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Adolescence has been considered as a period of challenges and strains. Aggressive behavior usually escalates during this period due to multiple reasons (e.g., physiological changes, need for independence, establishment of new identity, and role conflict). Parents play vital role in managing and monitoring adolescents’ social relationships and behavior (Parke & Burial, 1998). A lack of adequate parental role as a manager is a potential risk factor that is related to aggressiveness and juvenile delinquency (Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984).

The present study was carried out to investigate the role of demographic variables (viz., parents’ education and parents’ income) and parenting styles in aggression among late adolescents. The sample consisted of boys and girls from 9th and 10th grades, age ranged between 15 and 17 years. Sample was recruited from public and private schools of Punjab, Pakistan. Parents were approached through students at their homes. Data was collected by using Parenting Style Questionnaire (Robinson, Mandleco, Olsen, & Hart, 1995) and Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992). Significant gender difference appeared on total aggression and its components except for hostility. A considerable amount of variance in total aggression was accounted for by authoritarian parenting, permissive parenting, and income of parents. Parenting styles predicted distinctively in four components of aggression.
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Adolescence is a period largely characterized as beginning and ending with teen age. No unanimous definition from all the disciplines is available. Experts like Brooks-Gunn (1988) argue that it makes sense to divide the years between 12 and 20 into subperiods: one...
beginning at 11 or 12 (early adolescence) and other perhaps at 16 or 17 (late adolescence). Early adolescence is a time of transition, of significant change in virtually almost every aspect of child’s functioning; while late adolescence is more a time of consolidation, and establishing new identity and role commitments. Transition from childhood to adulthood is a long journey with many ups and downs. Adolescence period has its own strains. Hormonal changes may be directly implicated in the increase in confrontation between parents and children and in various kinds of aggressive and delinquent behaviors. Investigators support the role of estradiol at the beginning of puberty associated with verbal aggression and a loss of impulse control in girls, while in boys, increases in testosterone is associated with increase in irritability and impatience (Paikoff & Brooks-Gunn, 1990). There is abrupt turn in the attitude and behavior of parents at this stage. When the child’s body grows and seems more like that of adult, the parents start treating the child differently; on the other hand the child begins to see himself as an adult. The expectations of adolescents and their parents are usually violated by each other. Many parents see their child changing from a compliant being into someone who is non compliant, and oppositional to parental standards. Parents often restrict and put more pressure on the adolescent to conform to their standard. This leads to brief rise in parent adolescent confrontation. Rise of conflict between the parents and adolescents and the development of aggression among the latter is a commonly observed phenomenon. Parents play the role of manager in monitoring adolescents’ social relationships and behavior (Parke & Burial, 1998). For adolescents to reach their full potential an important parental role is to be an effective manager; one who finds information, makes contacts, helps structure choice and provides guidance (Youniss & Ruth, 2002).

It has long been theorized that what children learn, and how they react in certain situation is affected by their relationships with parents, parenting styles, and parents’ behavior (Collins & Laursen, 1999). Social learning theory (Bandura, 1973) supports the role of parenting in social behavior, particularly aggression among children by modeling and vicarious reinforcement. Children may imitate their parents through modeling their use of aggression in controlling them. Bandura (1989) rejected the misconception that modeling is just mimicry of other’s act, rather children may learn through modeling that their parents’ hostile and aggressive behavior is effective in winning the situation and controlling others, so these children may adopt physical and verbal aggressive strategies and other form of aggression in their social interaction to get control over the situation.
Vicarious reinforcement may also explain the development of aggression among adolescents. This reinforcement could be in the form of praise (positive reinforcement) or absence of punishment (negative reinforcement). For example, permissive parenting provides the form of negative reinforcement to their children’s undesired or aggressive acts via negligence.

Authoritative parenting is believed to be an adequate parenting style, because it supports a balanced use of warmth and control. All other parenting styles, such as authoritarian, permissive-indulgent, and neglectful-uninvolved, are tagged as inadequate, because they either lack warmth but with too much control, as with the authoritarian style; or they lack control yet with excessive warmth, or they lack both warmth and control, as with the neglectful-uninvolved style (Anonymous, 2012; Iwaniec, 1997; Klerman, 1993; Silove, George, & Bhavani-sankaram, 1987).

Baumrind (1991) believes in adequate parenting that is parents should be neither punitive nor aloof from their adolescents; rather she emphasized on parents to develop rules and be affectionate with them (authoritative parenting). She emphasizes three classical parenting styles that are associated with different aspects of adolescents’ behavior. Each parenting style is distinctive in terms of two dimensions (i.e., responsiveness, warmth, and control). Parents with authoritative parenting are warm and nurturant toward adolescent; they are high in control and high in responsiveness. The adolescents of authoritative parents are usually self-reliant and socially competent and have impulse control skills and coping mechanisms, such as emotional regulation, prosocial behavior, and social competence; whereas authoritarian parenting results in antisocial behavior such as aggression and delinquency. The authoritarian parents place firm limits and control on adolescents and allows little verbal exchange, results in socially incompetent behavior, they are high in control and low in responsiveness. Children growing up with neglectful and non indulgent or permissive parents, who are low in control and high in responsiveness, are likely to be aggressive particularly if parents are permissive toward aggressive behavior. These parents are warm and caring, may have a lot of difficulty setting appropriate limits. They may also be confused by their child's active, sensation-seeking manner, and find it difficult to teach their child how to communicate his intentions and feelings. Permissive parenting may lead to development and maintenance of negative behavior such as aggression. Children with permissive parents may not fully develop the ability to control his/her negative emotions, for example anger, due to the reason that perhaps their parents neither monitor their
children behavior in an appropriate way, nor make them reflect on this behavior. These children lack the ability to regulate their aggressive impulses when facing conflicts, and disagreements, or when their goals are thwarted; as a result display excessive levels of aggression. These parents do not exercise control to stop their children’s disruptive behavior (Nelson & Crick, 2002).

A substantial body of literature demonstrates that dimensions of positive or adequate parenting and negative or inadequate (viz., authoritative, and authoritarian, permissive or neglecting) are differentially associated with children’s prosocial and antisocial behavior (e.g., Alink et al., 2009; Romano, Tremblay, Boulceric, & Swisher, 2005). Later studies have established the role of adequate parenting in positive social behavior of children like more social competence, prosocial behavior, positive interaction with peers, and less aggression and delinquency (Collins & Steinberg, 2006; Pettit, Bates, & Dodge, 1997). Finzi-Dottan, Bilu, and Golubchik (2011) in a study concluded that positive parenting or adequate parenting accounted for 11% of variance in aggression reported by former soviet union immigrant adolescents, and native Israeli adolescents, age ranged between 14-18 years and 3% of variance in conduct disorder reported by instructors. Greater authoritative parenting is associated with less of an increase in internalizing behavior problems overtime (Williams et al., 2009).

Inadequate parenting based on harsh punishment and very little positive reinforcement (authoritarian parenting) has been linked with behavioral and conduct disorders (Barry, Frick, & Grafeman, 2008; De Clercq, Van Leeuwen, De Fruyt, Van Hiel, & Mervielde, 2008; Kim-Cohen et al., 2003; Patterson, De Baryshe, & Ramsey, 1989). McCord (1996) explained that violent offenders are less likely than non violent offenders to have experienced parental affection and supervision. McCord (1997) found that physical punishment predicted convictions for violence, especially when it was combined with low parental warmth and affection. Juvenile delinquency and heightened aggression in adolescents are most often preceded by inadequate parental control or inappropriate parenting style (Dishion, French, & Patterson 1995; Patterson & Stouthamer-Loeber, 1984). Poor parental monitoring and hard punishment and physical abuse predict violent offending, especially in sons (Gorman-Smith, Tolan, Zelli, & Huesmann, 1996; Malinosky-Rummell, & Hanson, 1993). Authoritarian parenting is also associated with children negative social adjustment, such as hostility and low self esteem (Coe & Dodge, 1998). Children of parents who use punitive and coercive discipline, who restrict the autonomy of child, have absolute standards, and do
not explain their demands are prone to use of physical aggression and hostile behavior towards peers (e.g., Coie & Dodge, 1998; Ladd & Pettit, 2002). Permissive parents exert low control and high responsiveness; they do not set clear limits and boundaries. Literature has also suggested that permissive parenting is highly associated with physical aggression (e.g., Rubin, Stewart, & Chen, 1995). The link between maternal and paternal parenting styles and childhood aggressive behavior was also measured by Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, and McNeilly-Choque (1998) in an ethnic Russian sample of 207 families of nursery school aged children. Results supported the findings from Western samples. Maternal and paternal coercion, lack of responsiveness, and psychological control (for mothers only) were significantly correlated with children's overt aggression with peers. Aggressive disciplinary framework of parenting tactics employed by parents is a possible risk factor in developing aggression and antisocial behavior in children (Farrington, Jolliffe, Loeber, Stouthamer-Loeber, & Kalb, 2001).

In addition to the empirical evidences which indicated that a major risk factor for aggression among children is parenting style (Georgiou, 2008), in particular inadequate (Finzi-Dottan et al., 2011; Scott, 2008). Aggressiveness of the children is also influenced by parents in multiple ways, i.e., by their genes determining aggressiveness later in life (Perusse & Gendreau, 2005), mothers’ behavior during the period of prenatal development (Hujibregts, Se’guin, Zoccolillo, Boivin, & Tremblay 2007), and emotional family climate (Lau, Takeuchi, & Alegría, 2006). Demographic variables also define the groups at highest risk for aggression (Orpina, 1999). Role of demographic variables in aggression among children has been supported in subsequent studies (e.g., Baumeister & Boden 1998; Rahman & Huq, 2005). Scientific studies on direct forms of aggression have shown that men are more aggressive than women (e.g., Crick et al., 1999; Galen & Underwood, 1997; Hyde, 1984; Wahl & Metzner, 2012). Young people emerged as more aggressive than older people (Maguire & Pastore, 1997). Other factors that play role into this directly and indirectly include domestic violence, parental drug abuse, maternal depression, family poverty, parents with low education, stressed families and single parent status (Bloomquist & Schnell, 2005; Webster-Stratton & Reid, 2008). Violence disproportionally affects the poor and the uneducated. Aggression is higher in low socioeconomic neighborhoods, and the risk of being the victim of crime increases for people of low socioeconomic status (Farrington, 1989; Maguire & Pastore, 1997). Indices of family socioeconomic status, including parent education as important
predictor of children’s educational and behavioral outcomes have been supported over the years (e.g., Davis-Kean, 2005; Dearing, McCartney, & Taylor, 2001; Nagin & Tremblay, 2001). Empirical evidence has established that more affluent and more educated parents are more likely to show warmth, and read to their children than parents with low levels of education (Barker et al., 2008; Feinstein & Sabates, 2005; Sabates & Feinstein, 2005). Literature also demonstrates that children of working mothers involve more in aggressive acts as compared to those whose mother stay at home and give their children emotional support and sufficient time (e.g., Amin, 2011; Bossard as cited in Nye, 1963).

Most of the initial studies on aggression have been done on children. However, there is a lack of research on the role of parenting in behavioral problems of late adolescents, especially in Asian countries like Pakistan. Previous studies have explored the role of parenting in aggression among preschoolers, nursery children, pre adolescents and early adolescents (e.g., Alnik et al., 2009; Barker et al., 2008; Baumrind, 1991; Brown, Arnold, Dobbs, & Doctoroff, 2007; Casas et al., 2006; Hart et al., 1998; Hujibregls et al., 2007; Patterson, & Southamer-Loeber, 1984; Romano et al., 2005; William et al., 2009). Recently, trend has changed and studies on the issue have been done on both children and late adolescents (DeClercq, 2008; Kawabta et al., 2011; Wahl & Metzner, 2012).

Aggression among adolescents has drawn the attention of researchers due the fact that it can be considered pathological, when it is exaggerated, persistent and expressed out of context (Wahl, 2012). Magnusson (1989) advocates that adolescence is a period when a person is fully exposed to the society and his/her behavior, particularly violent acts are visible to community. However, there has been little research examining the role of parenting style in aggressiveness among late adolescents, especially in Asian societies.

The present study was planned to explore the relationship between parenting styles and aggression among adolescents in Pakistani cultural context, where adolescents’ behavior is likely to be influenced by extended family members in addition to parental control due to joint family system. Documented studies suggest that parenting styles are perceived differently in eastern and western societies, like traditional Chinese believe that parents are responsible for training the child to be socially and morally responsible for the socialization of their children, and parents should be harsh on it; whereas Western belief is that parents should encourage and nurture children’s self-esteem, independence, and expressions of opinions and feelings
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(Lieber, Fung, & Leung, 2006). In Pakistani society obedience is valued as a virtue, both religiously and culturally. Parents usually believe in harsh disciplinary measure to reprimand children at points where their actions or beliefs are in conflict with parents’ expectations and religious values. Keeping in view the work done in the West, the second purpose of the present study was to establish the validity of eastern and western belief in positive and negative parenting and to explore the role of demographic variables (viz., parents’ education, income, working status of mothers, and child’s gender) grouping together with parenting styles in aggression.

Method

Participants

The sample consisted of 109 late adolescents (52 boys and 57 girls) from 9th and 10th grades, age ranged between 15 and 17 years (\(M = 16.73, SD = 1.28\)) from intact families, and their parents. Mothers’ age ranged between 35 and 50 years (\(M = 43.75, SD = 4.24\)) and fathers’ age ranged between 44 and 62 years (\(M = 51.70, SD = 5.22\)). Convenient sampling technique was used to recruit adolescents from four public and private schools of four cities of Punjab. Parents were approached through students at their homes.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolescents’ age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers’ age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53-62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers’ education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under graduates</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued...
### Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status of mothers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Working</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers’ education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under graduates</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduates</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ monthly income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in Pakistani Rupees)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29 thousand</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 thousand</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 thousand</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 50 thousand</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Instruments

**Aggression Questionnaire.** Adolescents completed the Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992), consisted of 29 items to be rated on a 5-point Likert scale. It aimed at measuring attitudes toward aggressiveness and its expression in everyday circumstances. The questionnaire was designed to measure four dispositional dimensions of aggression (viz., physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility). Physical aggression subscale consisted of 9 items (e.g., *If somebody hits me, I hit back*). Verbal aggression subscale contained 5 items (e.g., *my friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative*), anger subscale contained 7 items (e.g., *I have trouble controlling my temper*), and hostility subscale comprised 8 items (*When people are especially nice, I wonder what they want*). Values of Cronbach’s alpha in the current study were (.88, .88, .70, .60, & .71) consecutively for total scale, physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. High correlations were found between subscales and total scale range between (.59 - .82, $p < .01$). Construct validity of the scale was supported to some extent by their relative associations with other self-report measures of personality traits (Buss & Perry, 1992; Harris, 1995; Harris & Knight-Boenhoff, 1996). Gallo and Smith (1998) reported evidence for the discriminant validity of the scale. Concurrent validity of the scale in health related studies has also been reported (e.g., Giancola, 2002; Gidron, Davidson, & Ilia, 2001).

**Parenting Styles Questionnaire.** Parents completed three subscales of the Parenting Styles Questionnaire (Robinson et al., 1995). The scale consisted of 32 items and each item of the scale was evaluated on 5-point Likert described as, *never, once in a while, about half of the time, very often, and always*. The authoritative subscale
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(e.g., I take into account child’s preferences in making plans for the family) consisted of 13 items, $\alpha = .90$ for mothers and $\alpha = .95$ for fathers in this study. The authoritarian subscale (e.g., I punish by taking privileges away from child with little if any explanations) consisted of 13 items $\alpha = .80$ for mothers and $\alpha = .78$ for fathers in this study. The permissive parenting (e.g., I ignore my child’s bad behavior) consisted of 4 items, $\alpha = .81$ for mothers and $\alpha = .65$ for fathers in this study. Inter subscales correlations were quite satisfactory between authoritative parenting and authoritarian parenting ($r = -.60; p < .01$); between authoritative parenting and permissive parenting ($r = -.73; p < .01$); and between authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting ($r = .72; p < .01$). Validity of the scale has been supported in number of studies (e.g., Ellis, 2007; Onder & Gulay, 2009; Robinson et al., 1995).

Permission to translate and use the scales was taken from the authors via email. Before data collection both questionnaires were translated into Urdu by five experts who were competent in both English and Urdu languages. Translations made by the experts were compared and best translated items were unanimously retained by three psychologists. Another expert who was competent in Urdu and English translated the scales back to English. The original and the Urdu translation of the scales were compared by the bilingual experts and the researcher and the final Urdu version of the scales was accomplished. Psychometrics of the scales were further strengthened by administering both Urdu and English versions of scales on 20 students and 25 parents and significant correlations appeared ($r = .88; p < .00$) between Urdu and English versions of Aggression Questionnaire and ($r = .84; p < .00$) between Urdu and English versions of Parenting Styles Questionnaire.

Procedure

Permission for data collection was taken from two public and two private schools. Students of 9th and 10th classes were approached in the classes and the purpose of research was explained to them. Students who showed their willingness were engaged in the study. Initially 180 students were willing to participate in the study, but final sample consisted of 109 adolescents due to the reason that 71 parents did not consented to participate in the study. Contact numbers of parents were gathered from students and time and date was fixed with them for data collection.
Adolescents filled up the aggression questionnaires at school after getting consent from their parents. Personal information form and Parenting Style Questionnaire were filled out by parents at their home. Fathers and mothers separately filled out the scale.

**Results**

Group differences were analyzed across gender and working status of the mothers. In addition, predicting role of various factors on aggression was determined through regression analyses.

Table 2

*Gender Differences on Aggression (N = 109)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Boys (n = 52)</th>
<th>Girls (n = 57)</th>
<th>t (107)</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Aggression</td>
<td>36.71 (15.15)</td>
<td>24.02 (7.45)</td>
<td>5.73**</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>[8.20, 17.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Aggression</td>
<td>24.50 (5.81)</td>
<td>20.30 (6.33)</td>
<td>3.58**</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>[1.89, 6.52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>31.32 (8.14)</td>
<td>26.83 (6.25)</td>
<td>3.03*</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>[1.76, 7.20]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>24.72 (7.66)</td>
<td>23.76 (9.30)</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>[2.30, 4.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aggression</td>
<td>117.26 (26.84)</td>
<td>94.92 (23.92)</td>
<td>4.52**</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>[12.73, 31.93]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. CI= Confidence Interval.*

*p < .05, **p < .00

Table 2 showed results of independent sample *t*-test indicating that boys scored significantly higher than girls on total aggression and subscales of aggression except for hostility. Effect sizes range support the strength of relationship of gender and aggression.
Table 3

**Group Differences across Working Status of Mothers on Aggression among Adolescents (N= 109)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Non Working Mothers (n = 81)</th>
<th>Working Mothers (n = 28)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Cohen’s d</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Aggression</td>
<td>29.30 (13.77)</td>
<td>32.75 (12.11)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>[-9.25, 2.37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Aggression</td>
<td>21.28 (6.05)</td>
<td>25.43 (6.54)</td>
<td>3.06*</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>[-6.83, -1.45]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>28.20 (7.56)</td>
<td>31.39 (6.80)</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>[-6.40, .01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>23.67 (8.30)</td>
<td>25.82 (9.11)</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>[-5.84, .15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aggression</td>
<td>102.47 (27.21)</td>
<td>115.39 (26.68)</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>[-24.69, -.15]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: CI = Confidence Interval
*p < .05

Results of independent sample t-test revealed that children of working mothers showed significantly higher score on verbal aggression, anger, and total aggression with large effect sizes, while non significant difference appeared on physical aggression and hostility subscales (see Table 3).

Simple regression analyses were run to investigate the predictive strength of continuous demographic variables (e.g., adolescents’ age, parental income, and parental education) and study variables (e.g., authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting, and permissive parenting) to predict four components of aggression that is, physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility (see Table 4).

Table 4

**Summary of Simple Regression Analyses for Variables Predicting Aggression among Adolescents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Var</th>
<th>Phy Agg</th>
<th>Ver Agg</th>
<th>Anger</th>
<th>Hostility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auth</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auth</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PMI</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>-.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>22.79**</td>
<td>11.75**</td>
<td>14.85**</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Var = Variables; Auth = Authoritative Parenting; Auth = Authoritarian Parenting; Per = Permissive Parenting; PMI = Parental Monthly Income; Phy Agg = Physical Aggression; Ver Agg = Verbal Aggression.

**p < .00, *p < .05**
Table 4 illustrates that authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting, submissive parenting, and parents’ income appear as salient predictors in physical aggression, verbal aggression and anger, whereas hostility was not predicted by any of the demographics or study variables.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parenting Styles</th>
<th>Father’s Authoritative</th>
<th>Father’s Authoritarian</th>
<th>Father’s Permissive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Authoritative</td>
<td>.54**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Authoritarian</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Permissive</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.68**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .00

Table 5 showed Pearson’s bi-variate correlation calculated to see the direction of correlation in parenting styles practiced by both parents. Results depicted that there was significant positive correlation or cohesiveness in practice of all three parenting styles practiced by parents in Pakistan (see Table 5). It means if father uses one parenting style, mother follows the same and vice versa.

Discussion

Violence is a prevalent phenomenon in Pakistan (World Report, 2012). A substantial portion of daily newspapers reports violence, terrorism, and rape taking place in the country. This human anguish due to violence is alarming; and if we do not pay heed to risk factors for aggression among adolescents, we will not be in a position to deal with this problem, and it will become a dilemma for the future generation. Adolescence is a time of heightened violence and the frequency of engaging in violent behaviors are greater for adolescents than for all other age groups (Polk, 2013). The present study is an empirical investigation aimed at exploring the phenomenon of aggression in late adolescent boys and girls, related to demographic variables and parenting styles.

The study was based on the assumption that positive / adequate parenting (authoritative) would have negative association with aggression, and negative/inadequate parenting (authoritarian and permissive) would have positive association with aggression among late adolescents in Pakistani cultural context. Simple regression
analyses illustrated that parenting styles had an impact on the aggression level of late adolescents, as significant amounts of variance in physical aggression, verbal aggression, and anger were accounted for by all three parenting styles. Results corroborate and extend findings from Western and Russian American samples (Barker et al., 2008; Finzi-Dottan et al., 2011). Permissive parenting appeared as significantly associated with physical aggression. The results match with the findings by Rubin et al. (1995). One possible explanation for this association might be that permissive parents neither monitor their children’s behavior in an appropriate way, nor make them to reflect on their behavior; as a result children lack the ability to regulate their aggressive impulse when face disagreement or clash. Since highest correlation was found between authoritarian parenting and verbal aggression; and authoritarian parenting and anger in the present study consecutively. One possible reason might be that when children see their parents being argumentative in controlling them, they learn that they may control the situation through verbal aggression. Role of authoritarian parenting in aggression is supported from number of studies (e.g., Coi & Dodge, 1998; Ladd & Pettit, 2002). Authoritative parenting had significant negative association with physical aggression and anger, and the results coincide with work done by other researchers (e.g., Alink et al., 2009; Finzi-Dottan et al., 2011; Romano et al., 2005).

Moreover studies have established the role of adequate parenting in positive social behavior of children instead of aggressive behavior (Collins & Steinberg, 2006). The rationale of this relationship might be that authoritative parents not only set disciplinary limits for their children and exert reasonable control over them, but also give space to their children to express their opinion and take their decisions. Indeed when authoritative parents and children are emotionally close, they can assert more mutual influence. Parents are in a position to be tough when toughness is required. Parents are not afraid to set limits, because they have emotional bond with their children and their words matter (Gottman & Declaire, 1997). Hostility was not predicted by any of the variables entered in the regression analyses.

Parent’s income appeared as negatively associated with aggression and the only demographic predictor in the present study. The result coincides with Wahl and Metzner (2012) study, in which low family income negatively correlated with higher aggressiveness. This might be due to the reason that parents from high income families have lesser complexes; they may easily fulfill the needs and desires of their children as compared to parents from low income
families. Low income and low education of parents imply knowledge deficits and may lead to negative patterns of parenting according to the frustration-aggression theory (Dollard & Miller, 1939). It is perhaps important to note that socioeconomic status (SES) may be regarded as functionally distinct domains of self-esteem (Twenge & Campbell, 2002). Social superiority and social exclusion due to low SES may emerge as reliable and positive predictor of hostile aggression (Baumeister & Boden 1998). The results do not coincide with the findings of Rahman and Huq (2005) in Bangladesh, in which respondents with high SES expressed more aggression than the middle and low SES. Guo and Harris (2000) dismissed the role of SES in parenting. Hence the role of SES in aggression in different cultural contexts still needs to be studied).

Boys scored significantly higher than girls on physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger and on total aggression. The results match with the study by Wahl and Metzner (2012), in which fathers and children themselves described the boys as aggressive with significantly greater frequency than girls. Physical aggression or intentional harm caused to others through deliberate physical acts (e.g., hitting, kicking) or verbal threat of such acts is thought to be largely the venue of boys (Crick et al., 1999). On the other hand, Owens, Shute, and Slee (2000) for example, showed that girls’ aggressive tactics included gossip, ostracism, breaking confidences, and criticism (relational aggression). Non significant sex differences on hostility (non overt form of aggression) found in the present study is also supported by earlier studies (e.g., Bjorkqvist & Niemela, 1992; Galen & Underwood, 1997; Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, & Peltonen, 1998). Results do not match with a study by Rahman and Huq (2005) in which girls showed more aggression than boys in age group 14-16 years.

The results in the present study also demonstrated that adolescents of working mothers scored significantly higher on verbal aggression and total aggression as compared to non working mothers. The results coincide with the findings (Amin, 2011). The evidence also supports the validity of Bossard’s conception (cited in Nye, 1963) that employed mothers induce maladjustment in child, because they presumably experience more difficulty in exercising direct control and supervision of children and children of employed mothers showed aggressive behavior due to certain conditions provoked by the working status of the mother (e.g., the child feels neglected and rationalizes his/her antisocial behavior, the child exploits lack of
maternal control, mother is exhausted and neglects supervision and training of the child).

In order to see whether parents play harmonizing role in parenting practices in Pakistan, assortative mating among both of the parents was measured by calculating correlation among all three parenting styles practiced by mothers and fathers of the adolescents’ sample. Analyses show that there is significant positive correlation on all three parenting styles measured in the study. This shows that couples in Pakistan have cohesiveness in parenting style practices. There is significant harmony in their parenting styles. No previous document was found to compare this phenomenon.

Limitations

The findings of the study should be interpreted with caution as it contains certain limitation. The study has limited generalizability as the sample was recruited from cities of Punjab only, so more representative sample from all over the country should be selected for future study. In future study both early and late adolescent groups should be included. It is a correlational study, so we cannot establish the direction of causality of the relationships studied, as in some cases hyperactive children provoke negative parenting practices, which in turn makes the children aggressive (Thomas & Chess, 1977). The present study explains the social and cultural dimensions of contributing factors in aggression. However literature illustrates that social, cultural, and biological factors work together to influence the aggressiveness of children and adolescents. Interdisciplinary work illuminating the complexed interplay of biological, social and cultural factors needs to be initiated in Asian societies.

Recommendations

Future studies should continue to explore the relationship between parenting styles and aggression. No earlier documented study has examined these relationships in adolescents in Pakistan. Future studies should include larger sample. The current study provides some support for the importance of parenting practices in aggression of children. Although aggression is often peer-directed and gender specific, children may learn aggressive strategies from their interactions with their parents. Therefore, future research should focus
on developing parenting interventions to reduce aggressive behavior in children. Since interventions targeting parenting practices could be designed for children high in aggression. The current study also illustrates the importance of considering gender, parents’ socio economic status, parents’ education level in the relationship between parenting and aggression, so we hope that such research will eventually help in the development of effective aggression prevention and intervention strategies. It underlines the fact that there is an opportunity to improve children’s life chances through directly intervening with programs that are effective in changing parenting styles. Considerable data has established that parenting programs are effective in England in helping parents reduce coercive parenting and improve child behavior, be it in clinical samples, or selected from a school screen (Scott, 2008).

Conclusion

Despite all the limitations the present study suggests that parents differ in their capacity for parenting, and different parenting styles may lead to difference in the levels of aggression. It may be assumed that parents need to adopt authoritative parenting styles as a safeguard against the behavioral problems of their children. While dealing with the aggressiveness of a child, parenting practices should be kept into consideration on high priority. Present study was an attempt to develop insight into the early prevention of aggression and the worth of involving parents in preventive program. This knowledge may be used to inform family based interventions aimed at preventing the perpetration of different forms of aggression.
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