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ABSTRACT

The study explored the relationship between variables of Goals of Misbehavior and Perceived Parental Treatment among children with behavioral problems. A purposive sample of 50 identified misbehaving children (boys) of English medium schools of Islamabad were selected. The study assumed a positive correlation between goals of misbehavior and perceived parental hostility, while negative correlation between goals of misbehavior and perceived parental supportiveness. Two scales Goals of Behavior Inventory (Manly, 1986), consisting of 16 items with four subscales: (attention, power, revenge inadequacy) and perceived Parental Inventory (Lovejoy, 1999), consisting of 20 items with two subscales: (hostility, supportive) were used to measure these variables. Kurder-Richardson reliability (KR-20) was found to be 0.65, P< .01 for Goals of Behavior Inventory and alpha coefficient reliability for Perceived Parental Inventory was 0.82, p < .01. The results indicated that there is a positive correlation between GBI and PPI (r =0.18). With regards to the first hypothesis of the study a positive correlation between perceived parental hostility scale and goals of behavior inventory was seen. Contrary to the second hypothesis, a positive correlation was found between goals of behavior inventory and perceived parental support. The study further proposed that individuals scoring high on goals of misbehavior inventory will score high on perceived parental hostility scale as to low scorers. Moreover, it was also hypothesized that ends scoring high on GBI will score low on perceived parental supportive scale as compared to low scorers. t –test analysis showed non results. Mean scores of the dimension of GBI showed that Attention (M = 2.18) is the major cause of misbehavior.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In our everyday life we come across many complaints about young children regarding their behavior from parents, friends, siblings, and especially from teachers about students who are difficult to manage and create problems in schools. Such children are seen as disruptive, wirily, rude, going against authority or misbehaving children. The most common trigger for misbehavior is a threat to self-esteem and low achievement. The second trigger for misbehavior is boredom. Broadly, misbehavior consists of fighting, teasing, building and disruptive behavior in school and at home [1]. According to Daniels, misbehaving children exhibit “actions inappropriate to the particular setting or the violation of the group norm” thus, what actions come under the umbrella of “misbehavior” or what is called disruptive behavior lies in the eye of the beholder and each teacher/person will have this or her own idea of what constitutes misbehavior [2].

Goals of misbehavior are goals that a child has developed from his experiences with his parents and their subsequent harsh treatment. Their goal “misbehavior” is reflected in their everyday behavior. They believe that no matter what they do, their parents will treat them badly, so they develop a goal of teasing their parents by behaving badly. The four goals of misbehavior are Attention, Power, Revenge, and Display of Inadequacy [3]. School is perhaps the obvious place where misbehavior of children is most obvious. Another study found that school teachers conceive misbehavior as “behavior that proves unacceptable to teacher.”[4] Research for many years has failed to provide any conclusive evidence suggesting the effect of corporal punishment to discipline children [5]. According to Charlton and David, such school children have an emotional profile which shows they easily reduce to tears, are prone to outbursts of anger or tantrums and are seen isolated form rest of group moreover they suffer more physical self-abuse and cannot express feelings. Study shows that there are different types of verbal, nonverbal school misbehaviors along with difficulties in personality organisation which includes truants from school, arriving late, leaving coat on and failing to bring books or equipment [6].

Parents are the universal social institution within which the rearing and care of children are based and where cultural and traditional beliefs and values are transmitted to the young.

The development of both healthy and disturbed personalities are explained through earlier life experiences [7]. As it has been seen from previously quoted research that positive relationship between the parent and the child fosters positive feelings, which serve as the basis for normal social development and acceptable behavior. On the contrary, parent rejection places a child at a greater risk for disruptive behavior. Numerous investigators have implicated parenting or children’s temperament in the development of children’s adjustment and social competence [8]. Parenting behavior has found to mediate between children’s temperament and their problem behavior [9]. There is mounting evidence that parent’s expression of emotion is related to their children’s socio emotional competence [10]. Parents high in warmth or positive emotion and low in negativity in interactions with their children have children who display increased social competence and social understanding and decreased levels of hostility, externalizing problems, and internalizing problems [11].

Research shows warm, accepting and supportive parents tend to have children who are socially better adjusted and competent. Whereas rejecting and authoritarian parents produces disruptive behavior in children. Babree, in his study in Pakistan found a positive correlation between aggressive children and their perceived parental treatment. However, most of the researches conducted concerning the relationship between parent-child and the subsequent consequences i.e., disruptive behaviors have been carried out abroad. It is therefore, imperative or in fact a necessity to conduct researches of the same nature in Pakistan [12].

Our study aims to assess whether parental behaviors in Pakistan has the same effect on a child’s disruptive behavior and to what extent and what are the other major factors underlying such behaviors. Hence, this study is aimed at determining the relationship between parental treatment and the goals of misbehavior in Pakistan. Therefore, in the present study the parental behavior and goals of misbehavior among children are studied to ascertain whether postulates derived from western theory of development are generalizable in Pakistan or not.

2. METHODS

Objective of the Study

The present study is an observational study which aims at exploring the relationship between parental
Part 1 Instruments

Goals of Misbehavior Inventory
Goals of Misbehavior Inventory is a scale developed by Manly (1986) [13], to determine which of the four mistaken goals of behavior is basic to a child's misbehavior. Frank Wickers made some minor changes in this inventory, which will also be used in the present study. The title has been changed to goals of behavior, to avoid the negative connotation of ‘misbehavior’. The sentences as presented by Manly were numbered as originally presented. Children respond by indicating which of the sentences is 'true' for them. The initials pertaining to the four goals are: A = Attention; P = Power; R = Revenge; I = Inadequacy.

The questionnaire consist of total 16 questions which cover 4 goals of misbehavior question no 8. 10. 11, 16 represent the attention goals, 1. 4. 13, 15 represent the power goals, 3, 5, 7, 12 represent the revenge goals and 1, 2, 6, 9, 14 represent the inadequacy goals. Score of each individual ranges from 0 to 16 with a Yes/No rating scale. ‘Yes' response scored as '1' and ‘No' response scored as '0'.

Parent Behavior Inventory
The Parent Behavior Inventory has been developed by Lovejoy, Weis, O'Hare, and Ruben (1999) [14], Northern Illinois University.

The PBI's two independent scales, Supportive/Engaged and Hostile/Coercive, have sufficient content validity, show adequate internal consistency and test-retest reliability, and relate to measures of parental affect. Parental stress and child behavior problems. (Lovejoy. et at.1999).

It consists of twenty questions. 1. 3. 5.7,9,13,15,17,19,20, measure, hostile/coercive factor and 2,4,6,8,10,11,12,14,16,18, measure the factor supportive engage.

The correlation between the two factors was -.23 (p < .05). Alpha was .81 for the Hostile/Coercive Scale and .83 for the Supportive/Engaged Scale. The average inter item correlation was .32 for the Hostile/Coercive Scale, with a range of .09 to .52: the average inter item correlation was .36 for the Supportive/Engaged Scale, with a range of .13 to .58. The total items in PBI are 20. Score of each individual ranges from 20 to 100. It is a 5 point rating scale, from (5) strongly agree to (1) strongly disagree.

Part II Implementation

Sample
For the main study, a sample of 50 students specifically boys was selected. Only those boys were selected who were identified with misbehavior in the classroom by their class teachers. The age range was 10-12 years and education level was 5th and 6th grade. The sample was drawn from different English medium public private schools of Islamabad and Rawalpindi.

Procedure
The teachers were asked to identify those children who showed bad behavior in the classroom. The teachers were briefed that all those students who break rules, fight, tease, bully do not complete their homework and who disturb and pay no attention to the teacher were categorized as children who show misbehavior. The misbehavior identified children were approached individually. The two questionnaires were handed to them together, students were requested to respond candidly to each item of the two scales. The instructions written on the questionnaires were once again explained to the respondents to tell them how to fill the questionnaire. Students were allowed to ask if there was any confusion. They were assured that information provided by them will be kept confidential and will be used only for research purposes. At the end of data collection all participants were thanked for their cooperation. The data collected was statistically analyzed to assess the psychometric properties of the two scales. In addition, in order to assess the hypothesis t-test was computed and correlational analysis was done.

3. RESULTS

The main purpose of the study was to explore the relationship between goals of misbehavior and perceived parental treatment among children with behavior problems. And also to investigate which factor of the goals of misbehavior occur most. In part II of the study, both scales (GBI and PPI) total and subscales reliability was computed on the main study sample. The score of all the four subscales were significantly correlated with the total GBI score with P <0.01 and the subscale score were significantly highly correlated with total. The results shows that there is a positive correlation association between the GBI and PPI scale and their subscales, except the GBI
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Table 1: Correlation between total and subscales of GBI and PPI (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales of GBI</th>
<th>GBI Total</th>
<th>Inadequacy</th>
<th>Revenge</th>
<th>Power</th>
<th>Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPI total</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td><strong>.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>.19</strong></td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td><strong>.05</strong></td>
<td><strong>.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05

T-test mean and standard deviation were also computed to show the comparison between the high and low scores of GBI and PPI and its subscale. The results shows that Goals of Behavior Inventory, the sub dimension “attention” is the most common reason for which children misbehave (M = 2.18, SD = 1.17). The mean score of PPI is (M = 87) which shows that perceived parental behavior is highly influencing children’s behavior. The mean value of supportive factor is higher than the mean value of hostility factor.

Table 2: Means, Standard deviations, and t-values of the scores of GBI and PPI and its subscales (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High GBI Scores</th>
<th>Low GBI Scorers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GBI Total</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td><strong>.09</strong></td>
<td><strong>.19</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td><strong>.05</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td><strong>.07</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05

Table 2 shows that on Goals of Behavior Inventory, the sub dimension attention is the most common reason for which children misbehave (M= 2.18, SD=1.17). The reliability estimation of the scale was determined and it were computed of the total Goals of Behavior Inventory which were 0.65 and indicated in Table 3.

Table 3: Kuder-Richardson (KR-20) Reliability estimates of total GBI and its subscales (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscales GBI</th>
<th>Total GBI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequacy</td>
<td>.689**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>.430**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power</td>
<td>.793**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention</td>
<td>.720**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

Table 3 shows that the scores of all the four subscales were significantly correlated with the total GBI scores. The Kuder-Richardson (KR-20) reliability of the inventory showed adequate internal consistency (0.65, p < .01). that is, Goals of Behavior Inventory (16 items) is an adequately reliable measure despite the fact that it is a multi-dimensional scale.

Table 4: Alpha Reliability Coefficient of PPI and its subscales (N = 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Alpha Reliably</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPI total and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subscales</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPI total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supportive</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.84**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01

All the alpha reliability coefficient shows that the PPI items and its subscales have statistically significant internal consistency.

The second instrument, which was used to determine the parental treatment was Perceived Parental Inventory (Lovejoy, 1999). The minimum score is 20 and the maximum score can be 100, the alpha reliability of the inventory showed high internal consistency (.82, p < .01).

The results shows that on Goals of Behavior Inventory (manly, 1986) the factor attention is the main cause of misbehavior (M = 2.18, SD – 1.17). The mean value
of supportive factor is higher than the mean value of hostility factor.

4. DISCUSSION

Many possible causes of school misbehavior have been put forward. The Pack Report outlined possible causes as being: early maturation, raising school-leaving age, unsettlement, dislike of secondary provision, teacher shortage, high staff turnover, teachers who cannot cope [15]. An interesting study (Reybekill, 1988) asked pupils with bad behavior and teachers to give explanations for disruptive behavior and truancy. Pupils with disruptive behavior felt that individual teacher and their teaching styles were the reason for their behavior [16]. Teachers, on the other hand, blamed the pupils, their families and their peers. Neither teacher nor pupils with disruptive behaviors were willing to acknowledge their own role in the problem.

Ogilvy (1994) argues that the difficulty with discussing causation is that this line of enquiry often seeks to find single explanations for the behavior. These explanations can see the child, the home, or school as being the cause. He argues that such as linear explanation is not helpful, as it tends to simplify a very complex situation. An interactional or systemic approach is needed [17].

A large number of investigations have shown that the children’s social and emotional development and cognitive competencies are influenced by the quality of the instruction they receive from their parents and their parental treatment. Parents serve as significant interpreters for children of information about the world [18].

The parental treatment or emotions parents express indicates to children what goals their parents’ value and how they are supposed to act [19]. When parents are warm and supportive with their children, children are likely to believe that their parents are concerned with their interests, and consequently, such children are motivated by feeling of trust reciprocity. Thus, children are likely to comply with demands for self-regulation [20]. If parental treatment is good and parents tend to be supportive with their children in stressful situations, their children may be less likely to become over aroused in those situations and better able, and more motivated, to process parents’ messages and other relevant information. As a consequence, such children are likely to be relatively skilled at managing this emotion and behavior and at identifying parents’ goal and expectation [19].

Familial issues has identified heightened risk factor with family environment [21]. In addition one of major family factors related to children’s misbehavior/disruptive behavior, the most pertinent seems to be parent-child interaction and parental modes of discipline and parental treatment.

5. CONCLUSION

Keeping in view the traditions and values of the Pakistani culture, the family has a greater impact on the personality of an individual. Western culture emphasizes/promotes individual autonomy and freedom of choice whereas our culture emphasizes on obedience to elders and lack of independence. A few studies which have dealt with parental control reported that authoritarian personalities play an important role in children's maladjustment [22]. However, in most studies parents are the main source of data. Such a research can suggest better child rearing practices, along with techniques to overcome misbehavior of children especially in homes and schools.

This research is one of its first kinds being conducted in Pakistan. It is an attempt to initiate such kind of research, since 'misbehavior' of children is a very important problem of our society which has been neglected to a great extent. It is not taken as a serious problem, though it is of vital importance in disrupting the personality of a child and needs to be identified and solved immediately. This study gives an insight in identifying misbehaved children and as a result the major reasons behind this misbehavior was identified.

6. LIMITATIONS

Like other researches in the social sciences, the present research also has encountered with quite a number of limitations. These limitations were mainly either related to the sample, the variables which were studied in the research or the instruments used in the study. The sample was quite homogeneous as only misbehaved boys (and not misbehaved girls) were taken, so its findings can be generalized to this population only. The identified misbehaved children were difficult to deal with because of their vulnerability to lie in case of disclosure of their responses to their parents. Although they were assured by the researcher about the confidentiality of their responses. It was observed during data collection that many children were in a highly suggestible and uncooperative psychological state.
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