

Parenting Style, Self-Control and Peer Influence toward Students' Misbehavior

Azizi Haji Yahaya, Nordin Ajmain, Muhamad Ali Jinah Bin
Kader Ebrahim, Balan Rathakrishnan, Halimah Ma'alip, Hanun
Ahmad, Pg. Razmahayati Pg. Hj. Mahmud, Zeliha Haji
Mohamad Ali

Faculty of Psychology and Education, Malaysia Sabah University, Jalan UMS, 88400 Kota
Kinabalu Sabah, Malaysia

Corresponding Author Email: nordin_ajmain_dp20@iluv.ums.edu.my

To Link this Article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i9/15563> DOI:10.6007/IJARBSS/v13-i9/15563

Published Date: 26 September 2023

Abstract

Misbehavior within the classroom disorders students' devotion and have a adverse impact in the teaching learning process. In the formation effective learning environment, the behaviors performed by each stakeholders such as parents, peers and ourselves in the classroom play significant roles for a positive teaching-learning atmosphere. This study aims to determine the relationships between parenting style, self-control and peer influence and student misbehaviors; and secondly, aimed to identify parenting style, self-control and peer influence are predictors of student misbehaviors. The data were gathered from 250 students at different schools through survey consists of five parts, part A is on demographic information of students, part B is on student misbehaviors, part C is the styles of parenting, part D is the self-control of students and part E is peer influence. The reliability of the questionnaire was high with value of 0.91. The data obtained are analyzed using the software of Statistical Package For Social Science version 26.0. The overall result of analysis from correlation Pearson showed that peer influence shows a significant relationship towards student misbehaviors than parenting style and self-control. Regression analysis shows that parenting styles, self-control, peer influence and gender are predictors of students' misbehaviors. For further research proposed suggest to collect more data from more various samples including different social contexts should be considered.

Keywords: Parenting Styles, Self-Control, Peer Influence, Misbehavior

Introduction

Nowadays, the problem of misbehavior among students indicates a growing trend over time especially in schools and universities. The various behavior problems in the classroom can be enlisted as follows-bullying, fighting, teasing, stealing, truancy, disobedience and insubordination, lying, cheating, lateness, rudeness, destructiveness, drug or alcohol

addiction, and so on (Tiwari, 2014). This situation became one of the contributors to student misbehaviors. Even in primary schools, the students who behave in such behaviors can be categorized as diversions or deviant behavior. According to Thashini and Ibrahim (2020), the factors which can contribute to a child's involvement in disciplinary problems are family factors, individual factors, peer factors, schooling factors and community factors.

Objective

- i. To determine the relationships between parenting style, self-control and peer influence with student misbehaviors.
- ii. To verify that parenting style, self-control and peer influence are predictors of student misbehaviors.

Hypothesis

- i. There is a relationship between parenting style, self-control and peer influence and student misbehaviors.
- ii. Gender, parenting styles, self-control and peer influence are the predictors of students' misbehaviors.

Literature Review

Parenting Styles and Misbehaviors

One of the main factors contributing to student discipline problems is the parent factor. Besides, parenting style is one of the variables often allied with student discipline problems. Moreover, the study found that there was no significant relationship between student misbehaviors in school and parenting style with the Pearson Correlation value, $r = 0.115$ (Syamimi et.al., 2021). Previously, Azizi et al (2012) have stated if a child misbehaves, the behavior of the child could be developed from the family.

Some past studies determine that children who display disobedient and non-compliant behavior are often disciplined ineffectively along with hostile parenting styles. Hafizar et al (2017) found that parenting styles are one of the factors causing deviant behaviors among their children. Added by Thompson et al (2017) in his study demonstrated that physical discipline from parental figures was related to more aggression and inappropriate behaviors in children, the frequency of children's behaviors and its relationship to parental disciplinary strategies. If the parenting style practiced by the parents is not compatible with the children, this will encourage them to get caught up with social problems (Hamidah, 2013).

The role of the parent's attachment is an important factor in predicting the global self-worth of an adolescent, which shows to be inconsistent with many other studies (Chii et al., 2016). A study by Siti Nazurah et al (2021) found that the parenting style namely authoritarian ($r = .462$), authoritative ($r = .456$), and permissive ($r = .354$) received by children during childhood will affect children's behavior and thinking style, especially at the primary and secondary school levels. Even there is a positive yet weak relationship between the parenting style and the emotional intelligence of early teens around Sabah.

Self-control and Misbehaviors

Some Theories agree that self-control (self-regulation, effortful control, self-discipline) taps into a common ability to direct their cognition, emotions, impulses, performances, and behaviors (Bridgett et al., 2015; Nigg, 2017). In fact, Yen et al (2021) found that three psychological factors (self-control, sensation seeking and cognitive distortion) were

significantly associated with pro-criminal attitudes. A Research finding from a study by Adlya et al (2020) significant contribution of self-control to students' discipline that shows the r score value of 0.590 which means that there is a strong relationship between self-control and students' discipline. Previous studies revealed that girls' scores are lower compared to boys in terms of motivational level, self-control and self-esteem (Pazzaglia et al., 2020).

Influence of Peer and Misbehaviors

Hadjar and Bucchmann (2016); Geven (2017), in their studies stated boys are often more influenced by their peers than girls are, resulting in higher levels of absenteeism, punishments and challenging behaviors that teachers have to face. Previously, Tome et.al (2012) stated that peers have a direct influence on adolescents' risk behaviours. Undoubtedly, peers help avoid the feeling of isolation, influence well-being, joy and health, and they help influence good school achievements and obtain crucial social skills (Hughes et al., 2009; Camacho et al., 2010). Alternatively, friends also appear as the variable most commonly associated with involvement in risk behaviors (Padilla et al., 2009; Glaser et al., 2010).

Gender and Students Misbehaviors

Ramlah and Mahani (2004), in their studies showed that male students are more involved in misbehaviors or disciplinary problems in schools especially in schools with large numbers of female teachers. This is necessary for them to build on a "manly" character or character. Usually, gender has been used to analyze these behaviors. Moreover, there are several studies that have found higher levels of inappropriate behaviors among boys than among girls whereas girls tend to be more proactive, less problematic and introverted behaviors (Driessen, 2011; Glock and Kleen, 2017). The finding resulted from Gallegos et al (2020b) highlights that boys showed higher levels of negative behaviors than girls.

Research Methodology

The study was conducted in the form of a descriptive survey that investigated the relationships of parenting style, self-control and peer influence on the problem of student misbehaviors in two primary schools and two secondary schools in the Tanjong Kling zone, Melaka. Descriptive research is a kind of survey. In this study, the researchers used correlation and regression statistics that provide the opportunity to measure many variables and hypotheses (Azizi et al., 2017).

Participants

The population was 748 respondents among students selected from two schools, namely year five students in primary school and form two students in secondary schools. The determination of the sample size in this study is based on the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) method involved only 250 students. The survey method was chosen because it was able to involve a large number of respondents and at the same time was faster and more economical (Borg et al., 2003).

Instruments

The instruments used in this study are shaped for the survey. They contain questions about the demographics of the respondents, the types of misbehaviors that students commit, the parenting styles, self-control and peer influence. The questionnaire is divided into five parts, namely, part A, parts B, C, D and part E. Part A contains questions about

the background of the students. Part B relates to the types of students' misbehaviors (adapted from the 'Delinquency Scale' Questionnaire developed by Junger (1997) in Badrulzaman (2006); Part C is the parenting style (adapted from 'Paulson's Perception of Parenting Scale' by Paulson (1994); Part D is the self-control (adapted from Tennessee Self-control Scale), and part E is the influence of peer (adapted from Teenagers Personality Questionnaire).

Validity and Reliability

To determine the validity of this study instrument, the researchers seek help from experts with experience in the relevant field to review the questionnaire to be used. In terms of reliability, a total of 30 students were selected for the pilot study. The findings from the pilot study were as follows :-

Table 1

Reliability

Question Item	Alpha Coefficient
Frequency of misbehaviors	0.936
Parenting styles	0.713
Student self-control	0.833
Influence of peer	0.785
Overall Item	0.910

Results

Table 2

Distribution of respondents (N=250)

Demography	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	116	46.4
Female	134	53.6
School Level		
Primary	111	44.4
Secondary	139	55.6
Race		
Malay	193	77.2
Chinese	49	19.6
Indian	2	0.8
Others	6	2.4

Table 2 shows the distribution of demography. About 116 (46.4%) of the respondents were male students and the other 134 students (53.6%) were female students. In this survey, 111 (44.4%) of the respondents were from the selected primary schools and 139 (55.6%) of them were from the selected secondary schools. Most of the respondents (77.2%) were Malays,

some were (19.6%) Chinese, a few respondents were (0.8%) Indians and the rest (2.4%) were made up of other races.

Hypothesis 1: There is a relationship between parenting style, self-control and peer influence and students' misbehaviours.

Table 3
Correlation analysis

Variables	Students' Misbehaviors
Parenting Styles	
Authoritarian	-.081
Authoritative	-.114
Permissive	.365**
Overall	.082
Self-Control	
Physical	-.014
Privacy	.103
Ethic Moral	-.003
Overall	.037
Peer Influence	
Positive	0.018
Negative	.311**
Overall	.206**

Table 3 above shows the interpretation of correlation analysis used to answer research hypothesis 1 in this research. Firstly parenting styles construct variables, the value of the correlation coefficient r of the authoritarian with students' misbehavior is ($r = -0.081$, $p = 0.200 > 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between authoritarian and students' misbehavior.

The value of the correlation coefficient r of the authoritative with students' misbehavior is ($r = -0.114$, $p = 0.073 > 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between authoritarian and students' misbehavior.

The value of the correlation coefficient r of the permissive with students' misbehavior is ($r = 0.365$, $p = 0.00 < 0.05$). It shows there is significant relationship between permissive and students' misbehavior.

Overall, the value of the correlation coefficient r of the parenting styles with students' misbehavior is ($r = 0.082$, $p = 0.199 < 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between parenting styles and students' misbehavior.

Secondly self-control construct variables, the value of the correlation coefficient r of the physical with students' misbehavior is ($r = -.014$, $p = 0.824 > 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between physical and students' misbehavior.

The value of the correlation coefficient r of the privacy with students' misbehavior is ($r = .103$, $p = 0.103 > 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between privacy and students' misbehavior.

The value of the correlation coefficient r of the ethic moral with students' misbehavior is ($r = -.003$, $p = 0.959 < 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between permissive and students' misbehavior.

Overall, the value of the correlation coefficient r of the self-control with students' misbehavior is ($r = 0.037$, $p = 0.564 < 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between self-control and students' misbehavior.

Lastly peer influence construct variables, the value of the correlation coefficient r of the positive peers with students' misbehavior is ($r = .018$, $p = 0.780 > 0.05$). It shows there is no significant relationship between positive peers and students' misbehavior.

The value of the correlation coefficient r of the negative peers with students' misbehavior is ($r = .311^{**}$, $p = 0.001 < 0.05$). It shows there is a significant relationship between negative peers and students' misbehavior.

Overall, the value of the correlation coefficient r of the peer influence with students' misbehavior is ($r = 0.206^{**}$, $p = 0.001 < 0.05$). It shows there is a significant relationship between peer influence and students' misbehavior.

Hypothesis 2: Gender, parenting styles, self-control and peer influence are the predictors of

<i>Model</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>R²</i>	<i>R² Change</i>	<i>Adjusted R²</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
1	.365 ^a	.133	.133	.130	38.147	1, 248	.001	.289	4.739	.001
2	.413 ^b	.170	.037	.164	25.359	2, 247	.001	.273	4.060	.001
3	.438 ^c	.192	.022	.182	19.469	3, 246	.001	-.147	- 2.294	.023
4	.455 ^d	.207	.015	.194	16.024	4, 245	.001	-.126	- 2.189	.030

students' misbehaviors.

Table 4

Results of the Regression Analysis for the Contributions of Gender, Parenting Style, self-control and Influence of peers to students' misbehaviors

- a. Predictors : (Constant), permissive
- b. Predictors : (Constant), permissive, negative peer

- c. Predictors : (Constant), permissive, negative peer, positive peer
- d. Predictors : (Constant), permissive, negative peer, positive peer, gender
- e. Dependent Variables : students' misbehaviors

Model 1: $F(1,248)=38.147, p<0.05$

Model 2: $F(2,247)=25.359, p<0.05$

Model 3: $F(3,246)=19.469, p<0.05$

Model 4: $F(4,245)=16.024, p<0.05$

Based on Table 4, the results of the analysis of the parenting styles significant to students' misbehaviors. Model 1 (Permissive parenting styles) is $R^2= 0.133$, $F(1,248) = 38.147$, $P 0.001 < 0.005$. When viewed from beta, permissive parenting styles (Beta= 0.289, $t = 4.739$, Sig = 0.001). This suggests that the proposed model only fits the data by 13.3%. The conclusions are also supported by a significant beta analysis where the significant value of 0.001 is smaller than the specified significant level value of 0.005. This finding means that the first predictor of the permissive style shown by the first model accounted for 13.3 percent of the additional changes in criterion (students' misbehaviors).

The analytical values of model 2 (Negative peers) are $R^2 0.037$, $F(2,247) = 25.359$, $P 0.001 < 0.005$. When viewed from beta, negative peers (Beta= 0.273, $t = 4.060$, Sig = 0.001). This means that the proposed model corresponds to the data in percentage values of only 3.7%. The conclusions are also supported by a significant beta analysis where the significant value of 0.001 is smaller than the specified significant level value of 0.05. This finding means that the second model of permissive parenting styles and negative peers shown by the second model contributed 17.0% of the additional changes in the criterion (students' misbehaviors).

The analytical value of model 3 (Positive partner) is $R^2 0.022$, $F(3,246) = 19,469$, $P 0.001 < 0.005$. When viewed from beta, positive peers (Beta= -0.147, $t = -2.294$, Sig = 0.023). This means that the proposed model corresponds to the data in a percentage value of only 2.2%. The conclusions are also supported by a significant beta analysis where the significant value of 0.023 is smaller than the specified significant level of 0.05. This finding means that the third model of permissive parenting styles, negative peers and positive peers shown by the third model accounted for 19.2 percent additional changes in criterion (students' misbehaviors).

The analytical value of model 4 (Gender) is $R^2 0.015$, $F(4,245) = 16.024$, $P 0.001 < 0.005$. When viewed from beta, gender (Beta= -0.126, $t = -2.189$, Sig = 0.030). This means that the proposed model corresponds to the data in a percentage value of only 1.5%. The conclusions are also supported by a significant beta analysis in which the significant value of 0.030 is smaller than the specified significant level of 0.05. The findings mean the fourth predictor of permissive parenting styles, negative peers, positive peers and gender shown by the fourth model accounted for 20.7 percent of additional changes in criterion (students' misbehaviors).

Discussion

This study aims to find out that there is a relationship between parenting styles, self-control and peer influence and students' misbehaviors. Secondly, the study is to verify that gender, parenting styles, self-control and peer influence are the predictors of students' misbehaviors. The total subject of this study is 250 respondents, from different levels of schools and races.

The research study using the Pearson correlation statistics found that the relationships between parenting styles, self-control and influence of peers, and students' misbehaviors are only weak. For parenting style, it was agreed by the previous researchers that the Pearson correlation value was only 0.115 (Syamimi, 2016; Nazurah et al., 2021). Other researchers such as Azizi et al. (2012); Thompson et al. (2017); Hamidah (2013) also agreed that such relationships exist as the parenting styles influence the development of the behaviors of their children. As with self-control, its relationship to students' misbehaviors is also weak. According to Yen et al. (2021) self-control affects students' misbehaviors. But in this study it was found that the influence of peers shows significant relationships with students' misbehaviors. The influence of peers on students' misbehaviors is proven by most of the previous studies that increase even positive or negative aspects to risk behaviors (Geven, 2017; Tome et al., 2012; Glaser et al., 2010).

Researchers managed to obtain four models that were formed after all available variables were tested to see the relationship that existed with student misconduct. Two variables that have a direct impact on student misconduct are permissive parenting style and negative peer. In addition, the authoritarian parenting style and authoritarian parenting style directly affect the student's self-sufficiency. Only the permissive parenting style affects the student's behaviors on the score of $R^2 = 0.133$. These findings show that the permissive parenting style practiced by the parents of the students contributed 13.3% to the problem of students' misbehaviors. Hetherington (2003) states that teens who grew up in a permissive parenting style often behaved aggressively in the situation and did not obey instructions.

Conclusion

Overall, we can state that dealing with students who are prone to misbehaviors is not an easy task. Students become troubled due to certain disorders in the development of their personality that drive this problem. It can be seen that there are actually many factors involved in contributing to this problem; parents and peers. Therefore, students should be guided continuously to develop their potential and at the same time be free from any misbehaviors. The role of parents at this level is boundless in educating their children towards the formation of the best self-personality through the observation of values and being the best role model to their children. This is because the parenting styles define themselves in their children. The role of the school is also very important being an agent of socialization, the self-control should be taught as the best self-sufficiency.

References

- Adlya, S. I., Yusuf, A. M., & Effendi, M. (2020). The contribution of self control to students' discipline. *Journal of Counseling and Educational Technology*, 3(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.32698/0791>
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1965). Educational Research: an Introduction. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 14(1), 146. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3119062>
- Bridgett, D. J., Burt, N. M., Edwards, E. S., & Deater-Deckard, K. (2015). Intergenerational transmission of self-regulation: A multidisciplinary review and integrative conceptual framework. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(3), 602–654. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038662>
- Camacho, I., Tome, G., De Matos, M. M. N. G., Gamito, P., & Diniz, J. A. (2010). A ESCOLA E OS ADOLESCENTES: QUAL A INFLUÊNCIA DA FAMÍLIA E DOS AMIGOS? *Revista De Psicologia*

- Da Criança E Do Adolescente, 1(1), 101–116. [Http://Revistas.Lis.Ulusiada.Pt/Index.Php/Rpca/Article/Download/11/Pdf](http://Revistas.Lis.Ulusiada.Pt/Index.Php/Rpca/Article/Download/11/Pdf)
- Driessen G. (2011). Gender differences in education: is there really a “boys’ problem?”. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting ECER, Berlin.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236004056_Gender_differences_in_education_Is_there_really_a_boys'_problem/citations
- Gallegos, A. G., Banos, R., Extremera, A. B., & Martinez-Molina, M. (2020). Analysis of Misbehaviors and satisfaction with school in secondary education according to student gender and teaching competence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00063>
- Geven, S., Jonsson, J. O., & Van Tubergen, F. (2017). Gender Differences in Resistance to Schooling: The role of Dynamic Peer-Influence and Selection Processes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 46(12), 2421–2445. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-017-0696-2>
- Glaser, B., Shelton, K. H., & Van Den Bree, M. B. (2010). The moderating role of close friends in the relationship between conduct problems and adolescent substance use. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 47(1), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.12.022>
- Glock, S., & Kleen, H. (2017). Gender and student misbehavior: Evidence from implicit and explicit measures. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 67, 93–103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2017.05.015>
- Hafizar, M. R. A., Abdullah, N., & Suhada, S. A. K. S. N. (2017). Hubungan Antara Jenis Komunikasi Dan Gaya Asuhan Ibu Bapa Terhadap Tingkah Laku Devian Remaja Kajian Literatur (Relationship Between The Type Of Communication And Parenting Style Towards Teen Deviant Behaviour: A Literature Review). *Journal Of Human Capital Development*, 10(1), 55–68. [Http://Journal.Utem.Edu.My/Index.Php/Jhcd/Article/View/2661/1712](http://Journal.Utem.Edu.My/Index.Php/Jhcd/Article/View/2661/1712)
- Hadjar, A., & Buchmann, C. (2016). Education systems and gender inequalities in educational attainment. In *Education systems and inequalities* (pp. 159-184). Policy Press. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1t892m0.14>
- Hughes, J. N., Dyer, N., Luo, W., & Kwok, O. (2009). Effects of peer academic reputation on achievement in academically at-risk elementary students. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30(2), 182–194. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2008.12.008>
- Nigg, J. T. (2016). Annual Research Review: On the relations among self-regulation, self-control, executive functioning, effortful control, cognitive control, impulsivity, risk-taking, and inhibition for developmental psychopathology. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 58(4), 361–383. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12675>
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607–610. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316447003000308>
- Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Bean, R. A. (2008). Negative and positive peer influence: Relations to positive and negative behaviors for African American, European American, and Hispanic adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32(2), 323–337. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.02.003>
- Tiwari, G. (2014). A Study on the classroom behaviour Problems at secondary level. *American Research Thoughts*. 1. 514-536.

- Thompson, R., Kaczor, K., Lorenz, D., Bennett, B. L., Meyers, G., & Pierce, M. C. (2017). Is the Use of Physical Discipline Associated with Aggressive Behaviors in Young Children? *Academic Pediatrics*, 17(1), 34–44. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2016.02.014>
- Tome, G., De Matos, M. G., Simoes, C., Diniz, J. A., & Camacho, I. (2012). How can peer group influence the behavior of Adolescents: Explanatory model. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v4n2p26>
- Yen, A. S., Kamaluddin, M. R., Nasir, N. C. M., Roseliza-Murni, A., & Rathakrishnan, B. (2021). Pengaruh kawalan sendiri, pencarian sensasi dan pengherotan kognitif terhadap sikap pro-jenayah dalam kalangan belia institusi pengajian tinggi di Malaysia (Influence of self-control, sensation seeking and cognitive distortion towards pro-criminal attitudes among Malaysian youths from higher education institutions). *Geografia: Malaysian Journal of Society and Space*, 17(2). <http://ejournal.ukm.edu.my/gmjss/article/download/43739/11905>