). Mean, standard deviation, and multiple regression analysis were used to analyze data. Major findings of the study showed that: Authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parents' child-rearing styles are dominant in Nsukka education authority. Majority of the parents of pupils with disruptive behaviour in Nsukka education authority engage in authoritarian and permissive child-rearing styles while minority of the parents engages in authoritative child-rearing style. Impact of parents' child-rearing styles on pupils' disruptive behaviour is significant. Based on the findings, conclusions were drawn and educational implications were discussed. Among the recommendations made is: Government should organize seminars and workshops for parents through the Parents Teachers Association forum, to enlighten parents on the need to adopt authoritative parent child-rearing style with the propensity to ensuring that pupils adopt behaviour that would create a conducive environment for effective teaching and learning.

Keywords: Parents-Child Rearing Styles, Pupils, Disruptive Behaviour Disorder.

Introduction

As children grow and progress through school, some of them constitute a diverse group with special attention which necessitates adaptation, modification and school adjustment programmes such as counseling, cognitive restructuring, and other therapeutic measures for them to benefit maximally. Some of these children may deviate from the classroom norm physically, socially, mentally or emotionally. As Bender (2001) observed, such children may have few friends, overtly rejected by other peers or somehow excluded from the social life of their schools. Their differences may manifest in diverse ways such as in sensory, physical, cognitive, emotional or communication disorder (Kauffman & Hallahan, 2003). Children with such characteristics may develop behaviour which could be negatively different from other children.

However, behaviour is the outward or external expression of the internal or inward processes of the individual (Nnachi, 2007). Behaviour could be perceived as an action that can be observed and measured in an objective way. Behaviour as a measurable and observable act, is also a response to a stimulus, such as aggression, gentleness, kindness, temperament; the way one talks, laughs, smiles, jokes, eats, looks, reasons, and how one interacts with others. When a particular behaviour begins to result in undue stress for a child in school and elicits negative reactions from others, such behaviour represents a distress signal (Southern Regional Education Service Center, 2014). Most times, children display inappropriate behaviour in the classroom which can make it difficult for teachers to teach effectively; and for the children to learn effectively; be harmful to themselves or others and exhibit behaviour that could lead to peer rejection (Eze, 2009). When such behaviours occur in the classroom settings often from a child, it could be referred to as disruptive.

Behaviour is disruptive when it is associated with behavioural disorders of ongoing patterns of hostile and deviant behaviours that children and adolescents direct towards any type of authority figure. All children seem to go through periods of testing limits by acting out in negative behaviours, while children with disruptive behaviour disorder (DBD) participate in these behaviours to such an extreme that it affects their everyday lives, as well as the lives of those around them.

Disruptive behaviour disorders like ODD and conduct disorder are said to be the most common psychiatric conditions diagnosed in children worldwide. Studies have shown that conduct disorder affects 1-4% of adolescents in the United States and oppositional defiant disorder is estimated to develop in approximately 10.2% of children. It has also been found to be a prevalent problem among pupils in Nigerian schools. The presence of DBD is also known to be more prevalent in boys than it is in girls.

The two most common forms of DBD are oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) and conduct disorder. Conduct disorder is characterized by persistent and repetitive behaviours that involve violating the basic rights of other human beings and severely breaking rules set to enforce age-appropriate societal norms. Oppositional defiant disorder (ODD) is similar to conduct disorder (CD) but usually presents itself earlier in a child's life and if not appropriately handled, would result in CD. ODD

which is characterized by patterns of hostile, defiant, and disobedient behaviours directed at parents, teachers, and any other type of authority figure (Valley behavioural health system, 2016).

Research reveals that ODD here is what I learned: The term disorder is a misnomer because it is not a disorder but instead a learned behavior, or likely a combination of a child's home environment and inherited factors including: ineffective, inconsistent and/or harsh discipline, lack of supervision, neglect or abuse, limitations or developmental delays in a child's ability to process their thoughts and feelings (Kids mental health, 2016). Oppositional defiant disorder is a learned behaviour which can also be unlearned or reversed with a strict and consistent routine. There are no medications to treat ODD; however, many times a child will have other related mental health issues that are successfully treated with medication. Some of the mental health issues often times occurring with ODD are: attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), anxiety, depression. Symptoms of ODD are extremely strong will, disrespect and opposition to adults or people in authority positions, defiance in almost any situation, temper tantrums disproportionate to the child's age, argumentativeness, lying, anger, and resentment. Children with ODD will struggle in school and in making and/or keeping friends. It appears a child with ODD thrives on deliberately annoying other people. They refuse to take responsibility, blaming others for their mistakes or misbehavior; they are easily annoyed and act with aggression toward peers and adults. They often have trouble academically. Conduct disorder (CD) on the other hand, commonly occurs when ODD is left untreated. The child will most likely begin to violate more serious rules like running away from home or skipping school. Their pattern of misbehaviour will usually progress to more aggressive behaviour toward people and or animals. Children may initiate bullying and fighting, or animal cruelty. They may become disrespectful of others' property by stealing or causing damage by vandalism or arson. Children afflicted with ODD or CD will most likely have trouble feeling empathy and may misread social queues or miss them altogether. He may misinterpret others behaviour as hostile or aggressive leading him to act out in response to the aggression with aggression in return. Theoretically, development of DBD is theorized to be the result of a variety of contributing factors, including genetic, physical, and environmental components. Genetically, children with DBD typically have family members who are also victims of some forms of mental illness, including mood disorders, personality disorders, and anxiety disorders or genetic component that subjects children to become more susceptible to developing and portraying symptoms of DBD. Physical, imbalances in the brain's frontal lobe have been hypothesized to affect the onset of DBD. The frontal lobe is responsible for regulating people's emotions and is said to be the "home" of personality development. When neurotransmitters (chemicals in the brain responsible for communication) throughout the brain are not balanced, the result is impairment in their ability to communicate properly or communication dysfunction which can lead to the onset of DBD symptoms. Environmentally, the place where children grew up can have an immense impact on whether or not they develop the behavioural patterns that define DBD. If children are surrounded by a chaotic home

life, they may begin to act out simply because it allows them to have something that they can control since they have no power over the chaos around them. Similarly, children who are raised without any form of appropriate discipline or whose parents tend to be more absent than not can experience major impacts on the ways in which they begin to behave. A typical parent-child interaction especially mothers at the time of child birth has also been theorized to have an effect on the onset of DBD. Risk factors can also have effect on childrens' DBD, such risk factors as exposure to violence, family history of mental illness or substance abuse, familial discord, suffering from abuse and neglect, being male, poor or inconsistent parenting/lack of parental involvement and dysfunctional home life. Research has revealed that if children with DBD do not receive proper treatment interventions, the effects of DBD can be long-lasting and can, in some cases, lead to the development of antisocial personality disorder. Some examples of the long-term effects that could be found on a person with untreated DBD include, criminal involvement, incarceration, substance abuse, risky sexual behaviours, inability to develop and maintain healthy, meaningful relationships and social isolation (Valley behavioural health system, 2016).

However, in the course of this study disruptive behaviour that were found in classroom in the area of this study were bullying, verbal abuse, truancy, quarrelsomeness, spitting on the floor, rudeness, mimicking other pupils, interfering with the work of other children, creating excessive noise, eating during lesson, disregarding the right of other children, breaking of rules, talking out of turn, inattentiveness, idleness and hitting other pupils. Teachers are saddled with the sole responsibility of creating an enabling environment and instructional strategies that will make the implementation of the inclusive education policy fruitful (Onuigbo, 2009). Thus, these teachers are expected to know the needs of such pupils with disruptive behaviour and proffer remedial strategy that will incorporate and meet the needs of such pupils. Researchers like Dunbar (2004) attributed psychological, physical and social needs of these pupils as the sources of disruptive behaviour; while Yaroson (2004) attributed it to parental training and societal influence. Observably, in Enugu State classrooms, pupils, especially those in Nsukka local Government Area have been found to display various types of disruptive behaviours during teaching and learning in the classroom. These children could be suffering from some psychological problems induced by the rearing style adopted by their parents during their childhood as pointed out by Yaroson (2004). Erickson's (1965) opined that identity formation creates tension in children to the extent that some of them become confused about their personality. It is possible, therefore, that parents' mishandling of their children with regard to the manner in which parents assist and guide their pupils may result in the pupils' development of unwholesome behaviours. The foundation of what a person becomes in the society is laid in the home. Parents therefore have important roles to play in ensuring their children acquire the appropriate social, psychological, moral and intellectual development especially through their child rearing styles.

Child-rearing is another term for raising children. It is the active mould of character, personality, talents, emotional and physical wellbeing of the child (Answers Corporation, 2011). Encyclopedia of Medical Concept (2007) perceived

child rearing as the act of training or bringing up children by parents or parent-substitutes. Uche and Benjamin (2009) perceived parents' child-rearing style as a particular pattern of interaction or relationship that exists between parents and children which gradually moulds the behaviour of the children. Huver, Huver, Otten, Vries (2009) defined parents' child rearing styles as a universal climate in which a family functions and in which child-rearing behaviour of parents or other primary caregivers revolve. The construct of parenting style by Baumrind (1991) is used to capture normal variations in parents' attempts to control and socialize their children. In the context of this study, however, parents' child-rearing styles are different relationships that parents establish in training or bringing up children which gradually mould their children's behaviour. Based on many dimensions of studies, Baumrind (1978) suggested that most parents display one of these different styles of child rearing: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive; while neglectful child rearing style was later added by Maccoby & Martin (1983). It might interest us to be aware that in the area of this present study, none of the pupils perceived their parents as neglectful in their parent child rearing practice.

Parents who adopt authoritarian child-rearing style are highly demanding but not responsive to the needs of their children. Such parents are status oriented and always expect unquestioned obedience and total compliance to orders or instructions. Children of such parents are believed to be fearful, apprehensive, unfriendly, vulnerable to stress, aimless, easily annoyed, passively hostile, and also tend to perform moderately well in school. Authoritative child-rearing style is adopted by parents who are both demanding of obedience and at the same time responsive to the needs of their children. Such parents are assertive but not punitive. Children of such parents are also believed to be self-reliant, self-controlled, cheerful and friendly, cooperative, purposive and cope well with stress (Baumrind, 1991). Hoshiar, John and Nadja (2015) whose findings stated that children from contributing factor such as "involvement with the child" "monitoring the child" and other positive dimensions tended to have low levels of behaviour problems. Baumrind (1978) further asserts that parents who employ the permissive style of child-rearing can sometimes be referred to as indulgent parents. This style is applied by parents who allow their children's preferences to take priority over the ideals and they rarely require them to conform to expected standards. Such parents are lax at enforcing rules and fail to direct behaviour. Children from such parents are believed to be rebellious, low in self reliance and self control, impulsive, aggressive, domineering, aimless and low in achievement. Uninvolved child-rearing style or neglectful is characterized by unsupportive nature of the parents towards their children. Parents who adopt this style, display ambivalent attitude in the life of their children and may be emotionally detached from them. Children of such parents have been observed to be impulsive and aggressive (Maccoby & Martin, 1983; Weiten Lloyd, 2003). In the course of this study none of the pupils identified exhibiting disruptive behaviour within the four walls of the classroom perceived their parents adopting uninvolved or neglectful child-rearing style and as such the child-rearing styles captured in this study are authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parent-child-rearing styles. As these child-

rearing styles adopted by parents are different, the researchers perceive likelihood that these could differentially impact the pupil's behaviour.

The manner in which such training is being exercised which can be termed the parents' child rearing styles has been observed to impact the child in many ways and in many spheres of his or her life. Other researchers elsewhere have suggested that it could be in behaviour such as the kind of behaviour being exhibited in the classroom during teaching and learning that impedes the teacher objectives of the lesson, and inhibiting other pupils from learning effectively. But the problem is that it is not very clear what the impact of parents' child-rearing styles on disruptive behaviour of these pupils in Nsukka Education Authority of Enugu State is. Therefore, the researchers seek to ascertain what the impact of parents' child rearing styles on disruptive behaviour of pupils in Nsukka education authority is. This question underlies the problem of this study.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to explore the impact of parents' child-rearing styles on disruptive behaviour disorder of pupils in Nsukka education authority. The study specifically seeks to.

- Identify the dominant parents' child- rearing styles from the pupils' perception.
- Ascertain the impact of parents' child -rearing styles on pupils with disruptive behaviour.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided the study:

1. What are the dominant child-rearing styles of parents of pupils with disruptive behaviour in Nsukka education authority?
2. What is the impact of parents' child- rearing styles on pupils with disruptive behaviour?

Hypothesis

This null hypothesis was formulated to guide the study and was tested at 0.05 probability level.

H₀₁: There will be no significant impact of parents' child rearing styles on pupils' disruptive behaviours in Nsukka education authority.

Method

The design adopted for this study is ex post- facto research design. Out of a population of 3,199, 40 primary school pupils in Nsukka education authority comprising of 28 males and 12 females made up the sample. Two instruments were used in collecting data for the study. Parent-Child Rearing Styles Questionnaire (PCRSQ); Pupils Behaviour Problems Measuring Scale (PBPMS). The PCRSQ has three clusters of seven (7) items each adopted from Baumrind 1971 typology of parenting styles. The first cluster determined the authoritarian parents' child-rearing style; the second ascertained the authoritative parents' child-rearing style, while the

third cluster was on permissive parents' child-rearing style respectively. The response options are Strongly Agree (SA) =4; Agree (A) =3; Disagree (D) =2; Strongly Disagree (SD) =1. The pupils' behaviour Problems Checklist (PBPC) teacher's version which contained twenty five (25) items was only used to identify pupils with disruptive behaviour in the classroom. The Pupils Behaviour Problems Measuring Scale (PBPMS) adapted from Emotional and Behaviour Problem Scale- Second Edition (EBPS-2) by Stephen and Tamara (2001) has twenty five items as well but the statements were personalized thus: Never (N) =1; Sometimes (ST) = 2; Often =3; and Very Often (VO) =4. For each respondent (pupils with disruptive behaviour) an overall mean score of 2.5 and above indicated that the pupil indulges in disruptive behaviour in the classroom. While in the parents-child rearing styles, the highest mean score a child scored among the three styles becomes the rearing style the parents adopts. The instruments were face validated by five experts- three experts in educational psychology, one in guidance and counseling and one in measurement and evaluation in the faculty of Education, University of Nigeria, Nsukka. The validated instruments were trial-tested using nine pupils who met the criteria of disruptive behaviour disorder in Obollo-Afor which is outside Nsukka education authority. The scores obtained from this trial test were also used to measure the reliability of the instrument using Cronbach Alpha, an internal consistency coefficient of 0.85 was obtained for PBPMS. While 0.81 for authoritarian style; 0.71 for authoritative style; and 0.95 for permissive style were obtained respectively. These were high enough for the instruments to be considered reliable. The researchers administered the instruments personally to the respondents. The questionnaires were all completed and handed over to the researchers. The data collected were analyzed using mean, standard deviation and the step-wise multiple regression analysis.

Results

Table I: Mean score and standard deviation of parents child rearing styles as perceived by the pupils

Parents child rearing styles	Number of pupils	Mean	Std. Deviation
Authoritarian	15	3.4	.38
	6	1.98	.42
	19	1.5	.45
Authoritative	15	2.1	.46
	6	3.5	.38
	19	1.46	.42
Permissive	15	1.8	.47
	6	1.91	.46
	19	3.2	.42

Results presented in Table 1 indicate that 15 out of 40 pupils perceived their parents to adopt authoritarian style; 6 pupils reveal that their parents adopt authoritative style; while 19 pupils revealed that their parents adopt permissive style.

These were indicated by the mean score of 3.4 with a standard deviation of .38 for authoritarian style; a mean score of 3.5 with a standard deviation of .38 for authoritative style; and a mean score of 3.2 with a standard deviation of .42 for permissive style respectively. However, the result revealed that authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parents' child-rearing styles are dominant in Nsukka Education Authority whereas, uninvolved or neglectful child-rearing style does not exist as revealed by the pupils' responses.

Table 2: Mean scores and standard deviation for parents' child rearing styles on pupils' disruptive behaviour

Parents child rearing styles		Problem Behaviour
Authoritarian	Mean	2.6
	N	15
	Std Deviation	14.3
Authoritative	Mean	2.4
	N	6
	Std Deviation	15.5
Permissive	Mean	3.6
	N	19
	Std Deviation	8.95

The results in Table 2 revealed that out of the parents' child rearing styles, pupils whose parents adopts authoritative child-rearing style had lower mean score in their disruptive behaviour than, pupils whose parents adopt authoritarian and permissive child-rearing styles. The Table shows mean disruptive behaviour scores of 2.6, 2.4 and 3.6 respectively, with a standard deviation of 14.3, 15.5, and 8.95 respectively. The result further indicated that pupils whose parents adopt authoritarian and permissive child-rearing styles had higher mean score than pupils whose parents adopt authoritative child-rearing style. In other words there is a differential outcome in the disruptive behaviour of pupils from the influential variables: authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parents' child rearing style. To further determine the impact of parents' child rearing styles on pupils' disruptive behaviour, a multiple regression analysis was conducted and presented to test hypothesis 1 in Table 3-5.

Table 3: Multiple regression analysis for parents' child-rearing styles on pupils' disruptive behaviour

Model	R	R-square	Adjusted R-Square	Std Error of the Estimate
1	.212	.045	.038	14.5

The results presented in Table 3 shows the calculated R, R square and the adjusted R square as .212, .045 and .038 respectively. The R-square which is .045 indicates that 4.5% difference in the disruptive behaviour of primary school pupils in Nsukka education authority can be explained by the impact of the parents' child-rearing styles. In determining further the impact of parents' child-rearing styles on

pupils’ disruptive behaviour in school, f-test analysis was conducted and presented as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Multiple regression analysis for parents’ child-rearing styles on pupils’ disruptive behaviour: F-test analysis.

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
1 regression	3930.259	3	1310086	6.23	.000
Residual	83273.251	396	210.286		
Total	87203.510				

The result of f-test presented in Table 4 shows that the f-value of 6.23 is significant at 0.00 and also significant at 0.05 level of probability ($f=6.23$; $p<0.00$). This implies that the influential variables – authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parents’ child rearing styles influenced the pupils’ disruptive behaviour in schools as shown in Table 3. This suggests that parents’ child rearing styles had a significant impact on the pupils’ disruptive behaviour in schools. The null hypothesis 1 is therefore rejected. However, since the influential variables - authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parents child rearing styles acted in combination, the impact of one particular variable may be obscured by the impact of others, hence the result presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Multiple regression analysis for parents’ child-rearing styles on pupils’ disruptive behaviour Unstandardized and Standardized coefficient, t-test Analysis

Model	Unstandardized Coefficient		Standardized coefficient		
	B	Std Error	Beta	t	Sig
1 constant	37.1	7.1	-	5.3	.000
Authoritarian	2.6	1.2	.14	2.2	.029
Authoritative	-.83	1.2	-.04	-.67	.501
Permissive	3.1	1.1	.1.8	2.7	.007

Results presented in Table 5 indicate the B -values which are measures of the slope of the regression line or the amount of differences in the dependable variables for every unit difference in the influential variables: authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parents’ child-rearing styles (independent variables).

For every increase in the parents’ child rearing styles scale of 1; there is a corresponding difference on the pupils’ disruptive behaviour by 2.6, -.83, and 3.1 respectively. The data on the beta column shows the standardized coefficient of the data on B- column which compares directly the impact of the different influential variables with each other. The calculated beta-values are .14, -.04 and 1.8 for authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parents’ child-rearing styles respectively. This implies that the influential variables mostly responsible for disruptive behaviour

of the pupils are the authoritarian and permissive parents' child-rearing styles. The values with positive signs indicate that as the influential or impactful variables increase, so does the dependent variable and vice versa.

Results on Table 5 also indicate the calculated t-values and their associated probabilities. The t-value indicates whether a given influential variable significantly impact differently in the dependable measure with all other variables under the study. Result of the data on the t column shows that only permissive parents' child-rearing style with the calculated t of 2.7 and significant at 0.007 level of probability ($t=2.7$; $p<0.007$) and authoritarian parents' child-rearing style with the calculated t of 2.2 and significant at 0.029 level of probability ($t=2.2$ $p<0.029$) made a significant impact.

In explaining disruptive behaviour of pupils in school, therefore, authoritarian and permissive parents' child-rearing styles are the dominant variables that encourage most disruptive behaviour of pupils in school.

Discussion

Parents' child-rearing style as a particular pattern of interaction or relationship that exists between parents and their children gradually moulds their behaviours. These rearing styles can be authoritarian, authoritative or permissive. However, any of the styles used by parents can impact positively or negatively on a child's behaviour.

Results in Table 1 showed that parents of pupils with disruptive behaviour adopt the authoritarian, authoritative and permissive child-rearing styles. This is indicated in the number of pupils who perceived their parents as authoritarian were 15 with a mean score of 3.4, and a standard deviation of .38; authoritative were 6 with a mean score of 3.5, and a standard deviation of .38; and permissive were 19 with a mean score of 3.2, and a standard deviation of .42. Result in Table 2 indicate that majority of the parents of pupils with disruptive behaviour in Nsukka education authority engage in authoritarian and permissive child-rearing styles while minority of the parents engage in authoritative child-rearing style. However, in spite of the differences in the child-rearing styles of the parents of pupils with disruptive behaviour, Results in Table 3-5 indicate that parents' child rearing styles have a significant impact on pupils' disruptive behaviour in school. This finding is indicated in the difference of the mean disruptive behaviour score of pupils from different parents' child rearing styles: authoritarian, authoritative and permissive. Pupils whose parents adopt permissive child rearing style have the highest mean disruptive behaviour score of 3.6 with standard deviation of 8.95, followed by pupils whose parents adopt authoritarian child rearing style with mean disruptive behaviour score of 2.6 and standard deviation of 14.3, while pupils whose parents adopt the authoritative child rearing style have the least mean disruptive behaviour score of 2.4 and standard deviation of 15.5. This result agrees with Hoshier, John and Nadja (2015) whose findings stated that a situation where child rearing is associated with such factors as parental involvement with the child, child monitoring and other positive child rearing practices tend to be associated with low levels of disruptive behaviours. This implies that a parents-child rearing style has a tremendous impact on

a child's behaviour. This is because the style every parent adopts as primary care giver exerts a significant impact on the development of their child's present and future emotional health, personality, character, well-being, social and cognitive development. Just like, Allen, Hutfless and Larzelere(2003) opinion that a parenting style is an essential determinant of children's coping styles and a child's behaviour toward adults varies according to different parents child rearing styles

Conclusion

The study aimed at investigating the impact of parents- child rearing styles on pupils with disruptive behaviour in the classroom. In doing this, forty pupils identified as those that met the criteria for disruptive behavior in Nsukka education authority were used. Ex-post facto research design was employed. Using mean, standard deviation and multiple regression analysis, parents of pupils with disruptive behaviour in Nsukka education authority were found to be adopting authoritarian, authoritative and permissive child-rearing styles. Majority of parents of pupils with disruptive behaviour were found among those who adopt authoritarian and permissive child-rearing styles. Pupils whose parents adopt authoritative child-rearing style were found to be the minority compare to their counterparts with authoritarian and permissive parent child rearing styles. In spite of the difference in their parents' styles, Parents' child-rearing styles had a significant impact on pupils' disruptive behaviour in the classroom setting.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

- Seminars and workshops should be organized to sensitize parents and would be parents on the need to adopt authoritative parents' child-rearing styles, as it will help in ameliorating the number of pupils with disruptive behaviour and as well as reduce the task of teachers in the classroom settings.
- Government should also draft a programme that will sensitize teachers and parents on the consequences of authoritarian and permissive child rearing practice in their interaction with their pupils in order to have pupils with pro-social behaviour. This as a result will create an enabling environment for effective teaching and learning. Government can do this by ensuring that the parents of every pupil attend every Parents Teacher Association (PTA) meeting organized by every school.

References

- Allen, K. D, Hutfless, S. & Larzerlere, R. (2003). Evaluation of two predictors of child disruptive behaviour during dental treatment. *Journal of Dent Child*.70, 221-5
- Answer Corporation (2011). Retrieved from <http://wiki.answer.comQ/whatischildrearing>.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4 (1&2), 1-103.

- Baumrind, D. (1978) Parental disciplinary patterns and social competence in children. *Youth and Society*, 9 (3), 219-25.
- Bender, G. (2001) *Resisting dominance? The study of a marginalized masculinity and its construction within high school walls*. In J.N. Burstyn G. Bender, R. Casella, H. W. Gordon, D. P. Guerra, K.V. Lushen, R. Stevens, & K. M. Williams(Eds).
- Centers For Disease Control and Prevention (2000). Youth risk behaviour surveillance-United States. Retrieved from <http://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/brfss/>
- Clinnard, M. B. (1994). *Sociology of deviant behaviour*. New York: Hold, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- Erickson, E.H. (1965) *Childhood and society*. New York: Pengium
- Eskay, M., Onu, V. C., Obiyo, N. & Obidoa, M. (2012). Use of peer tutoring, cooperative learning, and collaborative learning: implications for reducing anti-social behaviour of schooling adolescents. University of Nigeria, Nsukka, Enugu State. *Us China Education Review*, 11, 932-945.
- Eze, U. N. (2009). Managing behaviour in the classroom. In Uchenna, L. I. and Uchenna, N. E.(Eds) *Classroom management for curriculum implementation: applying psychological principle*. (Pp 145-170). Enugu: Timex.
- Federal Republic of Nigeria (2004). *National Policy on Education (4th Ed)* Lagos: NERDC press.
- Gardner, W. I. (1988). *Children with learning and behaviour problems*. New York, Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Hoshiar, S., John, A. and Nadja, R. (2015) The effects of parenting styles on behavioral problems in primary school children: A Cross-Cultural Review. *Asian Social Science*, 11(22); 171-186.
- Huver R.M.E, Otten, R, Vries, H.D & Engels, R.C.M (2009) personality and parenting style in parents of adolescents. *Journal of adolescence*, 33,395-402. Retrieved January 26, 2012, from science direct database.
- Jessor, R. (1991). Risk behaviour in adolescence: A psychosocial framework for understanding and action. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 12, 597-605.
- Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P.(2005). *Special education: what it is and why we need it*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Kids mental health (2016) *Children Conduct Disorder Oppositional Defiant Disorder ODD*. Retrieved from <http://www.kidsmentalhealth.org/children-conduct-disorder-oppositional-defiant-disorder-odd/>
- Maccoby, E.E. & Martins, J.A. (1983) *Socialization in the Context of the family: Parent Child Interaction*. New York: Wiley.
- Nnachi, R. O. (2007). *Advanced psychology of learning and scientific inquiries*. John Jacob's Classic Publishers Ltd. Enugu-Nigeria.
- Onuigbo, L. (2009). Managing diversity in the classroom. In Uchennan, L. I. and Uchenna, N. E.(Eds), *Classroom management for curriculum implementation: applying psychological principle* (Pp 173-209). Enugu: Timex.

- Quay, H. C. & Peterson, D. R. (1987). Manual for revised behaviour problem checklist. University of Miami's, Coral Gables.
- Stephen, B. M., & Tamara, J. A. (2001). Emotional and behaviour problem scale-2nd edition. School Version Rating Form. Hawthorne Educational Service
- Southern Regional Education Services Center (2004). *Defining behaviour problem*. NHCEBIS Retrieved from [hp://:www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/cali...](http://www.sde.ct.gov/sde/lib/sde/pdf/cali...)
- Uche, N.E. & Benjamin, M.N. (2009) Parenting styles as predictor of adolescent socio-psychological adjustment in schools. *Journal of Educational Research*, 9, 143-153.
- Yarosan, Mc (2004) *Strategies for curbing indiscipline in Nigeria secondary schools*. Retrieved from <http://www.files.eric.ed.govt/..Ej1079558.pdf>.