

Influence of Peer Pressure and Parenting Styles on Criminal Thinking among Secondary School Students in AMAC

AMBROSE, Irene Ugochinyere¹, BAHIJJA, Tanko Kasim² & AJAYI, Oluwabunmi Hezekiah³

^{1,2}Department of Psychology, Federal University, Lafia, Nigeria

³Brains Specialist Hospital, Nigeria

Abstract: This study examined influence of peer pressure and parenting style on criminal thinking among secondary school students in Abuja Municipal Area Council (AMAC). Using a cross-sectional survey design, 350 secondary school students in AMAC were systematically sampled as participants across Government Secondary School Gwarimpa Life Camp and Government Secondary School Jabi, (AMAC). Peer Pressure and Popularity Scale, Parental Care Scale (PCS) and Criminal Thinking Scale were used for data collection. Three hypotheses were formulated and tested using Simple Linear Regression and multiple linear regressions. Findings of the study revealed that peer pressure had significant influence on criminal thinking ($R = .325$, $R^2 = .106$, $F(1,348) = 41.200$, $P < .01$) among secondary school students in AMAC. Result further reviewed that parenting style had significant influence on criminal thinking ($R = .329$, $R^2 = .108$, $F(3,346) = 14.032$, $P < .01$) among secondary school students in AMAC. The result further revealed that permissive parenting style ($\beta = .307$, $P < .01$) had the most significant independent influence on criminal thinking followed by authoritarian parenting ($\beta = .215$, $P < .01$) while authoritative parenting ($\beta = -.069$, $P > .01$) had no significant independent influence on criminal thinking among secondary school students in Abuja Municipal Area Council AMAC. Finally, it was revealed that, there was significant joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking ($R = .496$, $R^2 = .246$, $F(4,345) = 28.127$, $P < .01$) among secondary school students in Abuja Municipal Area Council. The researcher concluded that peer pressure and parenting styles independently and jointly influence criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. The researcher therefore recommended that effort should be made by the school authority to encourage and educate students to understand people they interact with so that they will not be pressured by bad friends to think or indulge in criminal acts. Parents should be made to understand and maintain the styles they bring their children up that will help in relating with their children so as to free them from been criminally-minded.

I. INTRODUCTION

Crime can be seen as an infraction of both the basic principles of law and order and the norms of civilised behaviour. No society is immune from this thorny social problem but what differs is the frequency and magnitude of the situation and the response mechanisms to address same (Emeh, 2012). Moreover, crime is viewed as a conduct behaviour or an act which violates the criminal law or formal or written laws of a state for which a punishment is prescribed

(Schmallenger, 2004; Terito, Halstaed, & Bromley, 2004; Adler, Mullier & Laufer, 2001). Behaviour that does not conform to the cultural norms or laws of a given society at a particular time and is often times negatively sanctioned, is referred to as criminal. This implies that non-conformity to a given set of laws or norms that are accepted by a significant number of people in a community, society or group is a criminal act. Society highly values conformity and expects it to be accepted and upheld by its members.

Criminal Thinking” is generally considered to be a way of thinking in which an individual finds the easiest solution to a problem. For instance, if a person is hungry and has no means of buying food “Criminal Thinking” would suggest said person take food to eat without paying for it. Furthermore, Criminal Thinking as defined is “Thought content and process conducive to the initiation and maintenance of habitual lawbreaking behaviour.” Attempting to understand and predict criminal behaviour has been an important and popular area of research for decades.

It is interesting to know that thousands of offenders or criminals would be released from prison only for them to return to crime. After being rearrested, they claim that they could not find employment, housing, and financial stability and perhaps social support. According to Clan and Shapiro (2007), many continue to struggle with legal difficulties as well as simple everyday processes which makes them to return to prison.

It is pertinent for researchers in forensic discipline to search for ways to redirect criminal behaviour and seek to minimise the impact crime has on the society, in view of this, this present study sought to explore what is actually responsible for criminal behaviour. Based on the study of Lemieux (2020), she indicated that criminal thinking processes in criminal offenders are responsible for their criminalities.

Closely related to dynamic risk factors is the notion of a pervasive criminal thinking style or pattern of maladaptive thinking errors. These errors have been empirically investigated in relation to predicting criminal behaviour and recidivism (Yochelson & Samenow, 1976; 1977; Walters, 1990; Mandracchia, Morgan, Garos, & Garland, 2007). The

construct of criminal thinking includes both internal components and external factors, such as ingrained attitudes and experience with criminal associates, which may influence an individual's behaviour.

Researchers have long investigated and theorised about maladaptive thinking patterns and styles that contribute to problematic behaviours. Beck (1976, 1999, 2004) proposed the notion that dysfunctional thinking processes are the product of spontaneous and unintentional, or automatic, thoughts that are believed to be present in all people. He maintained that such thinking processes affect emotions and behaviour, and are particularly associated with depression. Automatic thoughts (e.g., "I am dumb.") stem from negative self-perceptions that remain subconsciously present until brought to the forefront by a therapist or outside source (Beck, 1976). Beck considered the thoughts to be naturally reflexive (i.e., not intentionally activated and hard to terminate). However, such maladaptive thoughts are likely to result in negative consequences or poor social interactions, and are more likely to be noticed by others that interact with the individual rather than by the actual individual. One's current automatic thoughts are believed to be rational, even if understood to have been irrational in the past. Repetitive thoughts are taken at face value regardless of previous understanding (Beck 1976).

Yochelson and Samenow (1976, 1977) and Walters (1990) conjectured that criminals have a pervasively maladaptive framework or pattern of thinking that manifests across various aspects of their lives. They described criminal thinking patterns that consist of thoughts that most people have had before (e.g., considering committing a crime in times of desperation) but understand as unreasonable. However, for individuals with criminal thinking patterns (commonly offenders), these thoughts are not dismissed with simple reasoning. In fact, these individuals are also believed to have other cognitive tendencies (patterns of criminal thinking) that assist in the endorsement of such thoughts, as well as the execution of related actions, such as criminal acts. Although criminals are typically unaware of such erroneous and counter-productive thinking styles, these distinct patterns influence both the initiation and sustainment of antisocial behaviour. The two lines of theory both assert that criminal behaviour is a result of free choice and a culmination of irresponsible thinking that the individual acts upon. However, the two theories differ in how many errors are believed to be present.

Yochelson and Samenow (1976, 1977) phenomenologically derived 52 thinking errors from interviewing 240 offender volunteers. They include 16 "automatic errors of thinking" based on emotions, criminal thinking patterns that reflect irresponsible thinking in all people, and errors "from idea through execution," which apply to thought functioning before, during, and after a crime. The theorised thinking errors included patterns identified as entitlement (i.e., feelings of ownership, uniqueness, or misidentification), power

orientation (i.e., how the criminal perceives his/her control in life), the ability to eliminate fear, and super optimism (i.e., an extreme form of optimism that gives criminals the confidence to try to achieve unrealistic desires). The likelihood of experiencing these errors increases with criminal behaviour. Each type of error is presumed to serve a different purpose subconsciously. For example, the thinking process may differ before and during a crime compared to after a crime in order to decrease impulsivity but increase confidence and support the execution of the criminal

Accordingly, society has put in place processes and institutions that will ensure and establish the necessary peace, order and stability required for the progress and development of humanity and society. Socialisation is one of such processes which is carried out by especially the family, the school and religious bodies. Aside from these institutions, other informal primary groups involved in the socialisation of individuals are the neighbourhood and peer group or friendship clique. Through the socialisation process, it is intended that the cultural norms and values of society which spell out the approved and disapproved (right and wrong) behaviour of society is taught to its members. However, as a result of other mitigating factors in society as well as individual differences, the outright or subtle violation of societal laws (crime) and "criminal tendencies remain a feature of every society" (Durkheim, 1966, Igbinovia, 2003 and Dambazzu, 2011).

They argue that crime is inevitable in all societies. Igbinovia (2003) observed that, there is hardly any Nigerian living today that can claim that he or she has not advertently or inadvertently, by commission or omission been involved in crimes or benefitted directly or indirectly from criminality or deviance or the commission of crimes or the proceeds of criminality". Apart from individual deviance, non-conformity or deviation from societal norms also occurs as a group. In line with this, (Iyoha, 1997, Carlson, 2010 and Esiri&Ejechi, 2013), noted that a greater part of group deviation occurs within society's criminal subculture. Most important is the fact that the individual in a situation of group deviation, acts in conformity to the norms of the sub-culture which has rejected the norms of the larger society. It is further noteworthy, that peers identify themselves as members of a particular group on the basis of the adoption of particular behaviours. The definition of a group is often based on the, assumption that common symbols, language, clothing and behaviour will mark this membership (Allen, 2003). Some examples of delinquent behaviour include stealing, theft, armed robbery, murder, assault, rape, unlawful possession of firearms, kidnapping, prostitution, drug sales and usage, tobacco usage, tax evasion, embezzlement, money laundering, bribery and corruption.

According to the United Nations office on drugs and crime (2011), crime is one of the human security problems confronting humanity across the world. Several nations have grappled with the rising incidence of homicide, armed

robbery, kidnapping, drugs and human trafficking, illegal gun running and a host of others. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) in 2011 estimated global homicides at 468,000 in 2011 and more than 36% was estimated to have occurred in Africa, 31% in the Americas, 27% in Asia, 5% in Europe and 1% in the tropical Pacific region. Africa has remained a leading continent in global crime statistics. The prevalence of violent and non-violent crimes has remained high in South Africa and Nigeria. According to Africa Check, an online newspaper 2/9/2016, the incidences of murder cases increased from 32.9 in 2014/2015 to 33.9 in 2015/2016 in South Africa alone, this means there were nearly 34 murders recorded per 100,000 people in the country. This shows a sharp increase in the number of murder cases when compared with the total number of cases the previous years. Globally, there are stories or reported cases of crime in the media every day. Aremu (2007) reported that rarely does an evening pass in which the locally televised news does not provide coverage of at least one shocking and disturbing act of criminal violence involving juveniles and youths. These facts were earlier established by Elliot (1993), and Snyder and Sickmund (1995), as well as Farrington (1991). Many Nigerians have expressed worries over the recent increase in criminal activities, especially the frequency of violent crimes across the country.

According to Ibrahim and Igbuzor, (2002), inter and intra-communal and ethnic clashes, ethno religious violence, armed robbery, assassination, murder, gender-based violence and bomb explosions have been on the increase leading to enormous loss of lives and property and a general atmosphere of siege and social tension for the populace which Nigerian undergraduates are fully involved in. Despite soaring security budget, insecurity still pervades the country. Consequently, insecurity has taken various forms in different parts of the country. In the South-West, armed robbers have taken over, while in the North, cross-border bandits operate with ease. However, in the South-South, there are rampant cases of kidnapping. Also, the incessant wave of crime and armed robbery attacks, all point to the fact that insecurity is fast becoming a norm in Nigeria and have somewhat suddenly become attractive to certain individuals in seeking to resolve issues that could have ordinarily been settled through due process.

The end-products lead to the decimation of innocent lives, disruption of economic activities, and destruction of properties among others. The incessant rate of cultism in our institutions today cannot be over emphasized, for instance in vanguard newspaper 8/2/2021, there was a cultists' clash in Lagos that led to the arrest of 19 suspected cultists and so many other cultist incidents. All these have raised serious concern among scholars and well-meaning Nigerians on the ability and approach of our Law Enforcement Agents in combating crime (Samson & Saawuan, 2013). Between the year 2000 and 2017, there have been reported cases of riots of Nigerian undergraduates. The media (print and electronics) is

awash with reported cases of riots among Nigerian undergraduates in various Institutions of Higher learning, e.g., Benue State University, Kogi State University and Federal University of Makurdi which is in the middle belt region of the country and some parts of the Eastern region. The Sun Newspaper of June 30th, 2014 reported the riot of Benue State University undergraduates, (Okoye, 2014 & Oshanaike, 2015). The deteriorating security situation in and around the surrounding University communities has culminated into a high number of individuals on campus. The tendency of behavioural problems remains high among the undergraduates due to the influence of both psychological and social factors.

Peer pressure is the power or influence a social group exerts on an individual or individuals. It may be found in children that are toddlers (that is age 2-3). Children of this age can mimic adults or if asked to do so take part in their actions. This type of influence can eventually affect the behaviour of such children in future. Again, with the common practice of pre-schooling in most Nigerian homes and families today, children between 3 and 4 years would sometimes not do what parents have taught them to do but would instead do things to please their friends just because they like them. Due to their exposure to schooling so early, they become aware of manners of doing things and rules that are different from those of their parents or families. Then they may actually begin to demand to do some of the things their parents had not allowed them to do. They may begin to cut boundaries or limits parents had set for them (Lapiere, 1954, Akers & Lee 1996). Their peer group becomes more important to them as models. Peer pressure becomes a disturbing and worrisome social problem as growing children take on their peer group as their role models. This is because they begin to act and develop the copycat syndrome (what Igbinovia 2003, identified as one of the causes of crime in Nigeria). As a result of this syndrome, a child would desire the same kind of toys, wear the same kind of clothes, eat the same kind of food, share eating habits, share favourite television programs share likes and dislikes, and even share bed times with peers. At this point, the parents start having difficulties exercising social control on the child because the values and opinions of their peers (age or friendship cliques) as far as he/she is concerned supersedes those of the parents. Also, because they want to look and act like the others. Imitation and experimentation have been identified as ways by which teens and adolescents learn anti-social and criminal behaviour (Powel, Tauras & Ross, 2003, Ogbobor, 2012). As children grow into teens, the symptoms of peer pressure become more problematic especially, where parental bonding is emotionally or otherwise lacking, or weak. More so, when there are difficulties and challenges at home and teenagers desire to fit with their peers and be accepted by them. Depending on the strength of this desire, teenagers' "right thinking may be beclouded or dislodged" (Ahigren, Noren, Hochhauser and Garvin, 1982). In view of these traits, a teenager who is a part of a group that is involved in cultism, thieving, stealing, lying, drugs, examination malpractice or any of the vice of society, is most likely to

participate in them. According to Horton and Hunt, (1984), "all authorities agree that an individual's need for acceptance within intimate groups is a most powerful lever for the use of group pressure towards group norms".

Lapierre (1954), Powell, Tauras and Ross, (2003), agree that peer pressure may begin in early childhood, and increase until it reaches its peak in the pre-teen and teen years. They see social control as a primary process growing from the individual's need for group acceptance and argue that virtually all adolescents in middle and high school deal with peer pressure often on a daily basis. Lapierre points out that in this way, children and teens learn how to get along with others of their own age group and in the process they learn to become more independent adults.

A parenting style is a psychological construct representing standard strategies that parents use in their child rearing. The quality of parenting can be more essential than the quantity of time spent with the child. For instance, a parent can spend an entire afternoon with his or her child, yet the parent may be engaging in a different activity and not demonstrating enough interest towards the child. Parenting styles are the representation of how parents respond to and make demands on their children. Parenting practices are specific behaviours, while parenting styles represent broader patterns of parenting practices (Spera, 2005).

Children go through different stages in life therefore, parents create their own parenting styles from a combination of factors that evolve over time as children begin to develop their own personalities. During the stage of infancy, parents try to adjust to a new lifestyle in terms of adapting and bonding with their new infant. Developmental psychologists distinguish between the relationship of the child and parent, which ideally is one of attachment, and the relationship between the parent and child, referred to as bonding. In the stage of adolescence, parents encounter new challenges, such as adolescents seeking and desiring freedom.

Parents have huge impact on a person's life. Number of studies in the area of parenting matches its importance on the developing person. Parenting process combines all the activities of the parents that are intended to support their children's wellbeing. 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 socialisation of the children. Then many researches recognised the importance of researching role of parenting style in child development (Kordi, 2010; Schaffer, Clark & Jeglic, 2009; Kaufmann, 2000; 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. 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. For

grouping parents to different styles, Maccoby and Martin suggested a conceptual structure in 1983; they viewed parenting style as combinations of differing levels of parental demandingness and warmth. The styles are thus determined by measuring parental warmth and demandingness.

There is a growing interest in the role of parenting in a person's affective and social characteristics. According to a literature review by Christopher Spera (2005), Darling and Steinberg (1993) suggest that it is important to better understand the differences between parenting styles and parenting practices: "Parenting practices are defined as specific behaviours that parents use to socialise their children", while parenting style is "the emotional climate in which parents raise their children". One study association that has been made is the difference between "child's outcome and continuous measures of parental behaviour". Some of the associations that are listed include the following: support, involvement, warmth, approval, control, monitoring, and harsh punishment. Parenting practices such as parental support, monitoring and firm boundaries appear to be linked to higher school grades, less behaviours problems and better mental health. These components have no age limit and can begin early in pre-school leading all the way into college (Amato, Paul; Fowler & Frieda, 2002).

The role of parenting in the development of antisocial behaviours, including crime and delinquency, has been the source of a long line of empirical research. Behaviour that is peculiarly social is oriented towards other selves. Such behaviour apprehends another as a perceiving, thinking, Moral, intentional, and behaving person; considers the intentional or rational meaning of the other's field of expression; involves expectations about the other's acts and actions; and manifests an intention to invoke in another self-certain experiences and intentions. What differentiates social from non-social behaviour, then, is whether another self is taken into account in one's acts, actions, or practices. Goffman (2002). Criminal behaviour can be treated if the factors that lead to criminal activities are been identified. It is based on this background that this research is set to investigate the Influence of peer pressure and parenting style on criminal tendency among secondary school students in AMAC.

Statement of the Problem

The rate of crime is on the increase worldwide and it occurs in every sector of human endeavour and is perpetrated by young and old, male and female, literate and illiterate, religious and atheists, leaders and followers, government and the governed as well as members of the law enforcement agencies. Crime as a universal phenomenon that concerns us today and makes it a major public issue is that its incidence has been going up in all parts of the world and among all segments of society.

It has been observed that, several nations have grappled with the rising incidence of homicide, armed robbery, kidnapping, drugs and human trafficking, illegal gun running and a host of

others (Ukoji, 2006). The alarming level of insecurity in Nigeria has fuelled the crime through criminal thinking mind and has increased the rate of terrorist's attacks in different parts of the country, for the nation's economy and growth (Igbini, 2020). To address the threat to national security and combat the increasing waves of crime the federal government every year starting from 2013 budget has made huge allocation to security, and the national assembly passed the Anti-Terrorism Act in 2011 (Ewetan, 2013). Despite these efforts, the level of insecurity in the country is still high, and a confirmation of this is the low ranking of Nigeria in the Global Peace Index (GPI, 2012).

It should be worthy of note that criminality does not just happen it must start with a corrupt mind. The cognitive processes have to be triggered before a behaviour could occur. The Criminal Justice System to bring crime to an insignificant level using conventional and traditional approaches of controlling crime (investigating, apprehending, prosecuting, and punishing offenders of the law). Despite the plethora of security measures taken to address the daunting challenges of insecurity in Nigeria, government efforts have not produced the desired positive result and hence the need to look for solutions to this menace. The conservative or traditional approaches seem to be curative rather than preventive. This therefore calls for efforts that will look at the root causes of crime, so that we stop treating symptom rather than causes.

This ugly trend has been the major concern for researcher to determine what really influenced criminal thinking among secondary school students. Some argue that criminal mind has been on the increase due to environment, others believe that it is genetic, and yet others viewed it in connection with the personality of the individual. Others considered different variables as what determined criminal thinking of a person. But no attention has been given to peer pressure and parenting styles of the affected children. And the researcher is on the opinion that, the way secondary school students interact with their mates of different background with different home training at times can influence others and also the type of parenting styles parent used on their children can also determine the criminal thinking of a child. It is on this fact that research is aimed at investigating the influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC.

II. EMPIRICAL REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Influence of peer pressure and criminal behaviour.

The focus in criminological research on the influence of delinquent peers on delinquency has led the field to almost entirely ignore the influence of conforming peers on conformity. There have been some studies that sought to examine the influence of peer pressure on criminal behaviour and thinking. Take for example, Onoyase and Ebeonuwa (2018) examined the relationship among Adolescents' developmental characteristics, peer group influence and their

anti-social behaviours. The findings revealed that physical, intellectual, social/emotional characteristics and peer group influence adolescents' anti-social behaviours. It was recommended that adolescents should be made to indulge in productive leisure time activities where they can dissipate their energies.

Furthermore, Esiri (2016), in his study on how peer pressure influences criminal behaviour, found out that dimensions of peer pressure influence criminal behaviour in adolescents. Similarly, Szapocznik and Brown (2015) explored the existence of differential peer effects on youth crime for adolescents with different degree of parental involvement. The paper finds out that peer effects on juvenile crime are 48% lower for teenagers with engaged mothers, relative to those whose mothers prefer not to be involved in their life. Disengaged mothers are those who do not communicate with their kids when they do something wrong that is important and, as a result, do not help their offspring in understanding why such a behaviour is not appropriate. Furthermore, Brown (2014) affirmed in his study on the influence of peer pressure on adolescent misbehaviour in advantaged and disadvantaged schools. Results showed a significant positive relationship between peer pressure and adolescent misbehaviour in schools. In addition, misbehaviour was also positively predicted in both advantaged and disadvantaged schools, with disadvantaged schools being significantly more influential. When comparing peer pressure and adolescent misbehaviours in both advantaged and disadvantaged schools, adolescents in disadvantaged schools engaged significantly more in misbehaviour activities and also responded positively more to peer pressure than their counterparts in advantaged schools. Implications for further research were suggested.

Furthermore, Obaro (2013) examined how peer pressure is present in adolescents and how it may influence or create the leverage to non-conformity to societal norms and laws. The research analyses the process and occurrence of peer influence and pressure on individuals and groups within the framework of the social learning and the social control theories. Major features of the peer pressure process are identified as group dynamics, delinquent peer subculture, peer approval of delinquent behaviour and sanctions for non-conformity which include ridicule, mockery, ostracism and even mayhem or assault in some cases. Also, the paper highlights acceptance and rejection as key concepts that determine the sway or gladiation of adolescents to deviant and criminal behaviour. Finally, it concludes that peer pressure exists for conformity and in delinquent subculture; the result is conformity to criminal codes and behaviour. The research recommends more urgent, serious and offensive grass root approaches by governments and institutions against this growing threat to the continued peace, orderliness and development of society. Lastly, Okorodudu (2010) revealed in his study that peer pressure is one of the contributing factors to adolescent antisocial acts.

Parenting Styles and Criminal Thinking

Parenting has been implicated in determining the kind of behaviours children exhibit. A study conducted by Kring, Neale, and Johnson (2017) investigated the influence of parenting styles and peer pressure on delinquent behaviours among Senior Secondary School Students in Kaduna metropolis. Results of the finding revealed that there is a significant correlation parenting style and delinquent behaviour which implies that children from homes where democratic parenting style is used are less likely to be delinquents. Autocratic parenting style and delinquent behaviour among students strongly and positively correlate, thereby strongly suggesting that children from homes where autocratic parenting style and *laissez-faire* parenting style is practiced are strongly likely to be delinquents. Peer pressure was also found to strongly encourage delinquent behaviour among students.

Furthermore, Beaver, Kevin, Schwartz, Joesph, Connolly, Eric, Al-Ghamdi, Said, Kobeisy, and Nezar (2015) conducted a study on the role of parenting in the prediction of Criminal Involvement. The results revealed that parenting measures were significantly associated with odds of being arrested, being incarcerated, being on probation, or being arrested multiple times.

On Relationship between parenting styles and crime among the youths living in Hananasif slum in Dar-es-Salaam, Musyoki (2017) in his study which aimed at assessing parenting styles and whether they influence crime among youths in slums reported that *lazier-fair* parenting styles and the age factor could predict involvement of youth to petty crimes within the slums area. Furthermore, the result indicated that, authoritarian single parents either rarely involve themselves in petty crimes or never. However, it's clearly noted that in overall authoritarian parenting style nurtures the respondents well thereby becoming good citizens. As further revealed, 18.9% of the respondents from authoritative parenting style and who are single involve themselves in petty crimes. However, 14.3% respondents from the same parenting style and who are married get involved in petty crimes. It is clearly indicated that the level of petty crime is much higher from parents who are single.

Peer pressure, Parenting styles and criminal behaviour

In order to examine the joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal behaviour, Ashrafa, Madya, Ahmadb, and Talib (2019) in their study on the role of parenting and peer pressure in the development of Juvenile delinquent behaviour among higher secondary school children indicated that peer pressure and parenting styles jointly predict delinquency among secondary school children. Furthermore, Nisar, Ullah, Ali, and Alam (2015) demonstrated that familial problems like parental behaviour, lack of parental monitoring, conflictual family environment,

economic hardship, parental education, and peer pressure, potential influence the socialisation of children.

Lastly, Ajiboye (2015) in his study on the influence of parenting styles and peer pressure on delinquent behaviours among Senior Secondary School Students in Kaduna metropolis, indicated that both peer pressure and parenting styles independently and jointly influence delinquent behaviour. The gap identified in this literature is that all the studies were based on criminal behaviour and not criminal think; thus, the present study sought to fill the gap by investigating the influence of peer pressure and parentings on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC.

Research Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were generated for the research

1. There will be a significant influence of peer pressure on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC
2. There will be a significant influence of Parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC
3. There will be a joint significant influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC

III. RESEARCH METHOD

The study adopted a cross-sectional survey design to investigate influence of peer pressure and parenting style on criminal behaviour among secondary school students in AMAC. participants for this study were drawn from two (2) secondary schools in AMAC. The schools the researcher used for the study are: Government Secondary School Gwarimpa Life Camp and Government Secondary School Jabi, AMAC.

The record collected from the schools visited showed that, Government secondary school Gwarimpa life camp had a total number of 1,802 students while Government secondary school Jabi, had 1,711 students. The sample size for this study was estimated using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size estimation table for known populations. From the table, the ideal sample size for the population of 3500-4000 is 351. Systematic sampling was used for this study. Systematic sampling is a type of probability sampling method in which sample members from a larger population are selected according to a random starting point but with a fixed, periodic interval. This interval, called the sampling interval, is calculated by dividing the population size by the desired sample size Adam Hayes (2020). The justification for the choice of this sampling method is that, choosing a sample size through a systematic approach can be done quickly. Once a fixed starting point has been identified, a constant interval is selected to facilitate participant selection. Within systematic sampling, as with other sampling methods, a target population must be selected prior to selecting participants. Three hundred

and fifty questionnaires were found useful and were analysed. Participants for this study were 350 secondary school students in Abuja Municipal Area Council, drawn from two secondary schools; Government Secondary School Gwarimpa Life Camp and Government Secondary School Jabi, AMAC. Out of the participants, 204 (58.3%) Male and 146 (41.7%) Female. Their age ranges from 14 to 18 years. The participants were from different class of study as it was revealed that, 185 (52.9%) were from SSI class and 165 (47.1%) were from SS2, it was also revealed that 161 (60%) of the participants were from Government Secondary School Gwarimpa Life Camp and 149 (40%) were from Government Secondary School Jabi of AMAC.

Methods of Data Collection

Three instruments were used for this study. The instruments were grouped in sections. Section A contained the demographics information of the respondents such as age, class, and category of school. Section B contained the peer pressure and popularity Scale. The Peer Pressure and Popularity Scale was developed by Santor, Messervey, and Kusumakar (2000) and it measures peer pressure as a subjective experience of feeling pressured, urged, or dared by others to do certain things or actually doing particular things because others have pressured, urged, or dared you to. Like most measures of peer pressure, this measure assessed a number of delinquent behaviours, such as substance use, skipping classes, and theft and the peer pressure subscale contains 10 questions. The scale is scored using yes or no response patterns. In order to derive the level of pressure of a respondent, the total number of yes responses is summed. More “yes” responses indicated higher levels of peer pressure, while only a few “yes” responses indicated lower levels of peer pressure. The scale was reported to have adequate internal consistency. The measure yielded a reliability coefficient’s alpha ranging from 0.69 to 0.91 for all measures. The result of the pilot study showed that the 11- items on Peer Pressure Scale yielded a Cronbach alpha of .778. Therefore, all the 11-items were included in the main study. This means that the scale is reliable to be used on the population of secondary school students

Section C contained the Parental Care Scale (PCS). Parental care scale was developed by Baurind (1971) to measure adolescent’s perceived styles of parenting. The scale is made up of 20 items. The scale measures Authoritarian parenting style, permissive parenting style and Authoritative parenting style. Items 2, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 19 measure Authoritative style. Items 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 16 and 18 measure Permissive parenting style. Lastly, items 1, 5, 10, 17, and 20 measure Authoritative parenting style. Response format: It is a ‘Yes’ or ‘No’ response format. The scoring includes awarding 1 point for each correct response in each of the three categories while every ‘No’ response is awarded 0 mark. Add together the correct points for each of the three categories to obtain the sub-score for the particular parenting style. The norm score reported are the mean score obtained by secondary

school students investigated by Tumasi-Ankarh (2002). Omoluabi (2002) obtained a concurrent validity coefficient of .73 with internal consistency reliability estimate alpha coefficient of .86. Pilot study was conducted to establish the reliability Cronbach’s alpha coefficient for the current study. The result showed that the 15 items on the scale together yielded a Cronbach alpha of .772 with all the 15 items having the corrected items total correlation above the required .30.

Section D contained an adapted criminal thinking scale. This scale was originally developed by Walters (1998) which aimed at measuring the thinking patterns of criminals. The original scale contained 37 items with response categories ranging from 1=Strongly Disagree to 5=Strongly Agree. The original scale reported a Cronbach reliability coefficient of .78. Before pilot study was conducted, the original scale was given to three experts in the department of psychology Nasarawa state University for their opinions and for face and content validity to be established. After their perusal, some items which did not meet a consensual agreement were deleted while other items were rephrased to suit the context in which it would be used. In view of this, fourteen items (items 5, 15, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, and 37) were deleted. The remaining twenty-one (21) items were administered on fifty (50) secondary school students who were not from the same schools the main study was conducted. The result of the Pilot study yielded a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of .845. This generated Cronbach alpha was high and so was deemed useful for the main study.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

Test of Hypothesis One: The hypothesis stated that there will be a significant influence of peer pressure on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. This hypothesis was tested using Simple Linear Regression and the result is presented below.

Table 1: Summary of Simple linear regression showing the influence of peer pressure on criminal thinking among secondary school students in Abuja Municipal Area Council AMAC

Variables	R	R ²	F	df	β	t	Sig
Constant	.325	.106	41.200**	1,348		40.454	.000
Peer pressure					.325	6.419	.000

The result shows that peer pressure has significant influence on criminal thinking among secondary school students in Abuja Municipal Area Council AMAC $R = .325, R^2 = .106, F(1,348) = 41.200, P < .01$. The result further reveals that peer pressure accounts for 10.6% of the dispersion observed on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. Therefore, hypothesis 1 which stated that there will be a significant influence of peer pressure on criminal thinking among secondary school students in Abuja Municipal Area Council AMAC was accepted.

Test of Hypothesis Two: It stated that there will be a significant influence of parenting styles on criminal thinking

among secondary school students in AMAC. This hypothesis was tested using Multiple Regression and the result is presented below

Table 2: Summary of Multiple regression showing the influence of parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC

Variables	R	R ²	F	df	B	t	Sig
Constant							
Authoritarian parenting	.329	.108	14.032**	3,346	.215	29.568	.000
Authoritative parenting					-	2.756	.006
Permissive parenting					.069	-.892	.373
					.307	5.982	.000

The result shows that parenting styles has significant influence on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC $R = .329$, $R^2 = .108$, $F(3,346) = 14.032$, $P < .01$. The result further reveals that permissive parenting style ($\beta = .307$, $P < .01$) has the most significant independent influence on criminal thinking followed by authoritarian parenting ($\beta = .215$, $P < .01$) while authoritative parenting ($\beta = -.069$, $P > .05$) has no significant independent influence on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. Jointly, the parenting styles accounted for 10.8% of the level of dispersion found on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. Therefore, hypothesis 2 which stated that there will be a significant influence of parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC was accepted.

Test of Hypothesis Three: It stated that there will be a significant joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. This hypothesis was tested using Multiple Regression and the result is presented below.

Table 3: Summary of Multiple regressions showing the joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC

Variables	R	R ²	F	df	B	t	Sig
Constant							
Peer pressure					.877	31.027	.000
Authoritarian parenting	.496	.246	28.127**	4,345	-	7.930	.000
Authoritative parenting					.195	-2.199	.029
Permissive parenting					-	-5.542	.000
					.495	1.534	.129
					.084		

The result presented in the table above reveals that there is significant joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC $R = .496$, $R^2 = .246$, $F(4,345) = 28.127$, $P < .01$. Observation of the result further reveals that 24.6% of the variance found on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC was due to the joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles. Therefore, hypothesis 3 which stated that there will be a significant joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC was accepted.

V. DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

The study investigated influence of peer pressure and parenting style on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC.

Hypothesis One stated that there will be a significant influence of peer pressure on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. This hypothesis was tested using simple linear regression and the result shows that peer pressure has significant influence on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. The study finding supports the studies of Onoyase and Ebeunuwa (2018); Esiri (2016); Szapocznik and Brown (2015); Brown (2014); Obaro (2013); and Okorodudu (2010) whose reports indicated that peer pressure influences criminal behaviour among adolescents.

Hypothesis Two stated that there will be a significant influence of parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. Results shows that parenting style has significant influence on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC this present study is not contrary to that of Kring, Neale, and Johnson (2017); Musyoki (2017); Beaver, Kevin, Schwartz, Joesph, Connolly, Eric, Al-Ghamdi, Said, Kobeisy, and Nezar (2015); whose reports indicated that parenting styles influence criminal behaviour.

Hypothesis Three stated that there will be a significant joint influence of peer pressure and parenting style on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. Results reveals that there is significant joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. Observation of the result on table 4.3 further reveals that 24.6% of the variance found on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC was due to the joint influence of peer pressure and parenting styles. The result of the present study is in concordance with the results of Ashrafa, Madya, Ahmad, and Talib (2019); Nisar, Ullah, Ali, and Alam (2015); and Ajiboye (2015) whose various studies indicated that peer pressure and parenting styles influence criminal behaviours.

VI. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings, the study concluded that:

1. There is a significant influence of peer pressure on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. This means that, peer pressure is a determinant of criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC.
2. Parenting styles significantly influences criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC. This means that, parenting styles has a key role to play on criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC.

3. Finally, peer pressure and parenting styles are determinants of criminal thinking among secondary school students in AMAC.

VII. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the result of this study, the following recommendations are made

1. Effort should be made by the school authority to encourage and educate students to understand people they interact with so that they will not be pressured by bad friends to think or indulge in criminal act.
2. Parents should be made to understand and maintain the styles they bring their children up so that it will help them in relating with their children, so as to free them from been criminal minded.
3. Further studies should be conducted on the same topic in the same or similar setting with larger samples, so as to help in verifying the findings of this study.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahigren, A. Norem, A. Hochauser, M. & Garvin, J. (1982). Antecedents of Smoking Among Pre-Adolescent. *Journal of Drug Education*, 12, 325-340
- [2] Akers, R., & Lee, G. (1996). A Longitudinal Test of Social Learning, Adolescent Smoking. *Journal of Drug Abuse*, 26, 317-343.
- [3] Allen, M., Donohue, W.A., Griffin, A., Ryan, D., & Turner M. M.M. (2003). Comparing the influence of Parents and Peers on the Choice to use Drugs: A meta-analytic summary on literature. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour* 163-186.
- [4] Ashrafa, M.U., Ahmad, A.H.B., & Talib, A.B. (2019). The Role of Parenting and Peer Pressure in the Development of Juvenile Delinquent Behaviour among Higher Secondary School Children in Punjab, Pakistan: A Proposed Framework. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 7, (5).
- [5] Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of Parental Authority. *Developmental Psychology*, 4(1, Part 2).
- [6] Baumrind, D., & Black, A.E. (1967). Socialisation practices associated with dimensions of competence in preschool boys and girls. *Child Development*, 38, 291-327.
- [7] Beaver, K., Schwartz, J. A., Connolly, E. J., Al-Ghamdi, M.S., & Kobeisy, A. N. (2015). The Role of Parenting in the Prediction of Criminal Involvement: Findings from a nationally representative sample of youth and a Sample of adopted youth. *Developmental Psychology*, 51(3) 301-308.
- [8] Beck, A.T. (1976). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. International Universities Press.
- [9] Beck, A.T. (1999). *Prisoners of hate: The cognitive basis of anger, hostility, and violence*. Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.
- [10] Brown, B.B. (2004). Adolescents' relationships with peers. In R.M. Lerner & L. Steinberg (Eds), *Handbook of adolescent psychology*. John Wiley & sons Inc.
- [11] Carlson, A. (2012). How Parents Influence Deviant Behaviour among Adolescent: An Analysis of their Family, Life, their Community and their Peers.
- [12] Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 13(3), 487-496.
- [13] Durkheim, E. (1966). "Suicide: A Study in Sociology Translated by J.A. Spaulding and G. Simpson Trans New York. The Press 1951.
- [14] Esiri, M. & Ejechi, E. (2013). 'Area Boys Syndrome and the Upsurge of Juvenile Delinquency in Nigeria' In *Ethnographer* Vol. 11 No 3. ISSN: 1199-5223. Published by the Niger Delta Research Assessment in Collaboration with the Centre for Niger Delta Studies Niger Delta University, Wilberforce Island.
- [15] Esiri, M. (2016). The Influence of Peer Pressure on Criminal Behaviour. *IOSR Journal Of Humanities And Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)* 21, (1),
- [16] Farrington, D.P (1991). *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health* volume 1. Whurr publishers Ltd.
- [17] Farrington, D. P., Loeber, R., & Howell, J. C. (2012). Young adult offenders: The need for more effective legislative options and justice processing. *Criminology and Public Policy*, 11(4), 729–750.
- [18] Hayes, A. (2020). *Systematic Sampling. Corporate & financial analysis*.
- [19] Igbini, M.D. (2020). Insurgency in Nigeria: The Prognosis and its Effects on the Nigerian Politics. *Danubius Journals* <https://dj.univ-danubius.ro/index.php/JDSR/article/view/567/838>
- [20] Igbinovia, P.E. (2003). The Criminal in all of Us: Whose Ox have we not Taken" An inaugural Lecture Delivered at the University of Benin, November 27th 2003 Benin: University of Benin Press.
- [21] Iyoha, O. (1997). *Sociological and Legal Elements of Deviance*. Benin-City, Nigeria: Goboh Ventures.
- [22] Lapiere, R. T. (1954). 'Attitudes Versus Action' *Social Forces*. Vol. 13
- [23] Lemieux, M.V. (2020). *An Exploration of the Criminal Thinking Processes in Criminal Offenders*. Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection. Walden University.
- [24] Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialisation in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. P. H. Mussen (Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialisation, personality, and social development* (4th ed., pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- [25] Mandracchia, J. T., Morgan, R. D., Garos, S., & Garland, J. T. (2007). Inmate thinking patterns: An empirical investigation. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 34(8), 1029-1043.
- [26] Musyoki, M.Y. (2017). The relationship between parenting style and crime among youths in informal settlement in Hananasif (DAR-ES-SALAAM-TANZANIA).
- [27] Nisar, M., Ullah, S., Ali, M., & Alam, S. (2015). Juvenile delinquency: The Influence of family, peer and economic factors on juvenile delinquents. *Applied Science Reports*, 9(1), 37-
- [28] Obaro, G. A. (2013). 'Predictors and Prevention of Juvenile Delinquency', In *Nigerian South-South. Journal of Social Studies and Civic Education*, Vol. 8(7). Pp 243-255.
- [29] Ogbenor, G. G. (2012). 'Youth Violence in Contemporary Nigerian Society: A Psychological Approach'. In *Journal of the Nigerian Sociological Society*, Vol 2, 53-59.
- [30] Okorodudu, G.N. (2010). Influence of parenting styles on adolescent delinquency in Delta Central Senatorial District Abraka. Publication of institute of education, Delta state.
- [31] Santor, D.A., Messervey, D., & Kusumakar, V. (2020): Measuring Peer Pressure, Popularity, and Conformity in Adolescent Boys and Girls: Predicting School Performance, Sexual Attitudes, and Substance Abuse. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*.
- [32] Szapocznik, J. & Brown, B. (2015). The Extent and Effects of Peer Pressure among High School Students: A Retrospective Analysis. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 121-123.
- [33] Ukoji, V. N. (2006); A Study of Crime Reporting in Nigeria
- [34] Walters, G. D. (1990). *The criminal lifestyle: Patterns of serious criminal conduct*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- [35] Yochelson, S. & Samenow, S.E. (1976). *The criminal personality, volume I: A profile for change*. Northvale, New Jersey: Jason Aronson, Inc.
- [36] Yochelson, S. & Samenow, S.E. (1977). *The criminal personality, volume II: The change process*. New York: Jason Aronson.