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**ABSTRACT**

This study examined impact parent-child relationship (warmth) and parenting styles on academic engagement among adolescence in Enugu East local government area of Enugu state using 475 participants from four randomly selected secondary schools in Enugu East local government of Enugu state (2 single sex schools- St. Patrick College, Emene and Trans-Ekulu Girls Secondary School; and 2 mixed sex schools- Model Ideal College Abakpa and Godfrey Okoye Secondary School, Thinkers’ Corner). A total of one hundred and fifty (150) copies of the instrument were administered to systematically randomly selected SS 1 & 2 students of each of the four schools the participants (191 Males and 284 Females) were aged between 13 years and 21 years with a mean age of 15.93 years and a standard deviation of 1.22. Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II); Parental Warmth Scale and Student Engagement Scale (SES) were used to collect data for the study. Multiple Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses via the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v23).The result of this study does not support the null hypothesis since parent-child relationship (warmth) made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement .The result of this study support the null hypothesis because responsiveness did not make statistically significant contribution in predicting academic engagement. The result of this study support the null hypothesis for the reason that autonomy did not make statistically significant contribution in predicting academic engagement .The result of this study does not support the null hypothesis since demandingness made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement. Among the three dimensions of parenting styles, only demandingness made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement.
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**CHAPTER ONE**

**INTRODUCTION**

The Adolescence is a fascinating stage of development full of many physical, cognitive, social, and emotional changes. To Blackwell, Trzesniewski, Kali and Dweck (2007), this stage or period is sensitive and a critical time with important implications for school achievement. Also, the increase in academic demands and the complexity of the school structure make the task of academic success for adolescents even more difficult (Patrikakou, 2004).

Achievement is almost the most important issue for adolescents in education in any country and this is why many key people ranging from educators to psychologists and to sociologists have focused research attention and efforts towards identifying the reasons why some students perform well academically while others fail and drop out. Recently, nations such as Canada, has noted an increase in children with risk factors that may compromise their present achievement and future success, and approximately 27.6% or 1 in 4 students is considered to be at risk for school failure (Jordan, 2006). Belfield (2007) also found out that across the 21.9 million adults in California, 2.19 million males and 1.96 million females (20% of the students) were dropouts. Ghasemi (2010) in a study found that 22% of the students in Iran suffer from low academic achievement due to family problems and personal factors.

Besides factors such as parental, school, teacher and environmental factors; personal factors such as self-efficacy, engagement in academic work and personality also have significant positive relationships with adolescent’s academic achievement (Multon, Brown, & Lent, 1991; Fredrik, Blumenfield, & Paris, 2004). Among these personal factors is the main variable of consideration in this study which is academic engagement which is really emphatic among the contributing personal factors to academic achievement and personal development of adolescent students in schools. Such engagement can be described as the level of commitment and involvement or the amount of time, energy and effort that students put into their educational learning activities (Stewart, 2007).

Researchers have recently used the term engagement to refer to the extent to which students identify with and value schooling outcomes, and participate in academic and non-academic school activities (Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD), 2003). The definition of engagement usually comprises a psychological component pertaining to students’ sense of belonging at school and acceptance of school values, and a behavioural component pertaining to participation in school activities (Finn, 1993; Finn & Rock, 1997; Goodenow, 1993; Goodenow & Grady, 1993; Wehlage, Rutter, Smith, Lesko, & Fernandez, 1989). The psychological component emphasizes students’ sense of belonging or attachment to school, which has to do with feelings of being accepted and valued by their peers, and by others at their school (OECD, 2003). Another aspect of the psychological component concerns whether or not students value school success – whether they believe that education will benefit them personally and economically (Johnson et al., 2001). Students who do not feel they belong at school, or reject school values, are often referred to as alienated or disaffected. The participation component of engagement is characterised by factors such as school and class attendance, being prepared for class, completing homework, attending lessons, and being involved in extra-curricular sports or hobby clubs (OECD, 2003).

Academic engagement in the words of Willms (2003) entail investing quality time and energy by students in educationally purposeful activities and being persistent in the pursuit of academic success; it is an indicator that combine academic identification (getting along with teachers, having an interest in the subject matter and related behaviours and attitudes) and academic participation (students work effort both inside and outside of school including hours spent on homework, meeting deadlines and not skipping classes). Taylor & Lundy (2016) refers to academic engagement as the degree of attention, curiosity, interest, optimism and passion that students show when they are learning or being taught, which extends to their level of motivation and progress in education. Svanum and Biggatti (2009) points out that a student is academically engaged when the said student takes advantage of learning opportunities provided by their institution both inside and outside the classroom and involves course related activities such as class attendance and completion of assignment. In line with the foregoing, Horstmanshoff and Zimitat (2011) defined academic engagement in terms of university students as a measure of student’s involvement with university studies.

Academic engagement involves cognitive functions and self-regulatory strategies to pursue learning task (Butler, 2011); therefore, it involves all actions students undertake to enhance their learning. It emphasizes students various pattern of motivation, cognition and behaviour (Baron & Corbin, 2012). It is therefore, a behavioral, emotional and attitudinal involvement in learning and is concerned with concentration, effort and persistency in academic related activities.

Academic engagement improves students’ inquisitiveness, level of motivation and consequently progress in academic endeavors, (Stephens, 2015) and to a great extent may determine outcomes such as graduation. It aims at increasing successful student achievement levels and in understanding students’ positive development (Appleton, Christenson & furlong, 2008). Hence, it has grown in popularity recently probably as a result of increased understanding of the role it plays in learning process and social development (Fredrick et al, 2004). The concept typically arises when educators discuss educational strategies and teaching techniques that address developmental, intellectual, emotional, behavioural, physical and social factors that either enhance or undermine learning for students (Parsons, 2011). Educators may hold different views on students’ academic engagement for instance, observable behaviours such as attending class, listening attentively, participating in discussions, turning in work on time and following rules and directions may be perceived as forms of academic engagement by some educators while others relate academic engagement to internal states such as enthusiasm, motivation or interest.

Academic engagement is predicated on the belief that learning improves when students are inquisitive, interested or inspired and that learning tends to suffer when students are bored, dispassionate or otherwise “disengaged”, (Fredrick et al, 2004). Hence, it seems to play positively significant role in undergraduates’ ability to benefit from academic experiences and consequently achieve academic success. Among identified factors that are related to academic engagement are gender, race/ethnicity, students’ major, parental involvement, educational institution and contact with different people (Jonson, Crosnoe & Elder 2001; Taylor & Francis 2010; Pasquae & Murphy 2005).

The present study examined the impact of parent-child relationship and parenting style on academic engagement of adolescents in Enugu east local government of Enugu state. Research have shown that children of involved parents who participate in their children’s education, have higher standardized test scores and more academic aspirations (Bondioli, 2000; Hill, Castellino, Lansford, Nowlin, Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 2004).

Consequent upon the large body of work demonstrating a connection between parenting practices/styles and school achievement, studies are accumulating which suggest that one pathway through which parenting has an impact on children’s school performance is by shaping children’s classroom engagement, intrinsic motivation, preference for challenge, valuing and commitment to school, and enthusiasm, enjoyment, and interest in schoolwork (Epstein & Sanders, 2002; Jeynes, 2007; Pomerantz, Grolnick, & Price, 2005).

Darling & Steinberg (1993) define parenting style as "a constellation of attitudes toward the child that are communicated to the child and that, taken together, create an emotional climate in which the parents' behaviors are expressed". One of the most studied approaches to understanding parental influences on human development is concept of parenting style (Baumrind, 1967). Baumrind proposed parenting styles as correlates to socialization of the children (Shyny, 2017). Afterwards, many researches recognized the importance of researching role of parenting style in child development (Kordi, 2010; Schaffer, Clark & Jeglic, 2009; Lim & Lim, 2003). Many of the studies followed three parenting styles originally proposed by Baumrind namely authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting, though in 1971, Baumrind added negligent parenting (Shyny, 2017). Baumrind grouped parents to three (or four) parenting styles according to their child rearing patterns, on the basis of her interviews with parents and children.

Shyny (2017) opined that “there is a growing interest in the role of parenting in a person’s affective and social characteristics. The attention of educational researchers on the parenting styles and their effects on school relevant developmental outcomes are also on the rise. Several studies found that parenting style or parental behaviour has statistically significant relation with developmental outcomes like performance, achievement strategies, self-regulated learning, achievement goals, self-efficacy and wellbeing of students”. Academic or school engagement no doubt fall as component part of these factors, hence, a connection of parenting styles and students’ academic/school engagement.

Furrer and Skinner (2003) have in the past examined sense of relatedness (i.e., patterns of relationships with certain social partners such as parents, peers etc.) for its role in student engagement and subsequent academic performance. In this study, they specifically examined the following relationships: (a) the association between relatedness and classroom engagement and performance; (b) the role of parents, teachers, and peers on engagement; (c) the influence of age and gender on the relation between relatedness and engagement; and (d) the level of engagement associated with different relatedness profiles (i.e., patterns of relationships with certain social partners). Results suggested that student- and teacher-reported levels of student behavioral and emotional engagement each mediated the relationship between aggregated relatedness (across parents, teachers, and peers) and student grades. Moreover, student-reported relatedness to parents, peers, and teachers significantly predicted both student- and teacher-reported student engagement beyond student-reported perceived control at one point in time and also across the school year from fall to spring (Furrer & Skinner, 2003). Student feelings of relatedness overlapped moderately across partners (parents, peers, and teachers), yet relatedness with each partner was uniquely important in predicting engagement.

MacDonald (1992) considers warmth as a main component of an adaptive parent-child relationship, and refers to emotional nurturance and affectionate care giving expressed from a parental figure to the child. MacDonald also concluded that warmth and affection in the family evolved as an independent system of motivation, which was distinct from the process of attachment that prevents harm or loss. Thus rather than simply a behavioural contingency system at play, warmth, then, provides positive social reward that drives parent and child behaviour over the course of their relationship (MacDonald, 1992).

**Statement of Problem**

According to OECD (2003), school is central to the daily life of many youths in that they view schooling as essential to their long-term wellbeing, and this attitude is reflected in their participation in academic and non-academic pursuits; and they tend to have good relations with school staff and with other students – they feel that they belong at school. However, some youths do not share this sense of belonging, and do not believe that academic success will have a strong bearing on their future. These feelings and attitudes may result in their becoming disaffected from school (Finn, 1989; Jenkins, 1995). They may gradually withdraw from school activities, and in some cases participate in disruptive behaviour and display negative attitudes towards teachers and other students (OECD, 2003). These students who have become disaffected from school tend to create one of the biggest challenges for teachers and school administrators as they try to meet their need to be fully engaged in school.

Despite the high importance of students’ academic engagement as one of the key factors that determine academic achievement and the problem disengagement in school create for the student, the school and society at large, some students are still found in lapse engaging academically. Academic engagement has long been found as a critical factor in shaping college outcomes (Gasiewski, 2012). Despite the need, findings still indicates that students find it difficult to engage academically (Trawler 2010; Perkmann 2013). This problem of students’ difficulty engaging academically makes research on factors influencing academic engagement to remain an important research question.

Studies have been carried out to determine factors that influence academic engagement, (Jonson, Crosnoe & Elder 2001; Talor & Francis 2010; Pasquae & Murphy 2005; Granville & Dika, 2002; Fredricks & Blumenfeld, 2004) but not much of these studies have been done to see the impact of parent-child relationship and styles of parenting. Also, enough has not been done in Nigeria especially in the south-east in regards to this context, hence a gap in knowledge. This study therefore, will seek to fill some gap in knowledge by examining the impact of parent-child relationship and parenting style on academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of parent-child relationship and parenting style on academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East local government. Specifically, the study would seek to determine whether:

1. Parent-child relationship would have impact on academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.
2. Responsiveness parenting styles would have impact on academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.
3. Autonomy granting parenting styles would have impact on academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.
4. Demandingness parenting styles would have impact on academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.

**Operational Definition of Key Variables**

**Academic engagement**: Students’ investment in and commitment to learning, belonging and identification at school, and participation in the institution environment and initiation of activities to achieve educational goals as measured using the 31 item Student Engagement Scale (SES) by Doğan (2014).

**Parent-Child Relationship:** The unique and enduring bond between a parent or caregiver and his or her child measured using the Parental Warmth Scale from Child Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire (PARQ/Control; Rohner & Khaleque, 2005). The mean warmth received by each participant from both parents represents his/her parental warmth score.

**Parenting Style:** This is a collection of attitudes towards the child that are communicated to the child and that, taken together, create an emotional climate in which the parents' behaviors are expressed. Parenting style in this study is measured using Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II) by Darling and Toyokawa (1997) based on the three parenting style dimension of demandingness, responsiveness and autonomy granting. The mean score for each of the three dimensions from both parents represents each participant’s parenting style score.

**CHAPTER TWO**

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

There are two sections in this chapter namely, theoretical and empirical reviews relevant to the present research.

**THEORETICAL REVIEW**

The theories reviewed under this section are the ecological theory of Bronfenbrenner (1979) and the achievement motivation theory of Atkinson and Feather (1966).

**Ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979)**

One good theory that provides connection between parenting (both styles and warmth) and outcome behavior on children and adolescents (for example, academic engagement and achievement) is the ecological theory developed by Bronfenbrenner (1979). The theory postulates that a person’s development does not exist in a vacuum but within a specific context, and that there are multiple factors that can have an effect on an individual’s behaviors and attitudes. According to Bronfenbrenner (1979, 1986), there are four domains or systems that exert their influence on a person’s life, and changes in one system can have consequences not only for the person but also the other three systems. The relationship that these four domains have on a person is bi-directional in that he or she is both a product of their immediate and larger environment and a catalyst for change among and within these systems (Quach, 2008).

The four domains are labeled as the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1986). “The microsystem is the domain that is closest to the child and encompasses the relationships and interactions that a child has with his or her immediate environment. Structures in the microsystem include family, school, neighborhood, or child care agencies. The mesosystem consists of the connections and relationships among the structures in the microsystem (e.g., family and school or family and childcare agencies). The exosystem involves external settings that are not directly involved in the lives of children and adolescents but nevertheless can exert an influence on their development (e.g., a parent’s workplace). The macrosystem consists of the larger society or culture of which that a child and his or her family are members. Although ecological theory examines all four levels, the present study emphasized the micro and macro systems of the model” (Quach, 2008:45).

Bronfenbrenner (1989) considered the family context to be a prime example of how the microsystem can shape a child’s growth and maturity, particularly within the parent-child relationship irrespective of the fact that individual traits play a role during adolescent development. Parental behaviors and attitudes have the ability to affect children either positively or negatively (Quach, 2008). For instance, parents who are warm and loving to their children and allow them to openly express their opinions may foster more healthy psychosocial adjustment than parents who are harsh, strict, and demonstrate little or no affection and support. In contrast, if parents who expect high achievement from their children utilize excessive and constant pressure to try to motivate their children to achieve, this may cause adolescents to perform poorly in school (Quach, 2008).

**Achievement Motivation Theory (Atkinson & Feather, 1966)**

Achievement Motivation was proposed by Atkinson and Feather (1966). They stated in the theory that a person’s achievement oriented behavior is based on three parts: the first part being the individual’s predisposition to achievement, the second part being the probability of success, and third, the individual’s perception of value of the task. Atkinson and Feather (1966) stated, “The strength of motivation to perform some act is assumed to be a multiplicative function of the strength of the motive, the expectancy (subjective probability) that the act will have as a consequence the attainment of an incentive, and the value of the incentive: Motivation = f(Motive X Expectancy X Incentive)” (1966:13).

The individual’s perception of probability for achieving the task would cause a need to achieve and a fear of failure. Both are strong emotions that influence the individual’s decision on whether or not to attempt the task (Bar-Tal, Frieze, & Greenberg, 1974). If a task simultaneously arouses an individual’s motivation to approach the task and motivation to avoid the task, then the sum of the two motivations will be the result. If the result is more positive to approach the task, then the individual will be motivated toward the task. If the result is more positive to avoid the task, then the individual will be motivated to avoid the task. The strength of motivation also is important. Different variables are taken into account for each task. Often this is done subconsciously. These variables factor into how much the individual is motivated to approach or avoid the task (Atkinson & Feather, 1966). In a person motivated to achieve, their behavior is directed by a positive possibility. In a person motivated to avoid failure, their behavior is directed by an undesirable possibility. The same person may experience both motives at the same time depending on the situation. Which motive the person selects depends on the relative strength of the achievement motives, either to achieve success, or to avoid failure. An individual will find a task easy if they have a high probability of successfully completing the task. An individual will find a task hard if they have a low probability of successfully completing the task. Motivation, as it relates to students, is very important. Students who have high motivation to achieve generally do well academically. Students with low motivation do not do well academically. But motivation does not guarantee achievement. Similarly, achievement does not reflect motivation (Keefe & Jenkins, 1993).

**Dimensions or Components of Student Engagement**

Engagement is more than involvement or participation – it requires feelings and sense making as well as activity (Harper & Quaye, 2009a). Acting without feeling engaged is just involvement or even compliance; feeling engaged without acting is dissociation (Trowler, 2010). Focusing on engagement at a school level, Fredricks et al (2004), drawing on Bloom (1956), usefully identify three dimensions to student engagement. These three interdependent components or dimensions are behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004) and students need to be engaged in all three areas in order to be fully engaged (Lee, 2008). Although student engagement is somewhat difficult to measure, research has indicated that the construct itself is useful and significant (Finn & Rock, 1997; Marks, 2000; Willms, 2003).

**Behavioral engagement**

The term behavioral engagement usually encompasses a broad range of behaviors at school, from merely showing up to actively participating in academic or non-academic activities (Lee, 2008). Fredricks et al. (2004) have identified three forms of behavioral engagement: positive conduct, involvement in learning, and participation in school-related activities. Positive conduct includes attending class, avoiding disruptive behaviors, responding to directions, and following classroom rules. Involvement in learning includes concentrating, making an effort, being persistent, contributing to class discussion, asking questions, finishing homework, and spending extra time on class-related learning. Participation in school-related activities includes taking part in extracurricular activities such as sports teams or student organizations (Lee, 2008).

**Emotional engagement**

Emotional engagement, also called affective engagement or psychological engagement, includes affective reactions and having a sense of belonging at school (Finn, 1993; Willms, 2003; Lee, 2008). Affective reactions toward tasks, school, and people at school (e.g., teachers or peers) may include liking, disliking, being interested, being bored, being happy, being sad, or being anxious. These emotional reactions can be task/person-specific but may also be more general—for example, a student may be simply happy to be at school. Positive emotional reactions to tasks or people can lead to students having a sense of belonging at school (Lee, 2008). Having a sense of belonging refers to feeling accepted, included, respected, and/or valued by people at school (Goodenow & Grady, 1993; Willms, 2003). Studies have also referred to this sense of belonging as identification with school (Finn, 1993), school connectedness (Shochet, Dadds, Ham, & Montague, 2006), and attachment to school (Johnson, Crosnoe, & Elder, 2001).

Fredricks et al (2004) noted that measures of emotional engagement often do not specify the source of the feeling or emotion. A student may be happy to be at school because s/he likes to learn or to take part in extracurricular activities, or because s/he likes peers or teachers at school; and even when the source or cause of engagement is unknown, however, the construct of emotional engagement is useful in capturing how students generally feel about their school (Lee, 2008).

**Cognitive engagement**

Cognitive engagement which is evidenced by the amount of mental involvement and types of cognitive strategies that students use in learning is seen as an “exercise of thinking” (Lao & Kuhn, 2002). Cognitive engagement involves seeking, interpreting, analyzing, summarizing, critiquing, reasoning, and making decisions (Zhu, 2006). Due to the difficulties inherent in operationalizing and measuring the amount and depth of mental involvement, cognitive deep processing strategies and cognitive self-regulation often have been used to indicate cognitive engagement (Miller, Greene, Montalvo, Ravindran, & Nichols, 1996). Higher levels of cognitive engagement require higher-order thinking that can be found in deep processing strategies and self-regulated learning (Lee, 2008). Deep processing involves connecting new information with existing knowledge, creating meaning, and creating knowledge structure, while shallow processing involves only rote memorization (Craik & Lockhart, 1972). Self-regulated learning involves the use of meta-cognitive functions such as goal-setting, planning, self-monitoring, and self-evaluation during the process of learning (Zimmerman, 1990).

Cognitive engagement has not been clearly defined in the literature. In fact, most of the information cited by researchers on the subject has come from studies of cognitive processing or self-regulated learning, which do not use the term cognitive engagement per se (Lee, 2008).

Lee (2008) stated that:

“Although the definitions of student engagement found in the literature have at times been unclear, the multidimensional construct of student engagement effectively captures how students feel, think, and behave at school. Students are fully engaged when they are engaged behaviorally, emotionally, and cognitively, because these three components of engagement are interdependent and therefore influence each other. Students are more likely to show behavioral and cognitive engagement; for example, when they like the tasks and people at school, feel close to people at school, and feel they belong at school. Students also develop emotional engagement through meaningful behavioral and cognitive engagement.” (2008:8)

**Parenting Styles**

Parenting style is a complex construct that has been developing since the 1920s because of the increased interest in how parents influence the development of children’s social and instrumental competence (Darling, 1999). However, it is relatively hard to find actual cause-and effect links between definitions of parenting style as a complex activity that includes many specific behaviors that work individually and together to influence child outcomes. Most of the recent parenting style studies are based on Baumrind’s (1967) theory which views parenting style as the combination of parental attitudes, practices, and nonverbal expressions that characterize the nature of parent-child interactions (Glasgrow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg, & Ritter, 1997).

Even though Baumrind is commonly credited with the seminal work on parenting styles, several earlier researchers published less comprehensive but still relevant ideas about familial differences in childrearing. The earliest dimensions of parenting style were introduced by Symonds (1939), who identified two dimensions as acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission.

**Classifying Parenting Styles for Children**

Baumrind (1967) developed a classification scheme of parenting style by using the two dimensions of demandingness and responsiveness. Parental demandingness, sometimes called behavioral control, refers to “the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demand, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to control the child who disobeys” (Baumrind, 1991). Responsiveness, sometimes called warmth or support, refers to “the extent to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation, and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s special needs and demands” (Baumrind, 1991). Based on levels of demandingness and responsiveness, Baumrind (1967) created a typology of three parenting styles: authoritarian, authoritative, and indulgent. Later, Maccoby and Martin (1983) expanded this typology to include one more cluster—neglectful. Each of the four clusters reflects different patterns of parental values, practices, and behaviors (Baumrind, 1991).

**Classifying Parenting Styles for Adolescents**

Most of the aforementioned early work on parenting styles was based on research with samples of children, ages 4 to 15. Later conceptualizations of parenting, particularly those that included parents of adolescents in samples, identified another salient dimension of parenting behavior that essentially splits the “control” dimension into “behavioral control” and “psychological control,” with low levels of the latter referred to as psychological autonomy granting. Schaefer (1956) first included psychology autonomy/control as one salient domain in parenting style. He explored this construct by using 26 items scale of the Children’s Reports of Parental Behavior Inventory and added firm control/lax control (1956). Parents with high levels of autonomy granting allow adolescents to make choices and encourage developmentally appropriate independence, whereas parents with low levels of autonomy granting discourage independent thinking and use intrusive discipline strategies such as guilt induction (Silk, Morris, Kanaya, & Steinberg, 2003). Steinberg and his colleagues (1991) suggested that besides parental acceptance/warmth (responsiveness) and behavioral supervision /strictness (demandingness), autonomy granting (sometimes called democracy) is the third factor that contributes to adolescents’ healthy psychological development and school success among authoritative families. The psychological autonomy granting scale focuses on the degree to which parents use non-coercive and democratic discipline that allows adolescents’ expression for their own individuality.

**Gender differences in parenting style and adolescent academic engagement**

Some researchers have argued that despite the large number of studies on parenting dimensions (including parental warmth and control), there has been very little research that has examined the separate and unique influences of maternal and paternal parenting behaviors on male and female outcomes (Quach, 2008, Laible & Carlo, 2004; Shek, 1998). Although some research has suggested that parenting styles during the adolescent period are relatively similar (Baumrind, 1991; Stice & Barrera, 1995), Larson and Richards (1994) argue that mothers and fathers also have unique and different relationships with children depending on the gender of their offspring, and that it would be prudent to explore the gender of both parents and children in order to assess on a more detailed level the how gender influences the associations between parenting and children’s development (Quach, 2008). Such gender effects are part of the design of the present study.

Some researchers suggest that because of different societal expectations of gender roles, mothers typically spend more time with adolescents, are involved in a wider range of activities with them, and are more likely than fathers to provide care-giving (Holmbeck et al., 1995). Conversely, fathers tend to spend more time engaged in leisure and instrumental activities with adolescents (Holmbeck et al., 1995). These interactions generally result in more mutuality, closeness, and support within the mother-child as opposed to the father-child relationship during the adolescent period (Collins & Russell, 1991). Laible and Carlo (2004) argue that because of the different relationships that mothers and fathers have with their children, warmth/support and control from mothers and fathers may have different effects on adolescent functioning including academic/school engagement. In other words, because children are typically emotionally closer to their mothers than their fathers, maternal warmth may have a stronger relationship with adolescent academic/school engagement than paternal warmth because it has more meaning and significance for the children (Quach, 2008). In contrast, because fathers typically spend more time performing instrumental activities and providing lessons for their children, paternal pressure may exert a heavier influence on adolescent academic engagement and hence, achievement than maternal pressure (Holmbeck et al., 1995).

Whether these hypothesized relations exist is still unclear, due to the fact that there has been very little research on this area of gender differences in parenting and adolescent functioning, especially within the Eastern Nigerian population. No studies to date have measured gender as it relates to both parental (father and mother) styles and warmth and adolescent (male and female) academic engagement. This study adds to the existing literature on parenting dimensions and adolescent academic engagement by exploring such gender effects.

**EMPIRICAL REVIEW**

Cheng, Dong, and Zhou (1997) studied overall authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles and academic achievement on a group of second grade children in Beijing (N = 304; 143 females; mean age =7.11). The researchers used the Chinese version of Block’s Child Rearing Practices (CRPR) to assess parenting practices including encouragement of independence, punishment, induction, emphasis on achievement, and inhibition of affection. Results revealed that an authoritative style of parenting was positively correlated with children’s academic achievement and an authoritarian style of parenting was negatively correlated with academic achievement. The study by Cheng et al., (1997) suggests that authoritative parenting can have beneficial effects on adolescent academic achievement, but the sample group consisted of young children as oppose to adolescents, and the author’s measure of authoritative parenting did not appear to tap into the permissive dimension of parenting and dimensions of parental warmth and students engagement that are being examined in this study.

Mo and Singh (2008) conducted a study that focused on parents’ relationships and involvement in their children’s lives and the effects on the students’ school engagement and school performance. The study used the Wave I data from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health). The data on seventh and eighth grade students’ school and family experiences were analyzed using structural equation modeling. The study examined the effect of parents’ relationships and involvement on students’ cognitive, emotional, and behavioral engagement in school and subsequently on school performance. The results confirmed the importance and significance of parents’ involvement in middle school students’ school engagement and performance.

The outcome of the study show that Parental aspiration had direct effect on students’ cognitive (β = .25) and emotional engagement (β = .02); parent-child relationship had direct effect on all three student-school engagement constructs (β = .16, .35 and .19 respectively); and parental involvement in school had direct effect on school cognitive engagement (β = .03). Therefore, we could conclude that parents’ involvement had significant effects on students’ school engagement. The direct effects on school performance were not only from all three students’ school engagement constructs, but also from parental aspiration, and parental behavior. The strongest direct effect was from students’ school behavior (β = .28) on school performance. Though there was no significant direct effect from parents-child relationship to school performance, there was significant indirect effect (β = .14). For all effects on the students’ school engagement and performance (Mo & Singh, 2008).

The study further concluded that both parents’ relationship and involvement, and students’ school engagement had significant effects on students’ school performance. Since all path coefficients were positive, highly involved parents would motivate their children to higher engagement in their academic work, and in turn, the students’ engagement in school will lead to higher achievement. This is an important finding and has practical and policy implications for both parents and schools. Parents should realize the importance of their involvement and participation in schooling of their children and stay involved in their children’s daily lives, despite the growing independence of adolescent children (Mo & Singh, 2008).

Tolinski (2015) studied academic engagement and academic achievement among elementary-aged students and examine the role of students’ relationships with teachers and parents in academic engagement. The basic research question examined whether teacher-student relationships and parent-child relationships were related to academic engagement in school.

A hierarchical regression analysis was used to test whether teacher-student relationships and parent-child relationships significantly predicted academic engagement in school. The study explored all four aspects of academic engagement of Behavioral Engagement, Emotional Engagement, Behavioral Disaffection and Emotional Disaffection in separate hierarchical regression analyses. Both parent-child relationship and teacher-student relationship were significantly associated with engagement scores, with their correlation coefficient ranging from .20 to .62. Given a wealth of data supporting the importance of parent-child relationships, the six dimensions of the parent-child relationship (Autonomy, Coercion, Structure, Chaos, Warmth and Rejection) were entered first as predictors. Next, the three dimensions of the teacher-student relationship (Autonomy, Structure and Involvement) were entered as predictors.

The results for Behavioral Engagement indicate that the six dimensions of the parent-child relationship explains approximately 19% of the variance, F (6,255) = 11.09, p<.01. When the three dimensions of the teacher-student relationship were added to the model, it explained an additional 15% of the variance, F (9,252) = 15.38, p<.01, R2 adj = .33. The parent-child variables of Structure (β =.15, p < .01) and Autonomy (β = .20, p < .05) were found to significantly contribute to the model, whereas the teacher-student variable of Involvement (β = .37, p < .01) was the only significant predictor.

For Emotional Engagement, the parent-child relationship explains approximately 14% of the variance, F (6,256) = 7.86, p<.01, while the teacher-student relationship variables explains an additional 27% of the variance, F (9,253) = 20.87, p<.01, R2 adj = .41. In this model, the parent-child variable of Structure (β =.26, p < .01) and the teacher-student variables of Involvement (β =.31, p < .01) and Structure (β =.23, p < .01) were found to significantly contribute to the model.

For Behavioral Disaffection, the parent-child relationship explained approximately 14% of the variance, F (6,256) = 8.10, p<.01, while the teacher-student relationship explained an additional 10% of the variance, F (9,253) = 9.90, p<.01, R2 adj = .23. For this model, only the teacher-student relationship dimension of Involvement (β =.22, p < .05) was found to significantly contribute to the model. No parent-child relational dimensions were reported as statistically significant.

For Emotional Disaffection, the parent-child relationship explained approximately 16% of the variance, F (6,257) = 9.01, p<.01, while the teacher-student relationship variables explained an additional 31% of the variance, F (9,254) = 26.65, p<.01, R2 adj = .47). The teacher-student relationship dimensions of Involvement (β =.32, p < .01) and Autonomy (β =.20, p < .05) were found to significantly contribute to the model. No parent-child dimensions were reported as statistically significant. Based on these results, hypothesis 1 was partially supported, as the teacher-student relationship was found to have a significant contribution to academic engagement.

In a study, Steinberg et al (1992) found that authoritative parenting tends to a better school performance (GPA) and school engagement of adolescents, further they concluded that these parents also influence their children’s through their direct involvement in school activities such as attending parent teacher meetings, helping in homework, and by setting and maintaining high performance standards. In the same vein, Nyarko (2011) found that both mother’s and father’s authoritativeness was positively related to the academic achievement of secondary school students. In another study, Paulson (1994) explored the influence of parenting style (demandingness and responsiveness) on the achievement of early adolescents. Both maternal and paternal demandingness and responsiveness predicted the achievement positively. Desiandes et al (1997) conducted a study with two instruments developed by Steinber et al (1992) and Epstein et al (1993). They concluded that adolescents who perceive their parents as being firm, warmth, and democratic in nature, performed better at secondary school than their peers. This result also conforms the association reported by Kim (2002). In a study, Marchant (2001) reported that parenting styles (demandingness and responsiveness), parental involvement (values and participation in school functioning), and teaching styles (demandingness and responsiveness) factors significantly predicted their children’s school achievement. These findings also confirm the association between supportive environment and academic achievement at early level of adolescence.

**Summary of Literature Review**

Ecological theory of Bronfenbrenner (1979) provides connection between parental warmth and outcome behavior on children and adolescents which includes academic engagement. The theory postulates that a person’s development does not exist in a vacuum but within a specific context, and that there are multiple factors that can have an effect on an individual’s behaviors and attitudes. The four domains of this theory are labeled as the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem (Bronfenbrenner, 1986).

Achievement Motivation proposed by Atkinson and Feather (1966) stated that a person’s achievement oriented behavior is based on three parts: the first part being the individual’s predisposition to achievement, the second part being the probability of success, and third, the individual’s perception of value of the task.

Focusing on engagement at a school level, Fredricks et al (2004), drawing on Bloom (1956), usefully identify three dimensions to student engagement. These three interdependent components or dimensions are behavioral, emotional, and cognitive engagement (Fredricks et al., 2004) and students need to be engaged in all three areas in order to be fully engaged (Lee, 2008).

**Hypotheses**

1. Parent-child relationship (warmth) will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.
2. Responsiveness parenting style will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.
3. Autonomy granting parenting style will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.
4. Demandingness parenting style will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government.

**CHAPTER THREE**

**METHOD**

**Participants**

A total of four hundred and seventy five (475) participants from four randomly selected secondary schools in Enugu East local government of Enugu state (2 single sex schools- St. Patrick College, Emene and Trans-Ekulu Girls Secondary School; and 2 mixed sex schools- Model Ideal College Abakpa and Godfrey Okoye Secondary School, Thinkers’ Corner). The participants (191 Males and 284 Females) were aged between 13 years and 21 years with a mean age of 15.93 years and a standard deviation of 1.22. The study used systematic random sampling method to recruit participants in each of the four strata.

**Instruments**

A structured questionnaire composing of four sections and three instruments were used for data collection with the first section eliciting demographic data from the participants and other sections comprising of the Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II); Parental Warmth Scale and Student Engagement Scale (SES).

**Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II):** Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II) by Darling and Toyokawa (1997) is a 15 item inventory measuring three parenting dimensions- Responsiveness, Autonomy granting and Demandingness. The PSI-II is a self-report measure of students’ attitudes toward their general experiences with their parents. Students were asked to choose on a 5-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2=disagree, 3= I’m in between, 4= agree, and 5= strongly agree) to describe their feelings about their parents’ behaviors that tap various aspects of their general parenting style (acceptance/involvement, strictness/supervision, and psychological autonomy). Higher scores represent stronger agreement towards a given parenting dimension, with the exception of six reverse-scored items (1, 2, 6, 9, 12 and 15). The 15 items are divided equally into three subscales which represent three dimensions of parenting: responsiveness (5 items; e.g., “I can count on my parent(s) to help me out if I have a problem”), demandingness (5 items; e.g., “If I don’t behave myself, my parent(s) will punish me”), and autonomy granting (5 items; e.g., “My parent(s) respects my privacy”). Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of Responsiveness = .74, Autonomy granting = .75 and Demandingness = .72 were obtained for the scales.

**Child Parental Warmth Questionnaire:** Parental Warmth Scale was adapted from Child Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire (PARQ/Control; Rohner 2005a). It consists of 20 items with four response options ranging from “almost never true” to “almost always true”. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficient of the Child Parental Acceptance-Rejection/Control Questionnaire (PARQ/Control) scales ranged between .72 and .96.

**Student Engagement Scale (SES):** This is a 31 item inventory by Doğan (2014). It measures engagement under three dimensions – Emotional (items 1-10), Cognitive (items 11-22) and Behavioral Engagements (items 23-31). The responses ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Scores in items 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 29 were reversed. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability for the SES were obtained as .91 for all the scales, .88 for both emotional and behavioral and .83 for cognitive subscales.

**Procedure**

The secondary schools in Enugu East were written out on pieces of papers, folded and shuffled in an opaque bag in three clusters (A- Male only schools, B- Female only schools and C- mixed sex schools). From each of clusters A and B, one school each was drawn and from cluster C, two schools were drawn; all together, four strata were raised. A total of one hundred and fifty (150) copies of the instrument were administered to systematically randomly selected SS 1 & 2 students of each of the four strata. The students were approached in their class rooms after obtaining permission from the principal and through the guidance of their form teachers. The exercise was clearly explained to them and the researcher and his assistants observed them complete the survey instruments.

Out of the 600 questionnaire administered, a total of 475 (representing 79.2% of the total) made it to the final inclusion based on validity of their response. Those that skipped many items while completing the scales were excluded. It is also important to note that the participants received no monetary reward for participating in the study; the researcher just appreciated the participants in their classes after their completion of the instruments.

**Design/Statistics**

The study is a cross-sectional study using survey research design. Multiple Regression analysis was used to test the hypotheses via the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS v23).

**CHAPTER FOUR**

**RESULT**

The data obtained for this present study were thoroughly cross checked for accuracy. In testing for impact of parenting styles and parent-child relationship (warmth) on academic engagement, the data obtained from the participants were analysed by computing the means, standard deviations and correlations among the variables of study as well as the demographic variables.

**Table 1: Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the study variables**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Variable** | **M** | **SD** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** |
| 1 | **ENGAGEMENT** | 47.01 | 6.99 | \_ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | **GENDER** | 1.59 | .49 | -.03 | \_ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | **AGE** | 15.93 | 1.21 | -.01 | -.13 | \_ |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | **PARENTAL FIGURE** | 1.24 | .52 | -.001 | .16 | .08 | \_ |  |  |  |
| 5 | **RESPONSIVENESS** | 18.11 | 2.86 | .13 | -.15 | -.06 | -.06 | \_ |  |  |
| 6 | **AUTONOMY GRANTING** | 15.71 | 3.28 | .04 | -.07 | -.02 | -.02 | .26 | \_ |  |
| 7 | **DEMANDINGNESS** | 17.80 | 3.54 | .39 | -.17 | -.03 | -.06 | .48 | .22 | \_ |
| 8 | **PARENTAL WARMTH** | 64.89 | 8.08 | .23 | -.02 | -.08 | .02 | .02 | .24 | .35 |

Correlation result indicated that gender (r = -.03, p > .05), age (r = -.01, p > .05) and current parental figure (r = -.001, p > .05) showed insignificant negative relationship with academic engagement and autonomy granting (r = .04, p >.05) showed insignificant positive relationship with academic engagement, while responsiveness (r = .13, p <.01), demandingness (r = .39, p <.001) and parental warmth (r = .23, p <.001) were significantly positively related to academic engagement.

**Table 2: Hierarchical multiple regression predicting academic engagement through the demographic variables (gender and age), parenting styles (as well as dimensions) and parent-child relationship (warmth).**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **R** | **R2** | **R2Δ** | **B** | **Beta(β)** | **t** | **Sig** |
| **Step 1** | .031 | .001 | .001 |  |  |  | .932 |
| Gender |  |  |  | -.396 | -.028 | -.590 | .556 |
| Age |  |  |  | -.105 | -.018 | -.388 | .698 |
| Parental figure |  |  |  | .058 | .004 | .093 | .926 |
| **Step 2** | .394 | .155 | .154*\*\*\** |  |  |  | .000 |
| Responsiveness |  |  |  | -.151 | -.062 | -1.252 | .211 |
| Autonomy granting |  |  |  | -.088 | -.041 | -.931 | .353 |
| Demandingness |  |  |  | .849 | .430*\*\*\** | 8.766 | .000 |
| **Step 3** | .408 | .166 | .011*\** |  |  |  | .013 |
| Parental Warmth |  |  |  | .102 | .117*\** | 2.482 | .013 |

*Note: \*\*\*P< .001; \*P< .05*

Result of Step wise multiple regression analysis showed that the demographic variables entered in step one of the equation accounted for 3.1% variance as a predictor of academic engagement (*R* = .031, *p>* .05) which is statistically non-significant. The three dimensions of parenting style was entered in step two of the equation, and they collectively accounted for 15.4% significant variance in predicting academic engagement (∆*R*2 = .154, *p<*.001). However, among the three dimensions of parenting styles, only demandingness made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement (β = .430, *p<* .001), while other dimensions (responsiveness and autonomy granting) did not make statistically significant contributions in predicting academic engagement. Parent-child relationship (warmth) was entered in step three of the equation, and it accounted for 1.1% (statistically significant) variance in predicting academic engagement (∆*R*2 = .011, *p<*.05) and made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement (β = .117, *p<* .05).

**Summary of Finding**

1. Correlation result indicated that responsiveness, demandingness and parental warmth were significantly positively related to academic engagement gender, while age and current parental figure showed insignificant negative relationship with academic engagement and autonomy granting showed insignificant positive relationship with academic engagement.
2. Among the three dimensions of parenting styles, only demandingness made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement, while other dimensions (responsiveness and autonomy granting) did not make statistically significant contributions in predicting academic engagement.
3. Parent-child relationship (warmth) made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement.
4. None of the demographic variables made statistically significant contribution in predicting academic engagement.

**CHAPTER FIVE**

**DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS**

This study examined influence of parenting styles and parent-child relationship (warmth) on academic engagement among adolescents in Enugu East local government area of Enugu state.

The first hypothesis tested in the study stated that Parent-child relationship (warmth) will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government. The result of this study does not support the null hypothesis since parent-child relationship (warmth) made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement. Parents in good relationship with their adolescent children would lead to a positive engagement in school work. This result is in line with the findings of Mo and Singh (2008) that parent-child relationship have direct effect on all the dimensions of student engagement. It is also in line with the findings of Tolinski (2015) that both parent-child relationship and teacher-student relationship were significantly associated with engagement scores.

The second hypothesis tested in the study stated that responsiveness parenting style will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government. The result of this study support the null hypothesis because responsiveness did not make statistically significant contribution in predicting academic engagement. Meanwhile, the result contradicts the findings of Marchant (2001) and Paulson (1994) that both maternal and paternal responsiveness predicted the achievement positively.

The third hypothesis tested in the study stated that autonomy granting parenting style will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government. The result of this study support the null hypothesis for the reason that autonomy did not make statistically significant contribution in predicting academic engagement.

The fourth hypothesis tested in the study stated that demandingness parenting style will not significantly predict academic engagement of adolescent students in secondary schools in Enugu East Local Government. The result of this study does not support the null hypothesis since demandingness made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement. The outcome of this study is no doubt in support of the description of demandingness parenting style given its characteristic behavioral supervision/strictness which when played out on the adolescent, a lot engagement will result. This is in line with the findings of Marchant (2001) and Paulson (1994) that both maternal and paternal demandingness predicted the achievement positively.

**Implications of Findings**

The present findings have some implications. The findings on demandingness imply that parents and caregivers that exhibit characteristics of a demanding parent (supervision, strictness, close watch and expectant) on the child to help achieve in them good level of engagement in their studies.

The findings on parent-child relationship (warmth) is useful for guidance counsellors and school psychologists in advising parents and caregivers of adolescent students.

**Limitations of the Study**

This study was not without a limitation. The sample size for the study was limited. Another limitation is in the method adopted for the study. Use of qualitative methods based on surveys may seem inadequate to reveal people’s thoughts and preferences. A qualitative method which would have allowed for interactions with the participants would have done a lot on this.

Also, most of the participants were from Igbo origin with very few others from other tribes which suggests a sample that is homogeneous in its characteristics.

**Suggestions for Further Study**

The following suggestions are made for further study. Researchers interested in academic engagement should replicate this study using participants from more than one city, state and/or region and increase the number of participants for the study. The places covered can be extended to other cultures and places. The same study can be carried out checking which specific parent’s parenting style predicts academic engagement among adolescents.

Studies may also be carried out checking differences between day students and boarding students on the same variables.

**Summary and Conclusion**

This study examined influence of parenting styles and parent-child relationship (warmth) on academic engagement among adolescents in Enugu East local government area of Enugu state using 475 participants from four randomly selected secondary schools in Enugu East local government of Enugu state (2 single sex schools- St. Patrick College, Emene and Trans-Ekulu Girls Secondary School; and 2 mixed sex schools- Model Ideal College Abakpa and Godfrey Okoye Secondary School, Thinkers’ Corner). Parenting Style Inventory II (PSI-II); Parental Warmth Scale and Student Engagement Scale (SES) were used to collect data for the study.

The result of this study reveal that responsiveness, demandingness and parental warmth were significantly positively related to academic engagement gender, while age and current parental figure showed insignificant negative relationship with academic engagement and autonomy granting showed insignificant positive relationship with academic engagement.

Among the three dimensions of parenting styles, only demandingness made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement, while other dimensions (responsiveness and autonomy granting) did not make statistically significant contributions in predicting academic engagement. Parent-child relationship (warmth) made a statistically significant positive contribution in predicting academic engagement.
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**APPENDIX** **A**

Department of Sociology/Psychology

Godfrey Okoye University,

Enugu.

**Dear Respondent,**

I am a student of the above mentioned Department/Institution. I am carrying out a project work which is part of the requirements for the award of Bachelor of Science (B.Sc) in Psychology. It is purely an academic exercise. Please kindly respond to the questionnaire as **honestly** as possible. There is no right or wrong answer. All responses are confidential.

Thank you for your involvement.

Yours sincerely,

**ABOH, John**

**SECTION A**

**INSTRUCTION**: Please tick the appropriate box or fill in the blank spaces as appropriate.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GENDER:** | **Male** |  | | **Female** | |  | | **AGE (How old are you?)** | | | | | |  |
| **Who are you living with?** | | | | | **Biological parents** | | | |  | **A Relation** |  | | **Other than relation** | | | |  |
| **PARENTS’ OCCUPATION:** | | | **FATHER/FATHER**  **FIGURE** | | | |  | | | | | **MOTHER/MOTHER FIGURE** | | | |  | | |

**SECTION B**

**INSTRUCTION**: Given below are statements to know how your mother/father deals with you. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these statements about your parents (father and mother)? Tick √ Mark against each statement, on the left side about mother and on the right side about father, on the option that suites the behaviour of your mother or father in relation to you. Take care to mark your responses against all statements.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The response options are:  **1 = Strongly disagree**  **2 = Disagree** | | | | | | **3 = I’m in between**  **4 = Agree**  **5 = Strongly agree** |
| **MOTHER** | | | | | **My parent is someone that:** | | **FATHER** | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Doesn’t really like me to tell him/her my troubles. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Hardly ever praises me for doing well. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. I can count on to help me out if I have a problem. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Spends time just talking to me. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. I do things that are fun together. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Tells me that his/her ideas are correct and that I shouldn’t question them. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Respects my privacy. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Gives me a lot of freedom. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Makes most of the decisions about what I can do. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Believes I have a right to my own point of view. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Really expects me to follow family rules. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Really lets me get away with things. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. If I don’t behave myself, will punish me. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Points out ways I could do better. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. When I do something wrong, does not punish me. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**SECTION B**

**INSTRUCTION**: Here are some statements about the way mothers and fathers act toward their children. I want you to think about how each one of these fits the way your mother or father treats you. Remember, there is no right or wrong answer to any statement, so be as honest as you can. Answer each statement the way you feel your mother or father really is rather than the way you might like her/him to be. The responses are as follow:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **1 = Almost never true**  **2 = Rarely true** | | | | | | **3 = Sometimes true**  **4 = Almost Always true** | | |
| **MOTHER** | | | | | **My parent** | | **FATHER** | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Says nice things about me. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Talks to me about our plans and listens to what I have to say. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Encourages me to bring my friends home and tries to make things pleasant for me | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Makes it easy for me to tell her/him things that are important. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Makes me feel proud when I do well. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Praises me to others. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Talks to me in a warm and loving way. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Says nice things to me when I deserve them. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Is really interested in what I do. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Makes me feel wanted and needed. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Tells me how proud she/he is of me when I am good. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Makes me feel what I do is important. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Tries to help me when I am scared or upset. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Cares about what I think and likes me to talk about it. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Lets me do things I think are important, even if it is inconvenient for her/him. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Is interested in the things I do | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Tries to make me feel better when I am hurt or sick. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Lets me know she/he loves me. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Treats me gently and with kindness. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 1. Tries to make me happy. | | 1 | 2 | | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**SECTION C**

**INSTRUCTION**: The statements describe some of your experiences, feelings and behaviors in school and concerning school and your studies. How much do you agree or disagree with each of these sentences about your life in school and as a student? Tick √ Mark against each statement (on the right side) on the option that suitably describes you. Take care to mark your responses against all statements.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| The response options are:  **1 = Strongly disagree**  **2 = Disagree** | **3 = Not Sure**  **4 = Agree**  **5 = Strongly agree** |
|  | | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. Teachers in my school are honest with their students. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I like the teachers in my school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. Principals in my school are fair with regard to discipline. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. My teachers care about me. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. My teachers are good at their job. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. My teachers understand me. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. My teachers help me whenever I need. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I feel I am a member of my school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I recommend other students to come to my school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I believe I’m receiving a good education in my school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I spend a lot of time on my studies and homework. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I give all my attention to the lesson in the class. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I do my homework (work about the school) on time. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I work as hard as I can at my lessons. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I do my best in class. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I don’t give up trying even when the lessons are hard. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I believe I do my best to learn in class. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I try my best when working on my lessons. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I usually plan before doing my homework. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I work on my lessons even when there are no upcoming exams. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I share the knowledge I learned at school with other people. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I check mistakes in my homework. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I often get into trouble in school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I often get into fights in school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I am usually sent to the disciplinary board because of my behavior. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I play truant from school every chance I get. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I am usually late for school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I have considered dropping out of school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I pretend to be working during the class. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I’m going to graduate from my school. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 1. I want to attend university. | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

**Thanks for your time and for participating in this study.**

**APPENDIX B**

**Frequencies**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Statistics** | | | |
|  | | GENDER | AGE |
| N | Valid | 475 | 465 |
| Missing | 0 | 10 |
| Mean | | 1.5979 | 15.9290 |
| Std. Deviation | | .49084 | 1.22356 |
| Minimum | | 1.00 | 13.00 |
| Maximum | | 2.00 | 21.00 |

**Frequency Table**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **GENDER** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | MALE | 191 | 40.2 | 40.2 | 40.2 |
| FEMALE | 284 | 59.8 | 59.8 | 100.0 |
| Total | 475 | 100.0 | 100.0 |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **AGE** | | | | | |
|  | | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
| Valid | 13.00 | 4 | .8 | .9 | .9 |
| 14.00 | 53 | 11.2 | 11.4 | 12.3 |
| 15.00 | 117 | 24.6 | 25.2 | 37.4 |
| 16.00 | 139 | 29.3 | 29.9 | 67.3 |
| 17.00 | 113 | 23.8 | 24.3 | 91.6 |
| 18.00 | 31 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 98.3 |
| 19.00 | 6 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 99.6 |
| 20.00 | 1 | .2 | .2 | 99.8 |
| 21.00 | 1 | .2 | .2 | 100.0 |
| Total | 465 | 97.9 | 100.0 |  |
| Missing | System | 10 | 2.1 |  |  |
| Total | | 475 | 100.0 |  |  |

**Regression**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Descriptive Statistics** | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | Mean | | | Std. Deviation | | | N | |
| COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT | | 47.0147 | | | 6.98988 | | | 475 | |
| GENDER | | 1.5979 | | | .49084 | | | 475 | |
| AGE | | 15.9290 | | | 1.21059 | | | 475 | |
| PARENTAL FIGURE | | 1.2406 | | | .52122 | | | 475 | |
| RESPONSIVENESS | | 18.1147 | | | 2.86290 | | | 475 | |
| AUTONOMY GRANTING | | 15.7074 | | | 3.28332 | | | 475 | |
| DEMANDINGNESS | | 17.8000 | | | 3.53896 | | | 475 | |
| PARENTAL WARMTH | | 64.8853 | | | 8.07957 | | | 475 | |
| **Correlations** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT | GENDER | | AGE | PARENTAL FIGURE | | RESPONSIVENESS | | AUTONOMY GRANTING | DEMANDINGNESS | PARENTAL WARMTH |
| Pearson Correlation | | COG. ENGAGEMENT | | 1.000 | -.025 | | -.014 | .127 | | .036 | | .385 | .127 | .234 |
| GENDER | | -.025 | 1.000 | | -.133 | -.146 | | -.073 | | -.173 | -.146 | -.016 |
| AGE | | -.014 | -.133 | | 1.000 | -.064 | | -.017 | | -.031 | -.064 | -.084 |
| PARENT FIG. | | -.001 | .161 | | .075 | -.064 | | -.017 | | -.055 | -.064 | .023 |
| RESPONSIVENESS | | .127 | -.146 | | -.064 | 1.000 | | .255 | | .478 | 1.000 | .020 |
| AUTON GRANTING | | .036 | -.073 | | -.017 | .255 | | 1.000 | | .222 | .255 | .244 |
| DEMANDINGNESS | | .385 | -.173 | | -.031 | .478 | | .222 | | 1.000 | .478 | .352 |
| PARENT WARMTH | | .234 | -.016 | | -.084 | .020 | | .244 | | .352 | .020 | 1.000 |
| Sig. (1-tailed) | | COG. ENGAGEMENT | | . | .296 | | .380 | .003 | | .219 | | .000 | .003 | .000 |
| GENDER | | .296 | . | | .002 | .001 | | .057 | | .000 | .001 | .363 |
| AGE | | .380 | .002 | | . | .081 | | .358 | | .249 | .081 | .034 |
| PARENT FIG. | | .487 | .000 | | .052 | .083 | | .356 | | .114 | .083 | .306 |
| RESPONSIVENESS | | .003 | .001 | | .081 | . | | .000 | | .000 | . | .329 |
| AUTON GRANTING | | .219 | .057 | | .358 | .000 | | . | | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| DEMANDINGNESS | | .000 | .000 | | .249 | .000 | | .000 | | . | .000 | .000 |
| PARENT WARMTH | | .000 | .363 | | .034 | .329 | | .000 | | .000 | .329 | . |
| N | | COG. ENGAGEMENT | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |
| GENDER | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |
| AGE | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |
| PARENT FIG. | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |
| RESPONSIVENESS | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |
| AUTON GRANTING | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |
| DEMANDINGNESS | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |
| PARENT WARMTH | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | 475 | | 475 | | 475 | 475 | 475 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables Entered/Removeda** | | | | | |
| Model | | Variables Entered | | Variables Removed | Method |
| 1 | | PARENTAL FIGURE, AGE, GENDERb | | . | Enter |
| 2 | | AUTONOMY GRANTING, DEMANDINGNESS, RESPONSIVENESSb | | . | Enter |
| 3 | | PARENTAL WARMTHb | | . | Enter |
| a. Dependent Variable: COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT | |
| b. All requested variables entered. | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Model Summary** | | | | | | | | | |
| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate | Change Statistics | | | Change Statistics | |
| R Square Change | F Change | df1 | df2 | Sig. F Change |
| 1 | .031a | .001 | -.005 | 7.00882 | .001 | .147 | 3 | 471 | .932 |
| 2 | .394b | .155 | .144 | 6.46608 | .154 | 28.462 | 3 | 468 | .000 |
| 3 | .408c | .166 | .154 | 6.43073 | .011 | 6.160 | 1 | 467 | .013 |
| a. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Figure, Age, Gender | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Figure, Age, Gender, Autonomy Granting, Demandingness, Responsiveness | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Figure, Age, Gender, Autonomy Granting, Demandingness, Responsiveness, Parental Warmth | | | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **ANOVAa** | | | | | | | |
| Model | | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
| 1 | | Regression | 21.684 | 3 | 7.228 | .147 | .932b |
| Residual | 23137.213 | 471 | 49.124 |  |  |
| Total | 23158.897 | 474 |  |  |  |
| 2 | | Regression | 3591.721 | 6 | 598.620 | 14.318 | .000c |
| Residual | 19567.176 | 468 | 41.810 |  |  |
| Total | 23158.897 | 474 |  |  |  |
| 3 | | Regression | 3846.445 | 7 | 549.492 | 13.287 | .000d |
| Residual | 19312.451 | 467 | 41.354 |  |  |
| Total | 23158.897 | 474 |  |  |  |
| A. Dependent Variable: Cognitive Engagement | | | | | | | |
| B. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Figure, Age, Gender | | | | | | | |
| C. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Figure, Age, Gender, Autonomy Granting, Demandingness, Responsiveness | | | | | | | |
| D. Predictors: (Constant), Parental Figure, Age, Gender, Autonomy Granting, Demandingness, Responsiveness, Parental Warmth | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Coefficientsa** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | | | Standardized Coefficients | | | t | Sig. | |
| B | | Std. Error | | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 49.241 | | 4.551 | |  | | | 10.819 | .000 | |
| GENDER | -.396 | | .672 | | -.028 | | | -.590 | .556 | |
| AGE | -.105 | | .270 | | -.018 | | | -.388 | .698 | |
| PARENTAL FIGURE | .058 | | .629 | | .004 | | | .093 | .926 | |
| 2 | (Constant) | 35.150 | | 5.014 | |  | | | 7.011 | .000 | |
| GENDER | .504 | | .631 | | .035 | | | .798 | .425 | |
| AGE | -.009 | | .250 | | -.002 | | | -.037 | .971 | |
| PARENTAL FIGURE | .162 | | .581 | | .012 | | | .280 | .780 | |
| RESPONSIVENESS | -.151 | | .120 | | -.062 | | | -1.252 | .211 | |
| AUTONOMY GRANTING | -.088 | | .094 | | -.041 | | | -.931 | .353 | |
| DEMANDINGNESS | .849 | | .097 | | .430 | | | 8.766 | .000 | |
| 3 | (Constant) | 29.146 | | 5.542 | |  | | | 5.259 | .000 | |
| GENDER | .470 | | .628 | | .033 | | | .748 | .455 | |
| AGE | .047 | | .249 | | .008 | | | .188 | .851 | |
| PARENTAL FIGURE | .102 | | .578 | | .008 | | | .177 | .860 | |
| RESPONSIVENESS | -.084 | | .123 | | -.034 | | | -.682 | .496 | |
| AUTONOMY GRANTING | -.140 | | .096 | | -.066 | | | -1.461 | .145 | |
| DEMANDINGNESS | .752 | | .104 | | .381 | | | 7.224 | .000 | |
| PARENTAL WARMTH | .102 | | .041 | | .117 | | | 2.482 | .013 | |
| a. Dependent Variable: COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Excluded Variablesa** | | | | | | | | | | |
| Model | | Beta In | t | | Sig. | | Partial Correlation | Collinearity Statistics | | |
| Tolerance | | |
| 1 | RESPONSIVENESS | .126b | 2.714 | | .007 | | .124 | .971 | | |
| AUTONOMY GRANTING | .034b | .729 | | .467 | | .034 | .994 | | |
| DEMANDINGNESS | .392b | 9.072 | | .000 | | .386 | .967 | | |
| PARENTAL WARMTH | .234b | 5.189 | | .000 | | .233 | .991 | | |
| 2 | PARENTAL WARMTH | .117c | 2.482 | | .013 | | .114 | .798 | | |
| a. Dependent Variable: COGNITIVE ENGAGEMENT | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), PARENTAL FIGURE, AGE, GENDER | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Predictors in the Model: (Constant), Parental Figure, Age, Gender, Autonomy Granting, Demandingness, Responsiveness | | | | | | | | | | |