

## Perceived Parenting styles and childhood Behaviour as Predictors of Aggressive Behaviour Among Undergraduate Students

Ugwu, Chika Gloria<sup>1</sup>; Chikwendu, Chimezie Emmanuel<sup>1</sup>; Douglas, John Ufuoma<sup>1</sup>;  
Agu, Laurine Chikamneto<sup>1</sup>

Enugu State University of Science and Technology<sup>1</sup>, Corresponding Author:  
douglasufuoma@gmail.com

DOI:10.56201/jhsp.vol.11.no2.2025.pg122.136

---

### Abstract

*The study investigated perceived parenting styles and childhood behavior as predictors of aggressive behavior among undergraduate students, with one hundred and ninety-seven (197) undergraduate students that comprises of 124 females and 73 males with age range of 17-25 a mean age of 20.65 and S. D of 2.147 were drawn as participants using multi-stage (cluster, simple: balloting and purposive) sampling techniques from Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT). Baumrid (1971) Parental care scale, Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire (Felitti et al, 1998) and Aggressive Behaviour Scale (Orpinas, 2001) were used for data collections, correlational design was used, the statistical test that was used for data analysis is multiple hierarchical regression using SPSS version 27. The findings revealed that parenting styles (authoritarian  $St\beta = -.077$ ,  $t = -.482$ , permissive  $St\beta = .081$ ,  $t = .477$ , authoritative  $St\beta = -.147$ ,  $t = -.867$  at  $p < .05$ ) failed to predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students. Childhood trauma  $St\beta = .122$ ,  $t = .730$  at  $p < .05$  failed to predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate. The predictor variables at  $r = .197$  are not related to aggressive behaviour, they contributed 3.9% variation to aggressive behaviour at  $r^2 = .039$ , and childhood trauma and parenting styles jointly failed to predict aggressive behaviour. Hence, clinicians should try and help student to be able to get positive cognitive process. Parents should try and help students to be open minded and be positive in their thought.*

---

### Introduction

Aggressive behaviour in students is a phenomenon that is often found in schools that has a negative impact (Yuliyanto & Astuti, 2023). These include violations of school rules, social norms, religion, or the law (Mayasari et al., 2019). Therefore, aggressive behaviour is considered disturbing and disturbing comfort at school, so learning objectives are not optimally achieved. Hence the need to investigate factors that can contribute or facilitate aggressive behaviour, which prompt the study on parenting styles and childhood trauma as predictors of aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students.

Aggressive behaviour is an outburst of anger because someone has failed (Kartono, 2019). People who behave aggressively will react very primitively in the form of intense anger and explosive

emotions. The actions can be tyrannical, sadistic, and killing people. This will greatly interfere with one's concentration power. If it happens to students, aggressive behaviour has a major impact on academic achievement, namely in the form of a decrease in achievement and learning outcomes (Kashif et al., 2022). Aggressive behaviour is a life force and energy that can be constructive but can also destroy. Students with negative aggressive behaviour often show stubbornness in getting what they want (Duru et al., 2015). The way of playing is rough, haphazard, screaming while being chased, also used to swearing, and using harsh words. The attitude of parents who are too pampering and overprotective can lead to aggressive behaviour in children (Salmin et al., 2021).

On the other hand, parents who are too powerful, like to give corporal punishment or even refuse the presence of children, also create their vulnerabilities. Aggressiveness can also arise due to the lack of success of parents in providing understanding to children about which attitudes and behaviours are good and which behaviour cannot be justified. Children look very aggressive when faced with "restraints" especially from parents or their environmental system. This is done to master the situation, overcome obstacles or obstacles or damage an object (Gunarsa et al., 1978; Yuliyanto & Astuti, 2023).

Aggressive behaviour is usually channelled through actions or behaviour. However, if the behaviour is prevented, then aggressiveness will appear verbally, such as by cursing, swearing (misuh), or other dirty words. There are two reasons underlying aggressive behaviour in children. First, it is done to attack or fight other people. Usually characterized by anger or a desire to hurt others. Second, aggressive behaviour is carried out as an attitude of self-defence against attacks from outside. Including in this case something that makes him uncomfortable or failure after doing something. Experiences in the family that are destructive, such as rejection due to parents not getting along, not giving good guidance and examples, and being indifferent to children, are also factors that cause aggressive behaviour (Supratiknya et al., 1995; Yuliyanto & Astuti, 2023). This condition greatly affects the development of children's socialization. As a result, children often violate the norms around them, both at home, at school, and in the community. Aggressive behaviour makes many parties concerned, from parents, teachers, and community leaders. Therefore, aggressive students need to get serious attention so that their attitudes and personality can develop better (Mundia, 2006). All efforts to recognize, identify and explore aggressive student behaviour are important, as one of the real efforts to deal with aggressive behaviour in schools. Thus, it is hoped that it will be able to reduce or eliminate the problem of deviations from norms and school rules that are even more severe. Preventively, these efforts are carried out to prevent the emergence of aggressive behaviour in students from an early age (Bastian et al., 2018). To lead efforts to overcome aggressive behaviour, it is necessary to conduct an in-depth study of the case of aggressive students. The study includes the identification of cases, causes of aggressive behaviour, and possible efforts to overcome them. Therefore, case study research is considered appropriate in examining this problem.

According to the Centre for kid Trauma Assessment, Services and Interventions (2024), a childhood trauma is any traumatic event that a kid experiences and is typically violent, dangerous, or life-threatening. Numerous diverse events can result in trauma; these are also occasionally

referred to as adverse childhood experiences, or ACEs. Sadly, it happens far too often. According to The National Evaluation of the Children Mental Health Initiative (2016), trauma affects 46% of children at some point in their early lives. Even though they are strong, children are not infallible. One common statement made by adults is. They won't even remember it as an adult because they were so young when that happened. It is imperative to acknowledge, therefore, that childhood trauma may have enduring consequences (Forkey et al., 2021). Children learn how safe or unsafe the environment is by their experiences, which helps shape their developing brains. Children must learn how to defend themselves against things they see as dangerous, since this helps to build their personalities as adults.

Children can experience trauma from things like physical or sexual abuse. Children may also have psychological effects from isolated incidents such as vehicle accidents, natural disasters (such as hurricanes), the death of a loved one, or serious medical problems. Even though it may seem like ordinary stress to an adult, chronic stressors like being bullied or living in a risky neighbourhood can be traumatizing for a child (De Bellis & Zisk, 2014). Experiences that are not even directly experienced by the child might nonetheless cause childhood trauma. For example, seeing a loved one suffer from a serious illness can be very stressful for kids. This effect can also be attributed to violent media (Council on Communications and Media, 2016). An event does not automatically qualify as traumatic just because it is upsetting. For instance, although it's not always traumatizing, parental divorce will probably have an impact on the child (Brand et al., 2019). For this reason, it's critical to identify the moments when a youngster may require expert assistance in order to process their trauma. Additionally, early intervention can stop the traumas after effects from continuing into adulthood (Kassam-Adams, 2014).

Following a stressful experience, up to 15% of girls and 6% of boys acquire post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) (U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, 2022). PTSD-affected children may repeatedly relive the trauma in their minds. In addition, they might pretend to act out the experience or shun anything that brings up memories of it. Children can think that they were blind to the warning signals that foresaw the tragic event. They develop hyper vigilance, searching for clues that something negative is about to occur again, in an attempt to avert traumas in the future (Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (US) 2014).

The effects of childhood trauma can occasionally be felt in areas other than relationships and one's physical or mental health. According to some research, for example, having a difficult childhood increases the likelihood that, by the time one is 35 years old, one will have committed crimes, usually violent and significant ones (Fox et al., 2015). According to The National Child Traumatic Stress Network (2019), other effects may include: Having stronger reactions and being more quickly agitated, committing high-risk behaviours (driving fast or having sex when not at ease), unwillingness to prepare or plan ahead, Lack of impulse control, low self-esteem, and an increased risk of self-harm Having trouble reasoning or solving problems, According to the American Academy of Pediatrics (2014), children who have experienced traumatic incidents may also find it more difficult to parent their children in the future. The parent-child bond and the general

development of children and adolescents are both impacted by parenting (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Arora, 2023).

The term perception of parenting style describes how adults view their parents' methods of raising their children, which presents a certain image of them. Demandingness and responsiveness are the two basic dimensions that have been used to conceptualize parenting styles (Hughes et al., 2005; Arora, 2023). Although there have been several attempts in the past to conceptualize parenting styles, the most often used approach is Baumrind's differentiation of styles based on control degree (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Crittenden, Dallos, Landini & Kozłowska, 2014; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Therefore, parenting styles are seen as a compromise between the parents' degree of responsiveness to the kid and their degree of control (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Crittenden, Dallos, Landini & Kozłowska, 2014; Darling & Steinberg, 1993). A parent's style encompasses not only their actions toward their child but also their attitude during those actions, which shapes the environment in which the child is raised (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Crittenden, Dallos, Landini & Kozłowska, 2014; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Soňa, 2017).

Baumrind was able to measure parent and child behaviour independently as well as the bi-directionality issue, which allowed her to operationalize parenting styles on an individual basis—even though a child's attitude also affects the relationship between the child and parent (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Soňa, 2017). Parenting styles are classified as authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and neglectful based on this paradigm (Baumrind, 1971, 1991; Soňa, 2017).

A parent can be greatly influenced by their child, though, and this could prevent them from responding rationally. It is not necessary to exhibit flawless behaviour in order to support an authoritative parenting style. According to Baumrind (1971, 1991; Howe, 2011; Soňa, 2017), an authoritative parent need only be good enough to create a secure attachment and a healthy internal working model. This is because bringing up a child in this way creates goal-corrected partnerships (Howe, 2011; Soňa, 2017), in which the mother and child collaborate and discuss while understanding each other's needs. It's a process of learning where each person's needs are taught to be met within the parameters of the other person (Howe, 2011; Soňa, 2017).

Youngsters reared by parents in charge create a blended atmosphere of freedom and rules (Baumrind, 1966; Soňa, 2017). In the interactions between a mother and her child, communication is vital. Since she encourages the kid to inquire and examine what is being introduced, an authoritative mother does not need to express her opinions clearly (Baumrind, 1966; Soňa, 2017).

Parental authority figures rationalize their behaviour and allow their children to assume responsibility within reasonable limits (Baumrind, 1966; Soňa, 2017). This democratic home is not based on the need to punish children severely or to regulate the behaviour of others. Love and affection is displayed even in negative situations as love and display of affection is not under the condition of discipline and conformity. The authoritative parenting style requires discipline; nonetheless it is enforced in a tolerant manner (Baumrind, 1966; Soňa, 2017). Therefore the authoritative parenting style can be viewed as a balance of the permissive and authoritarian parenting style.

The three parenting styles have one issue in common, encouraging or controlling a child's autonomy. Children approach achievement positively when their parents encourage them to explore their surroundings, make mistakes and learn from them constructively, take progressive control over their actions, and let them solve problems within their reach (Pomerantz, Grolnick, & Price, 2005; Soňa, 2017). However, kids who are constantly being watched over by so-called "helicopter parents" find it difficult to work on their own and, if they do, are frequently viewed with suspicion. Because the children's lives are so regimented, they rarely have the opportunity to exercise complete control over their behaviour, which can lead to a restriction of their capacity to solve problems (Pomerantz, Grolnick, & Price, 2005; Soňa, 2017). This shapes a child's self-perception and continues to impact their self-worth throughout their adult life (Pomerantz, Grolnick, & Price, 2005; Soňa, 2017). It is necessary to look into parenting styles as potential predictors of social anxiety in undergraduates because the research currently available tends to indicate that parenting is a significant factor in the development of socially maladaptive behaviour.

Social behaviour theory by Bandura (1971) is adopted as theoretical framework because it proposes that new behaviours can be acquired by observing and imitating others, it states that learning is a cognitive process that takes place in a social context and can occur purely through observation or direct instruction, even in the absence of motor reproduction or direct reinforcement (Bandura, 1963). In addition to the observation of behaviour, learning also occurs through the observation of rewards and punishments, a process known as vicarious reinforcement. When a particular behaviour is rewarded regularly, it will most likely persist; conversely, if a particular behaviour is constantly punished, it will most likely desist (Renzetti et al., 2012). The theory expands on traditional behavioural theories, in which behaviour is governed solely by reinforcements, by placing emphasis on the important roles of various internal processes in the learning individual (Bandura, 1971). This means that the students can enquire aggressive behaviour from others even when they give best home training, or have not experience past traumatic experience during their childhood.

Hence these hypotheses were tested:

Parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian and permissiveness) will independently and jointly predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate

Childhood trauma will significantly predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students

Parenting styles and childhood trauma will jointly predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students

## **Method**

### **Participants**

One hundred and ninety-seven (197) undergraduate students that comprises of 124 females and 73 males with age range of 17-25 a mean age of 20.65 and S. D of 2.147 were drawn as participants using multi-stage (cluster, simple: balloting and purposive) sampling techniques from Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT). The students were clustered according to their faculties, simple random by balloting was used to pick five faculties, while purpose sampling technique which is criteria based selecting techniques to draw the participants from the following

faculties: forty-two from Applied natural sciences (43), thirty-nine from Education (39), forty-three from management sciences (43), thirty-eight from law (38) and thirty-four from environmental sciences (34). **Inclusive criterion: undergraduate students from the selected faculties. Exclusive criterion: none undergraduate and students outside the selected faculties.**

### **Instrument**

Three sets of instruments were used for the study; namely

- Baumrid (1971) Parental care scale
- Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire (Felitti et al, 1998)
- Aggressive Behaviour Scale (Orpinas, 2001)

#### **Baumrid (1971) Parental care scale**

Parental care scale (PCS); the 20-item instrument designed to measure styles of parenting .YES or NO response is expected from each statement in the questionnaire. The statement were categorized into 3 groups of parenting styles (Authoritarian style, permissive style and authoritative style), and each participant gets scores in all the styles of parenting and the style with the highest score becomes dominant. The scale was administered individually after establishing adequate rapport with the participant. Baumrid (1970) provided the original psychometric properties for American samples while Tumasi & Ankrah (2002) provided the properties for African samples .The norms are as follows; males authoritarian style=7.87,permissive style= 13.57, and Authoritative style= 7.40, female authoritarian style 7.72, permissive style =12.82 and authoritative authoritative= 7.48, and male and female are authoritative style =7.80 ,permissive style=7.44.Baumrid (1971) reported an interval consistency alpha coefficient of .86 on the reliability while omoluabi (2002) obtained ac concurrent validity coefficient of .73 by correlating FCS and IFR (Hufson;1982).The norms scores were the basis for interpretation of the score of the participants, the scores higher than the norms indicates the dominance of the particular parenting style.

#### **Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaire (Felitti et al, 1998)**

The Adverse Childhood Experiences Questionnaires is a 10-item measure used to measure childhood trauma. It was developed by Felitti et al., in 1998. The questionnaire assesses the subject's recall of 10 types of childhood exposure to trauma such as psychological, physical, and sexual abuse as well as household dysfunction including domestic violence, substance abuse, and incarceration before the age of 18 years.

Five are personal: physical abuse, verbal abuse, sexual abuse, physical neglect, and emotional neglect. Five are related to other family members: a parent who's an alcoholic, a mother who's a victim of domestic violence, a family member in jail, a family member diagnosed with a mental illness, and the disappearance of a parent through divorce, death, or abandonment.

The questionnaire is a dichotomous one in which affirmative answers are scored as 1. The adverse childhood experience score is determined by adding up all the points. An adverse childhood experience score of 0 suggests that the person reported no exposure to childhood trauma while an adverse childhood experience score of 10 suggests that the person reported exposure to childhood trauma. Examples of the items include; "Did a parent or other adult in the household

often or very often push, grab, slap, or throw something at you or ever hit you so hard that you had marks or were injured?” and “Did you live with anyone who was a problem drinker or alcoholic or who used street drugs?” However, the score only reflects the respondents' exposure number and not the severity of the exposure. It has a reliability coefficient (Cronbach alpha) of .88 and a good test-retest reliability.

### **Aggressive Behaviour Scale (Orpinas, 2001)**

The scale consists of 11 items designed to measure self-reported aggressive behaviours among middle school students (sixth, seventh, and eighth graders). The scale measures behaviours that might result in psychological or physical injury to other students.

Construct validity. The relation between self-reported aggression, measured by the Aggression Scale, and other self-reported measures and predictors of aggression were analysed. Univariate analysis of variance showed a positive relation between the mean score in the Aggression Scale and the number of injuries due to fights,  $F(3, 245) = 14.1$ , and the number of days students carried a weapon,  $F(3, 248) = 16.1$ . Mean aggression scores also increased as the number of days students reported drinking alcohol increased,  $F(3, 248) = 16.1$ , parental monitoring decreased,  $F(4, 244) = 6.0$ , and academic achievement decreased,  $F(3, 244) = 7.1$  (see Table 1). All these relations were statistically significant ( $p < .0001$ ). The mean score on the Aggression Scale was significantly higher among boys ( $X = 19.3$ ,  $SD = 15.5$ ) than among girls ( $X = 13.2$ ,  $SD = 12.9$ ),  $F(1, 251) = 11.7$ ,  $p = .0007$ .

Internal consistency. The internal consistency scores, estimated with Cronbach's alpha coefficient, were high (.87 for the total sample, .88 for boys, .87 for girls, .86 for Hispanic students, .85 for African American students, and .92 for Caucasian students). The item-deleted estimates for alpha coefficients for the total sample ranged from .85 through .87.

### **Procedures**

Undergraduate students were drawn as participants from five faculties in Enugu State University of Science and Technology (ESUT) using multi-stage sampling (cluster, simple random: by balloting, and purposive) techniques for this study. The students were clustered according to their faculties, simple random: balloting was used to pick the faculties while purposive sampling techniques were used to draw the students from selected faculties. The researchers employed the research assistants who are faculty executives from the selected faculties to help distribute and retrieve the instrument Two hundred and eleven questionnaires were sent out, and two hundred and five were returned. Among the returning ones, five bear multiple initials and the other three were not properly responded to, which makes the numbers properly responded to be one hundred and ninety-seven, which were used for data analysis.

### **Design and Statistics**

The design for this study is correlation research design as the level of interaction between the studied variables has been investigated (Sousa, et al., 2007). The statistical test that was used for data analysis is multiple hierarchical regression using SPSS version 27.

**Results**

**Table I: descriptive and correlation statistics of childhood trauma and parenting styles as predictors of aggressive behaviour**

S/N	Variables	M	S. D	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Aggressive behaviour	14.7907	12.24659	1	-.076	.040	-.111	.124	-.139	-.138
2	Authoritarian	3.3953	1.41656		1	-	-.086	.219	.430**	-.142
3	Permissive	3.5116	1.48600			1	.357**	-.022	.042	.155
4	Authoritative	4.9535	1.21407				1	-.219	.304*	-.028
5	Childhood trauma	1.8605	2.17761					1	.137	-.206
6	Age	20.6512	2.14791						1	-.373*
7	Gender	1.6512	.48224							1

**At  $p < .05$ ,  $p < .01$**

Table I above shows that parenting styles (authoritarian  $r = -.076$ , permissive  $r = .040$  and authoritative  $r = -.111$  at  $p < .05$ ) and childhood trauma  $r = .124$  at  $p < .05$  did not relate with aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students, this means that the predictor variables and dependent variable are compatible. That is the increase or decrease in the independent variables will neither cause the increase or the decrease of aggressive behaviour among undergraduates. Age  $r = .430^{**}$  at  $p < .01$  positively relate with authoritarian, this implies that an increase in age will lead to an increase in authoritarian dimension of parenting style. Age  $r = .304^*$  positively relate with authoritative dimension of parenting styles, this implies that an increase in age will cause an increase in authoritative parenting styles.

**Table I: regression statistics on childhood trauma and parenting styles**

Model	R	R <sup>2</sup>	UnSt $\beta$	St $\beta$	t
1	.159	.025			
Authoritarian			-.666	-.077	-.482
Permissive			.670	.081	.477
Authoritative			-1.481	-.147	-.867
2	.197	.039			
Childhood trauma			.686	.122	.730
Age			-1.137	-.199	-.971
Gender			-5.456	-.215	-1.207

**Dependent variable= aggressive,  $p < .05$ .  $r =$  relationship,  $r^2 =$  relationship square, UnSt $\beta =$  unstandardized, St $\beta =$  standardise**

Table II above indicate parenting styles (authoritarian St $\beta = -.077$ ,  $t = -.482$ , permissive St $\beta = .081$ ,  $t = .477$ , authoritative St $\beta = -.147$ ,  $t = -.867$  at  $p < .05$ ) failed to predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students, this implies the different dimensions of parenting styles cannot



bring about aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students. Parenting styles at  $r = .159$  is not related to aggressive behaviour, it causes 2.5% variation of aggressive behaviour at  $r^2 = .025$ .

Childhood trauma  $St\beta = .122$ ,  $t = .730$  at  $p < .05$  failed to predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate, this implies that childhood trauma cannot cause the occurrence of aggressive behaviour among undergraduate. The predictor variables at  $r = .197$  are not related to aggressive behaviour, they contributed 3.9% variation to aggressive behaviour at  $r^2 = .039$ , and childhood trauma and parenting styles jointly failed to predict aggressive behaviour. Age  $St\beta = -.199$ ,  $t = -.971$ , gender  $St\beta = -.215$ ,  $t = -1.207$  at  $p < .05$  failed to predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students.

### **Discussion**

The first hypothesis tested which stated that childhood trauma will significantly predict aggressive behaviour was not confirmed, hence the hypothesis was rejected. The finding obtained indicates that childhood trauma is not a factor that can determine aggressive behaviour undergraduate students, which implies that traumatic experience and reoccurring is a personal choice. The past unpleasant experience according to the result indicated that it cannot contribute to students exhibiting aggressive behaviour, which means other factors that was considered in this study would have cause the no significant result obtained.

The findings implies that childhood trauma and aggressive behaviour are not related among undergraduate students, hence aggressive behaviour among undergraduate student might have other contributing factors such as environmental, personal, peer and other factors that are strong enough to regulate the students behaviour and perception towards some certain issues. Therefore traumatic experience during childhood should not be consider as a factor to treat when handling aggressive behaviour among young adult or undergraduate students.

The second hypothesis tested which stated that parenting styles will significantly predict aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students was not confirmed, hence the hypothesis was rejected. The result obtained indicates that the different parenting styles (authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative) cannot determine the occurrence of aggressive behaviour. It means that the type of parenting styles the students pass through does not comes to play when their behavioural pattern, been from any of the parenting styles might not lead to aggressive behaviour. It shows that been aggressive is an individual choice which the students is been opened to, or decision of the students.

### **Implication of the findings**

The findings was in congruity with social behaviour theory by Bandura (1971) that was adopted as theoretical because it proposes that new behaviours can be acquired by observing and imitating others, it states that learning is a cognitive process that takes place in a social context and can occur purely through observation or direct instruction, even in the absence of motor reproduction or direct reinforcement (Bandura, 1963). In addition to the observation of behaviour, learning also occurs through the observation of rewards and punishments, a process known as vicarious reinforcement. When a particular behaviour is rewarded regularly, it will most likely persist; conversely, if a particular behaviour is constantly punished, it will most likely desist (Renzetti et

al., 2012). The theory expands on traditional behavioural theories, in which behaviour is governed solely by reinforcements, by placing emphasis on the important roles of various internal processes in the learning individual (Bandura, 1971). This means that the students can enquire aggressive behaviour from others even when they given best home training, or have not experience past traumatic experience during their childhood.

The empirical work cited was not in congruity, but it added to literature that can be cited by future researcher.

The result indicated that childhood trauma and parenting styles did not predict aggressive behaviour, hence clinicians should try and help student to be able to get positive cognitive process. Parents should try and help students to be open minded and be positive in their thought. School authority should try and come with a course that can help build their confidents so as to overcome negative thoughts that can lead to aggressive behaviour

### **Limitation of the study**

Some factors militated against this study, one of such is the sampled population. Sampling only one institution during exam reduces the numbers of participants, more students would have participated assuming more than one university was sampled.

The sampling techniques also affected the numbers of participants, the more students would have been sampled assuming a suitable sampling techniques was adopted.

Some demographic variable were left on answered by the participants which lead to the researcher not including the outcome in the study, demographic such as religious affiliation, parental working status et al. These control variables would have help to give this study direction.

### **Suggestion for further study**

Future researcher should consider sampling population from different institution and also to consider carrying this study outside examination period, this will give student opportunity to participate in the research.

A suitable sampling technique should be considered by future researcher, because this will give room for the selection of larger population.

The future researcher should consider to arrange the demographic variables in such a way that the participants will not leave them unattended to.

### **Summary and Conclusion**

the study investigated childhood trauma and parenting styles as predictors of aggressive behaviour among undergraduate students, the findings revealed that childhood trauma and parenting styles did not predict aggressive behaviour.

Mayasari, O. A., Yusuf, A., & Nugroho, S. E. (2019). The Aggressive Behaviour in Elementary School and Factors Can Be Influence. *Journal of Primary Education*, 8(5),  
Mayasari, O. A., Yusuf, A., & Nugroho, S. E. (2019). The Aggressive Behaviour in Elementary School and Factors Can Be Influence. *Journal of Primary Education*, 8(5),  
Mayasari, O. A., Yusuf, A., & Nugroho, S. E. (2019). The Aggressive Behaviour in Elementary School and Factors Can Be Influence. *Journal of Primary Education*, 8(5),  
Mayasari, O. A., Yusuf, A., & Nugroho, S. E. (2019). The Aggressive Behaviour in Elementary School and Factors Can Be Influence. *Journal of Primary Education*, 8(5),

## References

- American Academy of Pediatrics. *Adverse Childhood Experiences and the Lifelong Consequences of Trauma*. Elk Grove Village, IL American Academy of Pediatrics 2014. Available at: [https://www.aap.org/en-us/documents/ttb\\_aces\\_consequences.pdf](https://www.aap.org/en-us/documents/ttb_aces_consequences.pdf). Accessed January 11, 2021
- Arora, R. (2023). Intellectual Structure of Parenting Style Research: A Bibliometric Analysis. *Sage Open*, 13(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440231167843>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice-Hall.
- Bastian, A., Efastris, S. M., & Filtri, H. (2018). The Strategy of Aggressivity Handling at Early Childhood of Berkah Ceria Pekanbaru. In IOP Conference Series: *Earth and Environmental Science*. 175(1).
- Baumrind D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behaviour. *Child Development*. 37:887–907. doi: 10.2307/1126611.
- Baumrind D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behaviour. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*. 75:43–88. doi: 10.1037/h0024919.
- Baumrind D. (1971) Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology*. 4:1–103. doi: 10.1037/h0030372.
- Baumrind D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In: Damon W, editor. *Child Development Today and Tomorrow*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 349–378.
- Baumrind D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance abuse. *Journal of Early Adolescence*. 11:56–95. doi: 10.1177/02724316911111004.
- behaviour and intention of aggressive behaviour among adolescent school children in Selangor State-Malaysia. *Research on humanities and social sciences*, 3(5).

- Berkowitz, L. (1989). Frustration-aggression hypothesis: Examination and reformulation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106(1), 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.106.1.59>
- Bernstein, D. P., & Fink, L. (1998). *Childhood Trauma Questionnaire. A retrospective self-report. Manual*. San Antonio, TX: The Psychological Corporation. Harcourt Brace & Company
- Bernstein, D. P., Fink, L., Handelsman, L., & Foote, J. (1994). *Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (CTQ)* [Database record]. APA PsycTests. <https://doi.org/10.1037/t02080-000>
- Bowlby, J. (1969). Maternal deprivation, Grief in children, Bereavement in children, Attachment behavior in children, Separation anxiety in children, Psychology, Pathological, Attachment behavior in children, Bereavement in children, Grief in children, Maternal deprivation, Psychology, Pathological, Separation anxiety in children. *International psycho-analytical library*. 79. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England : Penguin Books ; New York, N.Y.U.S.A. : Viking Penguin
- Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (US). Trauma-Informed Care in Behavioral Health Services. Rockville (MD): Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (US); 2014. (Treatment Improvement Protocol (TIP) Series, No. 57.) Chapter 4, Screening and Assessment. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK207188/>
- Chemtob C., Roitblat H. L., Hamada R. S., Carlson J. G., Twentyman C. T. (1988). A cognitive action theory of post-traumatic stress disorder. *J. Anxiety Disord.* 2, 253–275
- Crittenden, P.; Dallos, D; Landini, A & Kozlowska, K. (2014). *Attachment and Family Therapy*. Open University Press
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487–496. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487>
- De Bellis, M. D., & Zisk, A. (2014). The biological effects of childhood trauma. *Child and adolescent psychiatric clinics of North America*, 23(2), 185–vii. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chc.2014.01.002>
- Dinç, M. & Küçük, K. A. (2021). The relationship between childhood trauma and aggression in young adulthood. *Journal of Scientific Perspectives*. 5(Supplement Issue):163-175
- Duru, C. K., Redzuan, M., Hamsan, H., & Shahrinin, M. I. (2015). Attitude to aggressive
- Duru, C. K., Redzuan, M., Hamsan, H., & Shahrinin, M. I. (2015). Attitude to aggressive behavior and intention of aggressive behavior among adolescent school children in Selangor State-Malaysia. *Research on humanities and social sciences*. 3(5)

- Forkey, H., Szilagyi, M., Kelly, E. T., & Duffee, J. (2021). Trauma-Informed Care. *Pediatrics* 148 (2): e2021052580. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.2021-052580>
- Fox, B. H., Perez, N., Cass, E., Baglivio, M. T., & Epps, N. (2015). Trauma changes everything: examining the relationship between adverse childhood experiences and serious, violent and chronic juvenile offenders. *Child abuse & neglect*, 46, 163–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2015.01.011>
- Gilbert, R., Widom, C.S., Browne, K., Fergusson, D., Webb, E., & Janson, S., (2009). Burden and consequences of child maltreatment in high-income countries. *Lancet* 373 (9657), 68–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(08\)61706-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(08)61706-7)
- Gonzalez A, Greenwood G, & WenHsu J, (2001). Undergraduate students' goal orientations and their relationship to perceived parenting styles. *College Student Journal* 35(2): 182-193. doi:10.5897/ERR2014.1789
- Gunarsa, S. D., & Jakarta P, A.; B., (1976). PT BPK Gunung Mulia.
- Howe, D. (2011). *Attachment across the Life-course: A brief Introduction*. Palgrave Mc Milla  
<https://www.nctsn.org/what-is-child-trauma/trauma-types/complex-trauma/effects>
- Hull, C. L. (1943). *Principles of behavior: an introduction to behavior theory*. Appleton-Century.
- Kartono, K., Patologi Sosial, Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada, 1997.
- Kashif, N., Bashir, F., Ahmed, E., & Nasim, I. (2022). Aggressive students' academic performance: teachers' insight. *Review of economics*
- Kassam-Adams, N. (2014). Design, delivery, and evaluation of early interventions for children exposed to acute trauma. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 5, Article 22757. <https://doi.org/10.3402/ejpt.v5.22757>
- Liu, B., Yang, Y., Geng, J., Cai, T., Zhu, M., Chen, T., & Xiang, J. (2022). Harsh Parenting and Children's Aggressive Behavior: A Moderated Mediation Model. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 19(4), 2403. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19042403>
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetheringtono (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. IV. Socialization, Personality and Social Development* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed., pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.

- Mambra, K., Jaleel, A. & Suphala, K. (2024). The Effects of School Environment on Student Aggressive Behavior: A *Comprehensive Review*. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=4801284> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4801284>
- Masud, H., Ahmad, M. S., Cho, K. W., & Fakhr, Z. (2019). Parenting Styles and Aggression Among Young Adolescents: A Systematic Review of Literature. *Community mental health journal*, 55(6), 1015–1030. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10597-019-00400-0>
- Mayasari, O. A., Yusuf, A. & Nugroho, S. E. (2019). The aggressive behavior in elementary school and factors can be influence. *Journals of primary education*. 8(5)
- Mayasari, O. A., Yusuf, A., & Nugroho, S. E. (2019). The Aggressive Behaviourin Elementary
- Mundia, L. (2006). Aggressive Behaviour Among Swazi Upper Primary and Junior Secondary Students: Implications for Ongoing Educational Reforms Concerning Inclusive Education. *International Journal of Special Education*, 21(3).
- Nikkheslat, N., McLaughlin, A. P., Hastings, C., Zajkowska, Z., Nettis, M. A., Mariani, N., Enache, D., Lombardo, G., Pointon, L., Cowen, P. J., Cavanagh, J., Harrison, N. A., Bullmore, E. T., NIMA Consortium, Pariante, C. M., & Mondelli, V. (2020). Childhood trauma, HPA axis activity and antidepressant response in patients with depression. *Brain, behavior, and immunity*, 87, 229–237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbi.2019.11.024>
- Piotrowski, J. T., Lapierre, M. A., & Linebarger, D. L. (2013). Investigating correlates of self-regulation in early childhood with a representative sample of English-speaking American families. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 22(3), 423–436. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-012-9595-z>
- Pomerantz, E. M., Grolnick, W. S., & Price, C. E. (2005). The Role of Parents in How Children Approach Achievement: A Dynamic Process Perspective. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (229–278). Guilford Publications.
- Rademacher, A., Zumbach-Basu, J. & Duering, U. V. (2023). Parenting Style and Child Aggressive Behavior from Preschool to Elementary School: The Mediating Effect of Emotion Dysregulation. *Early Childhood Education Journal*.
- Resick, P. A., & Schnicke, M. K. (1992). Cognitive processing therapy for sexual assault victims. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 60(5), 748–756. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.60.5.748>
- Salmin, A. H., Narsudin, |D., Hidayat, M. |S., & Winarni, W. (2021). The effect of overprotective parental attitude on children’s development. *Journal Belaindinka (PembelajaranDan Inovasi Pendidikan)*, 3(1)

School and Factors Can Be Influence. *Journal of Primary Education*, 8(5),

Soňa, T. (2017). *The Effect of Age, Sex, and Parenting Styles on Self-Esteem in Young Adult*

The Center for Child Trauma Assessment, Services and Interventions Department of Psychiatry & Behavioral Sciences (2024). A Center of the National Child Traumatic Stress Network (NCTSN) at Northwestern University. <https://cctasi.northwestern.edu/>

Turner, E. A., Chandler, M., & Heffer, R. W. (2009). The Influence of Parenting Styles, Achievement Motivation, and Self-Efficacy on Academic Performance in College Students. *Journal Of College Student Development*, 50(3), 337-346.

U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, (2022). PTSD: National Center for PTSD. [https://www.ptsd.va.gov/understand/common/common\\_children\\_teens.asp](https://www.ptsd.va.gov/understand/common/common_children_teens.asp)

Wagner, K. D. (2016). Effects of Childhood Trauma on Depression and Suicidality in Adulthood. *The Psychiatric times*, 33.

Wang, C., Zhu, L., Zheng, W., Peng, H., Wang, J., Cui, Y., Liu, B., & Jiang, T. (2023). Effects of childhood trauma on aggressive behaviors and hippocampal function: the modulation of COMT haplotypes. *Psychoradiology*, 3, kkad013. <https://doi.org/10.1093/psyrad/kkad013>

Watson, J. B. (1913). Psychology as the behaviorist views it. *Psychological Review*, 20(2), 158–177. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0074428>

Yuliyanto E. & Astuti B. (2023). Aggressive behavior in the elementary school student: a descriptive phenomenological approach. ISDTGCSS 2022, *ASSEHR*. 743

Zarse, E. M., Neff, M. R., Yoder, R., Hulvershorn, L., Chambers, J. E., Chambers, R. A., & Schumacher, U. (2019). The adverse childhood experiences questionnaire: Two decades of research on childhood trauma as a primary cause of adult mental illness, addiction, and medical diseases. *Cogent Medicine*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331205X.2019.1581447>