

PARENTING STYLES AND ENTERPRISE
POTENTIAL AMONG ADOLESCENTS

Chiyem Lucky Nwanzu

Department of Psychology, Delta State University, Abraka.

ABSTRACT

Childhood experience is widely documented to influence behaviour in later stages of development, and parents in its generic sense are at the centre of the experience. This study examined whether parenting styles differ in their influence on enterprise potential, and what influence gender has on experience of parenting styles and on degree of enterprise potential of adolescents. Two hundred and eleven undergraduates of a State-owned university in south-south Nigeria participated in the study. The sample comprised of 101 males and 110 females, with mean age of 21 years and a standard deviation of 2.37. The design of the study was cross-sectional and data were collected through self-report measure. Data analyses revealed significant parenting style difference in enterprise potential among adolescents $F(2,178) = 2.97, p < .05$. No significant gender difference in experience of authoritative $t_{(103)} = .64, p > .05$, authoritarian $t_{(47)} = .42, p > .05$ and permissive $t_{(55)} = .43, p > .05$ parenting styles of adolescents were observed. Also, no significant gender difference in enterprise potential was observed $t_{(209)} = .26, p > .05$. Based on the results It was concluded that the authoritative parenting style has the most significant influence on the enterprise potential of Nigerian adolescents.

Keywords: parenting styles, enterprise potential, and adolescents

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Chiyem Lucky Nwanzu, PhD, Department of Psychology, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria. Email: nwanzuchiyem@gmail.com

Among the very few issues that scientific method and other sources of knowledge (common sense, authority, and personal experience) are in much

agreement is that childhood experience counts much in adulthood. A child's early home environment and the skills learned in the first three years have been linked to high school graduation, teen parenthood, and adult employment and earnings (Duncan, Ziol-Guest & Kalil, 2010). Two interacting forces, nature and nurture are widely implicated to determine the child early life experience. Nature is represented by instincts and genetic factors, while nurture indicates social influences. The acknowledgement of the interaction of genetics and environment in the development of individual personality is historical. It is noticeable in the works of ancient philosophers such as Plato, Aristotle, Locke and Descartes, and in comparatively recent time, Freud's psychodynamic theory typified every theoretical undertaking that linked early childhood experience to adult personality.

In the myriads of factors that fall within the coverage of nurture as an influence in a child early stage of development, the parent ranked among the most impactful. Parent is an inclusive word that refers to one who begets, gives birth to, or nurtures and raises a child. (American Heritage Publishing Company (1992). Therefore, parenting is the process or state of being a parent and it includes nourishing, protecting, and guiding the child through the course of development (Brooks, 1991). It is the activities of parents with an aim of helping their child to bring forth (Gafoor, & Kurukkan, 2014). Difference in how parent(s) raised their child is captured in the term parenting styles. A concept Darling and Steinberg (1993) defined as the emotional climate in which parents raised their

children. Inclusively, parenting styles represent constellations of parental attitudes, values, practices and non-verbal expressions that characterized the nature of parent-child interactions across diverse situations (Glasgow, Dornbusch, Troyer, Steinberg & Ritter, 1997). This inclusive approach merged the concepts of parenting style and parenting practices. Distinctively, parenting styles indicates child raising climate, while parenting practices are specific behaviours that parents use to socialize their children (Darling& Steinberg, 1993). However, parenting style largely influences parenting practices.

A number of models exist on parenting style. These include responsiveness and unresponsiveness (Freud, 1933), democratic and autocratic (Baldwin, 1948), restrictive and permissive (Becker, 1964), authoritative, authoritarian, permissive and negligent (Baumrind1967, 1971, 1991), indulgent, authoritarian, authoritative and uninvolved (Maccoby & Martin, 1983),acceptance/involvement, firm control, and psychological autonomy granting (Steinberg, Mounts, Lamborn, & Dornbusch, 1991), autonomy granting, demandingness and responsiveness (Lefebvre, 2004), warmth, rejection, structure, chaos, autonomy and support, and coercion (Skinner, Johnson, & Snyder, 2005), indifference, abuse and over control (Black Dog Institute, 2016).Implicit in the models, parental behavior mainly involves two related issues (responsiveness and demandingness). Parental responsiveness refers to the extents to which parents intentionally foster individuality, self-regulation and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive and acquiescent to children special needs

and demands. This dimension is assessed by the level of warmth, reciprocity, and clear communication and person-centered discourse exhibited by a parent when dealing with a child. Parental demandingness refers to the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family whole, by their maturity demands, supervision, disciplinary efforts and willingness to confront the child who disobeys (Baumrind, 1971; Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

In Nigerian, as it is in a number of developing countries, one of the widely proposed interventions for the soaring rate of unemployment among youths is entrepreneurship (Akanbi, 2013; Mwangi & Ngugi, 2014). According to Dabson (2007) entrepreneurship has become an article of faith, reflecting a confidence and certainty that its facilitation will lead to positive economic outcomes. Entrepreneurship is any attempt to create a new business enterprise or to expand an established business or the processes of starting and continuing to expand new businesses (Hart 2003; Zacharakis, Bygrave, & Shepard 2000, as cited in Dabson, 2007). It is the process of doing something new and something different for the purpose of creating wealth for the individual and adding value to society (Kao, 1999). A foundational and fundamental aspect of entrepreneurship is enterprise potential. The concept of enterprise potential is a phrase of two words. Enterprise refers to the activity of starting and running businesses; the willingness to undertake new ventures, while potential denotes capability of being, but not yet in existence; likely to develop into a particular type of person or thing in the future (American Heritage Publishing Company, 1992; Longman

Publishers, 2009). Consequently, enterprise potential expresses a latent ability and quality possessed by the individual that relate to activity of starting and running businesses. Individuals with enterprise potential have the possibility, capability, or power to own business.

That childhood experience counts much in adulthood implicitly or explicitly underlies studies that examined parenting styles as antecedent (e.g. Avolio, Rotundo & Walumbwa, 2009). However, while some variables such as academic achievement (Yasmin & Kiani, 2015), emotional intelligence (Mohamadyari, 2013), delinquent behaviour (Terry, 2004), locus of control, (Keshavarz, Baharudin, SitiNor, & Jopei, 2012) have been widely studied along with parenting styles, there is dearth of study on parenting styles and enterprise potential. Although, a few studies exist on parenting styles and entrepreneurial orientation and entrepreneurial intention (e.g. Kaur, 2011; Tenibiaje, 2010), these latter concepts are essentially different from enterprise potential. Consequently, the problem statement of this study is whether parenting styles have significant impact on enterprise potential, whether gender has significant influences on experience of parenting styles and degree of enterprise potential among adolescents. This problem was examined with Baumrind's (1967) and Athayde's (2009) models of parenting styles and enterprise potential respectively.

The Baumrind's model of parenting styles has three dimensions that covered authoritarian, permissive and authoritative. The authoritarian parenting

style is characterized by the adoption of unusually high expectations of conformity and compliance with rules for children. The permissive parenting style enforces very few rules or boundaries, allowing children to dictate their own life affairs, make their own choices, and out rightly refuse compliance with the choices of others, without regard or consequences. The authoritative parenting style places limits and controls on children's behaviour; however, it allows for them to engage in extensive communication with their parents (Giselle, 2015). Consequently, an authoritarian parent gives strict rules to the children with little discussion of the reason for the rules. The permissive parent gives the child few rules and rarely punishes misbehaviour. And the authoritative parent is an authority figure to the child, but provides good explanations for all rules and freely discussed them with the child (Lahey, 2003). Parents that are high in responsiveness are thought to be authoritative or permissive. Parents that are low in responsiveness are characterized as authoritarian. Parents with high demandingness are widely characterized as either authoritarian or authoritative, while those with low levels of demandingness are characterized as permissive.

Athayde's (2009) model of enterprise potential comprises five dimensions (creativity, intuition, leadership, personal control and achievement motivation). Creativity is the process of developing novel ideas that can be put into action; it is closely linked to innovation, as it also involves the application of ideas (DuBrin, 2012). Intuition is an experience-based way of knowing or reasoning in which weighing and balancing evidence are done unconsciously and automatically. It

is also a way of arriving at a conclusion without using the step-by-step logical process (DuBrin, 2012). Leadership is the process of influencing others to understand and agree about what needs to be done and how to do it, and the process of facilitating individual and collective efforts to accomplish shared objectives (Yukl, 2006). Personal control (Locus of control) is the extent to which people believe events are within their control. Individuals who feel that they are very much in charge of their own destiny have an internal locus of control. Individuals who think that events in their life are due mainly to fate, luck, or powerful others have an external locus of control (McShane & Von Glinow, 2008). Achievement motivation is the drive to work with diligence and vitality, to constantly steer toward targets, to obtain dominance in challenging and difficult tasks and create a sense of achievement as a result (Bigge & Hunt, 1980, as cited in Singh, 2011).

Empirical Review

The empirical literature is inundated with studies on parenting styles and the various dimensions of enterprise potentials. Tenibiaje (2010) investigated personality traits, parenting styles and interest as precursors to successful entrepreneurial skills within the Nigerian environment and reported among other findings that authoritative parenting influenced entrepreneurial success of

youths. However, it is not clear whether this result was from descriptive or inferential statistics as there was inconsistency in statistical tools reported in the abstract and result section of the paper. Kaur (2011) studied the relationship between three dimension of parenting styles along with other variables and entrepreneurial orientation among adolescents pursuing graduation course and reported that authoritative parenting style has high significant positive relationship with entrepreneurial orientation; authoritarian parenting style has high negative significant relationship with entrepreneurial orientation, while permissive parenting style has no relationship with entrepreneurial orientation. Yordanova and Tarrazon (2010) studied gender differences in entrepreneurial intention and observed that women have lower entrepreneurial intention than men and that the gender effect on entrepreneurial intentions was fully mediated by perceived behavioural control and partially moderated by perceived subjective norms and attitudes towards entrepreneurship. Dabic, Darm, Bayraktarogiu, Novak and Basic (2012) observed that female students were less willing to start their own business than male students. Malach-Pinesand Schwartz (2008) observed few gender differences in entrepreneurial traits and values, and large gender differences in the willingness to start a business among management students and smaller differences among students who intend to start a business.

Fearon and Saxon (2013) examined the relationship between parenting styles and creativity among a sample of Jamaican students and their parents and

reported that the authoritarian style of parenting was the most salient predictor of creativity in children and that this relationship was negative. Miller, Lambart and Neumeister (2012) explored the potential relationships among perceived parenting style, perfectionism, and creativity in a high-ability and high-achieving young adult population and observed positive relationships between permissive parenting style and creativity, and negative relationships between authoritarian parenting style and creativity. Yasmin and Kiani (2015) examined the relationship between parenting styles and students' academic performance of students of higher secondary level along with their parents and reported that the authoritative parenting style of mother and father had a positive relationship with academic performance, while the authoritarian and permissive parenting style of mother and father were negatively correlated with academic performance. Hassan and Sen (2015) investigated the relationship between parenting styles and academic performance among undergraduates in Malaysia and observed significant negative relationship between authoritarian parenting style and undergraduates' academic performance, but no significant relationship between academic performance and the other two parenting style, which were authoritative and permissive parenting styles. Parenting styles and children's temperament were related to children's academic achievement. Sociable children had higher academic performance and children who experienced authoritarian parenting showed lower academic achievement (Hsieh, 1998). Authoritarian and authoritative parenting styles made significant contributions to students'

academic achievement and achievement goal orientation partially mediated the influence of parenting style on academic achievement (Obi & Okeke, 2014).

Fenton (2015) examined the relationship between the five factor personality model, parental psychological control, and emergent leadership behaviors in emerging adults. The researcher observed that parental psychological control was not significantly related to affective-identity motivation to lead, leadership self-efficacy, or leadership position. Keshavarz, Baharudin, Siti-Nor and Jopei (2012) study the relationships between perceived parenting styles and locus of control, and the moderating role of family income in the relationship using school-going adolescents and observed that paternal authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles were significantly related to internal locus of control. McClun and Merrel (1998) examined the relationship between adolescents' perceptions of their parents' responsiveness and demandingness, adolescents' locus of control orientation, and adolescents' self-efficacy rating among students and observed that participants who perceived their parents as being authoritative had a significant more internal locus of control orientation than subjects who perceived their parents as either permissive or authoritarian. In a study on parental authority, parent-child relationship and gender differences among students, Tam, Lee, Kumarasuriar and Har (2012) reported that male participants rated both parents as significantly more authoritarian and permissive than their female participants. In a study on gender differences in perceived parenting styles and socio-emotional adjustment of

athletes, Kausar and Shafique (2008) observed that boys compared to girls, perceived their parents more authoritative. Brand, Gerber, Beck, Kalak, Hatzinger, Puhse and Holsboer-Trachsler (2011) reported that perceived parenting styles differ between males and females, with females reporting higher scores for positive (support, commendation) and lower scores for negative (reproach, restriction, inconsistency) parenting styles. The ratings and perception of the participants indicate their experience of parenting styles.

Literature on parenting styles has three obvious features. First, although a number of models exist on parenting styles, Baumrind's (1967) model dominates the literature. Perhaps, this is because it is the first to be empirically derived and very inclusive. Second, a number of scales (e.g. Gafoor, & Kurukkan, 2014; Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979) exist on parenting styles, but among all Buri's (1989) Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) received most adoption in parenting styles studies (e.g. Keshavarz, Baharudin, Siti Nor, & Jopei, 2012; Yasmin, & Kiani, 2015). This is not unexpected as the scale was developed on the most adopted (Baumrind's) model of parenting style. The wide adoption could also be because the scale has moderate number of items (30), and has received wide satisfactory psychometric properties reports. Third, statistical test of relationship (e.g. correlation and regression) were largely adopted in the studies on parenting styles (e.g. Obi & Okeke, 2014; Yasmin, & Kiani, 2015). Relationship statistics tests basically imply both what is at present and what would be, but more indicative of what would be. This feature is both a strength

and weakness for such statistical tests. It is a strength if at least one of the variables being examined is still increasing; a weakness if all the variables being examined are no longer increasing. Finally, among the dimensions of the Burnmind's models, authoritative parenting dimension appeared to be mostly linked to the outcomes desired by the society. As Lahey (2003) noted "research clearly indicate that children whose parents adopt an authoritative style are better behaved, more successful, and happier than the children of parents who used other styles of discipline". Supporting Lahey from the opposite side, Bornstein and Bornstein (2007) remarked that "although authoritarian and permissive parenting styles appear to represent opposite ends of the parenting spectrum, neither style has been linked to positive outcomes"

Hypotheses

- 1 There is significant parenting style difference in enterprise potential among adolescents.
- 2 There is a significant gender difference in the experience of parenting style among adolescents.
- 3 There is a significant gender difference in enterprise potential among adolescents.

Method

Participants

Two hundred and eleven regular students (Fresher) who registered for Introduction to Psychology course in a State-owned university located in south-south Nigeria were sampled for the present study. In parenting style literature, sampling undergraduate population is a common feature. The participants comprise 101(48%) males and 110(52%) females, 75(47%) orthodox churches, 84(52%) pentecostal churches, 159(77%) urban area, and 45(23%) rural area. Their mean age was 21 years and the standard deviation was 2.37. Seventy-six percent of the participants were raised by both parents, 9% by father, 6% by mother and 9% by other relatives. The participants were all of single marital status.

Instrument

Buri's (1991) 30-item Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ) was used to measure the student's experience of the three dimensions of the parenting styles. Parental Authority Questionnaire was developed on Baumrind's (1967) model of parenting styles. As indicated earlier, the model has three dimensions (authoritarian, permissive and authoritative). A number of previous researchers (e.g. Kaur, 2013; Keshavarz, Baharudin, SitiNor, & Jopei, 2012) who adopted the scale reported satisfactory psychometric properties. The present researcher's test of Cronbach's alpha on the three dimensions (authoritarian, permissive and authoritative) of the scale yielded the following coefficient alpha .80, .73 and .64 respectively. Athayde's (2009) 18-item scale developed on enterprise potential among youth was adopted in this study. The scale consists of five dimensions

(creativity, personal control, achievement motivation, intuition, and leadership). On the development of the scale, overall Cronbach alpha of .82 was reported. However, Cronbach's alpha of .93 was observed in the present study. Six-point Likert method of summated rating scale (6-strongly agree, 5-moderately agree, 4-agree, 3-disagree, 2-moderately disagree and 1-strongly disagree) was adopted. Assurance of anonymity and confidentiality were clearly stated in the covering letter attached to the questionnaire. The covering letter included the phrase "there is no right or wrong answer" that aimed at urging the participants to respond as honestly as possible. For the two measures, scores were computed by averaging each participant's response to the scale items.

Procedure

The participants received the research questionnaires in their lecture halls. The distribution of the questionnaire followed convenience sampling techniques, as only those who attended class on the two occasions the questionnaires were distributed constituted the research sample. The present researcher, who was the lecturer of the course, introduced to the participants a post graduate candidate as the owner of the questionnaire. The participants were requested to offer assistance to the post graduate student by responding to the questionnaires. In the two occasions of distribution, the students enthusiastically received, filled and returned the questionnaires. The post-graduate candidate was introduced as the owner of the questionnaire because of possible bias that

might come from the participants if they were aware that their course lecturer owned the study.

Design and Statistics

A cross sectional research design was adopted. This is so as data were collected at one point in time. Parenting styles were assessed through the participants' experience. That is, the participants reported their parenting experience. This approach has two admirable features. It gathered information on parenting style from those (adolescents) who experienced it, rather than those (parents) who dispensed it. It is most likely that those who experienced would have a better and more reliable account of the situation than those who dispensed. The approach is also economical (both material and financial) as it required only the children (no parent) to provide information on parenting styles and other variables in the study. Participants were grouped into authoritative, authoritarian or permissive parenting style in terms of the parenting style they had the highest score. Statistical tests of difference (analysis of variance and t-test) were adopted in the present study. Test of skewedness (enterprise potential scores -5.49, authoritarian parenting style scores -5.50, authoritative parenting style scores -5.49, and permissive parenting style scores -5.49) indicated that the population of the study was normally distributed. Interval scaling was achieved with the adoption of the Likert scaling format. Although placing Likert rating scale format at the interval level of measurement is controversial (Jamieson, 2004; Norman, 2010) it is still widely accepted in the

behavioural sciences. Statistical Packages for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20 was used for data analysis. As the F -ratio results from Levene's test of equality of variance for all the tested hypotheses were significant at .05, "equal variance not assumed" statistics were adopted from the SPSS outputs. However, both ANOVA and t-test are robust tests. Ellis's (2010) recommendation on effect size (η^2) calculation was adopted for analysis of variance, while the online Cohen's d calculator was used for the calculation of effect size for unrelated t-test. Howitt and Cramer's (2011) approach to interpretation of confidence interval were adopted in this study.

Results

Descriptive statistics revealed that the majority of the participants experience authoritative parenting style (50%), followed by authoritarian parenting style (27%) and permissive parenting style (23%). On the average, enterprise potential of the participants was moderate, and males and females had almost the same level (males' mean, 4.14; females mean, 4.11, on a six-point scale). One-way unrelated analysis of variance (Table 1) indicated significant difference in enterprise potential of adolescents that experienced authoritative, authoritarian or permissive parenting, $F(2,178) = 2.97, p < .05, \eta^2 = .03$). Therefore, Hypothesis 1 that stated significant parenting styles difference in enterprise potential among adolescents was accepted. However, Scheffe's test revealed that adolescents that experience authoritative parenting style

differed significantly from those that experienced authoritarian ($p = .046$) and permissive ($p = .048$) parenting styles in enterprise potential. No significant difference was observed in enterprise potential of adolescents that experience authoritative parenting style and those that experience permissive parenting style. Specifically, adolescents that experienced authoritative parenting style had a mean score of 4.32 on enterprise potential, those that experienced authoritarian parenting style ($M = 3.91$) and those that experienced permissive parenting style had a mean score of 3.93. The obtained effect size (η^2) was .03. Applying Cohen's (1988) criteria, the obtained effect size indicated that authoritative parenting style has small and trivial effect on enterprise potential among adolescents.

Table 1
Differences in Enterprise Potential of Adolescents That Experienced Authoritative, Authoritarian or Permissive Parenting style.

Model	Sum of square	Mean square	Df	η^2	Sig
Between Group	4.15	2.07	2	.03	< .05
Within Group	124.38	.70	178		
Total	128.53		180		

Unrelated t-test (Table 2) indicated no significant difference between male and female adolescents in experience of parenting styles, authoritative $t_{(103)} = .64, p > .05$ two-tailed, Cohen's $d = 0.10$; authoritarian $t_{(47)} = .42, p > .05$ two-tailed, Cohen's $d = 0.12$ and permissive $t_{(55)} = .43, p > .05$ two-tailed, Cohen's $d = 0.12$. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 that stated significant gender difference in experience of parenting styles among adolescents was rejected. The difference between mean score of male adolescents experience of authoritative parenting ($M = 4.61, SD = .92$) and the mean score of female adolescents experience of authoritative parenting ($M = 4.72, SD = .82$) was $-.11$. The 95 percent confidence interval for this difference was $-.44$ to $.15$. Since the confidence interval passed through 0.00 , the difference is statistically not significant at two-tailed $.05$ level. The difference between the mean score of male adolescents that experienced authoritarian parenting ($M = 4.40, SD = .94$) and that of female adolescents that experienced authoritarian parenting ($M = 4.30, SD = .69$) was $.10$. The 95 percent confidence interval for this difference was $-.37$ to $.57$. Since the confidence interval passed through 0.00 , the difference is statistically not significant at two-tailed $.05$ level. The difference between mean score of male adolescents experience of permissive parenting ($M = 4.39, SD = .81$) and the mean score of female adolescents experience of permissive parenting ($M = 4.29, SD = .83$) was $.09$. The 95 percent confidence interval for this difference was $-.44$ to $.49$. Since the confidence interval passed through 0.00 , the difference is statistically not significant at the two-tailed $.05$ level. For the three pairs compared in Hypothesis

2, the obtained effect size (Cohen's d) of .10, .12 and .12 indicated that gender has a small, trivial effect on the experience of parenting styles among adolescents.

Table 2

Differences between Male and Female Adolescents in Parenting Styles Experience.

Parenting styles	N	M(SD)	Df	T	Cohen's d	P	95%CI	
							Lower	Upper
Authoritative								
Male	43	4.61(.92)	103	-	0.10	>0.05	-.45	-.23
Female	62	4.72(.82)		6.4				
Authoritarian								
Male	24	4.40(.94)	47	.42	0.12	>0.05	-.37	.57
Female	25	4.30(.69)						
Permissive								
Male	32	4.39(.81)	55	.43	0.12	>0.05	-.34	.53
Female	25	4.29(.83)						

Unrelated t-test (Table 3) indicated no significant difference between male and female adolescents in enterprise potential, $t_{(209)} = .26$, $p > .05$ two-tailed, Cohen's d = 0.12. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 that stated significant gender difference in enterprise potential among adolescents was rejected. The difference between male adolescents mean score on enterprise potential ($M = 4.13$, $SD = .85$) and female adolescents mean score on enterprise potential ($M = 4.11$, $SD = .78$) was $-.03$. The 95 per cent confidence interval for this difference was $-.19$ to $.25$. Since the confidence interval passed through 0.00, the difference

is statistically not significant at two-tailed.05 level. The obtained effect size (Cohen's d) of .12 indicated that gender has a small effect on enterprise potential among adolescents.

Table 3

Difference in Enterprise Potential of Male and Female Adolescents

Enterprise potential	N	M(SD)	Df	T	Cohen's d	P	95%CI	
							Lower	Upper
Male	101	4.13(.85)	209	.26	0.02	>0.05	-.19	.25
Female	110	4.11(.79)						

Discussion

The present study examined whether parenting styles differ in their influence on enterprise potential, and what influence gender has on experience of parenting styles and on degree of enterprise potential of adolescents. The findings (Hypothesis 1) that parenting styles relate differently with enterprise potential among adolescents was as expected and it is in congruent with related extant studies such as Kaur (2013) who reported that authoritative parenting influenced entrepreneurial success of youths, and Tenibiaje (2010) who

observed that authoritative parenting style has high significant positive relationship with entrepreneurial orientation among adolescents. Post hoc tests on the three groups that constituted Hypothesis 1 showed that the difference between the means was in favour of authoritative parenting style. A plausible explanation for this is that compared to the other two dimensions of parenting styles examined, authoritative parenting style allows greater communication and interaction between the parent(s) and the child, and this has implication for greater and better bond that give security and confidence to the child.

The observation that there was no significant difference between male and female adolescents experience of parenting styles was unexpected. This result was contrary to some findings in the extant literature. For instance, Tam, Lee, Kumarasuriar and Har (2012) reported that male participants rated both parents as significantly more authoritarian and permissive than the female participants. Similarly, Brand, Gerber, Beck, Kalak, Hatzinger, Puhse, and Holsboer-Trachsler (2011) reported that perceived parenting styles differ between males and females, females reported higher scores for positive and lower scores for negative parenting styles. A plausible explanation for the result observed in Hypothesis 2 of this study is that, although both personality and environmental factors influence behavior, it is most likely that with regards to an individual parenting style, the influence of personality would dominate that of the environment. And because an individual personality is consistent, it is also most

likely that both male and female children from the same parent would experience the same parenting style.

The observation that there was no significant difference between male and female adolescents in enterprise potential was also unexpected and contrary to the finding from some extant studies. For instance, Yordanova and Tarrazon (2010) reported that women have lower entrepreneurial intention than men. Dabic, Darm, Bayraktarogiu, Novak & Basic (2012) observed that female students were less willing to start their own business than male students. And Malach-Pinesand and Schwartz (2008) observed gender differences in entrepreneurial traits and values, and willingness to start a business among management students. A possible explanation for the result observation in Hypothesis 3 of this study (no significant difference between male and female adolescents in enterprise potential) is the complex modern life of the present time that is de-emphasizing sex-role differences. For all the groups compared, the effect sizes were small with low practical relevance.

The majority of the participants identified with authoritative parenting. On the bases of the extant literature that attributed more positive attributes to authoritative parenting style than the other styles, the above observation is a welcomed trend. Enterprise potential of the participants was moderate; males and females had almost the same level of score on the variable. On the bases of the findings, the following conclusions were reached. First, the effect of authoritative parenting on enterprise potential of adolescent was significantly

different from the effect authoritarian parenting or permissive parenting had on the same variable, and the effect of authoritarian parenting on enterprise potential of adolescent was not significantly different from the effect of permissive parenting on that variable. Second, male and female adolescents differ in their experience of parenting styles. This implies that parent(s) does not adopt different parenting styles for their male or female children. Third, enterprise potential in the sampled adolescents (males and females) was moderately high. This indicates hope for the society as there is potential to explore and harnessed. Finally, most of the adolescents sampled experienced authoritative parenting.

This study is among the first investigating the relationship between parenting styles and enterprise potential of Nigerian adolescents. More studies are therefore recommended to guide appropriate parenting style. In addition, this study is not without limitations. First, as a result of the various groups compared in Hypothesis 2, the study sample size became too low for that comparison, future studies should appropriately increase sample size. Further studies should examine the relationship between locality (urban and rural), home structure (intact and single parent, male single parent, and female single parent), religion and parenting styles. Data were from the participants' recall of their upbringing, relationship with their parents. Such source of information could be contaminated by social desirability bias, which has negative implication for research results. In the midst of these limitations, the study of the relationship between parenting

styles and enterprise potential is relatively new in Nigeria and needs more research work.

References

- Akanbi, T. S. (2013). Familial factors, personality traits and self-efficacy as determinants of entrepreneurial intention among vocational based college of education students in Oyo State, Nigeria. *The African Symposium*, 13, (2), 66-76.
- American Heritage Publishing Company (1992). *The American heritage dictionary of the English Language* (3rded). Boston: Houghton Mufflin.
- Athayde, R. (2009). Measuring enterprise potential in young People *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 481-500.
- Avolio, J. B., Rotundo, M., & Walumbwa, O. F. (2009). Early life experiences as determinants of leadership role occupancy: The importance of parental influence and rule breaking behaviour. *The leadership Quarterly*, 20, 329-342.
- Baldwin, A.L. (1948). Socialization and the parent child relationship. *Child Development*, 19, 127-136.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding: Three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75(1), 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Harmonious parents and their preschool children. *Developmental Psychology*, 4, 99-102.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). Parenting styles and adolescent development. *Journal of Early Adolescence* 11(1) 56-95
- Becker, W.C. (1964). Consequences of different kinds of parental discipline. In M.L. Hoffman & L.W. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of child development research*. New York: Russell Sage.
- Black Dog Institute (2016). Measure of Parental Style (MOPS). Retrieved on 22/06/2016 from www.blackdoginstitute.org.au.

- Bornstein, L. & Bornstein, H. M. (2007). *Parenting Styles and Child Social Development*. Retrieved on 22/04/ 2016 from <http://www.childencyclopedia.com/documents/BornsteinANGxp.pdf>.
- Brand, S. Gerber, M., Beck, J., Kalak, N., Hatzinger, M., Puhse, U., & Holsboer-Trachsler, E. (2011). Perceived parenting styles differ between gender, but not between elite athletes and control, *Adolescent Health, Medicine and Therapeutics*, 2, 9-14.
- Brooks, J. (1991). *The process of parenting* (3rd ed.). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- Buri, J. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 51(1) 110-119.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences* (2nd) Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Dabson, B. (2007). Entrepreneurship as rural economic development policy: A changing paradigm. In N Walzer (ed.) *Entrepreneurship and local economic development*, New York: Lexington Books.
- Dabic, M., Darm, T., Bayraktarogiu, E. Novak, T. & Basic, M. (2012). Gender differences in attitudes of university students towards entrepreneurship: An international survey, *International Journal of Gender and Entrepreneurship*, 4(3), 316-336.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychology Bulletin*. 113: 487–496.
- DuBrin, A. J. (2012). *Essentials of management* (9thed), USA: South-Western.
- Duncan G. J, Ziol-Guest K. M, & Kalil, A. (2010). Early childhood poverty and adult attainment, Behavior and health. *Child Development*, 81, 306–325.
- Ellis, D. P. (2010). *The essential guide to effect sizes: Statistical power, meta-analysis, and the interpretation of research results*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fearon, D. D., Copeland, D. & Saxon, F. T. (2013). The Relationship between parenting styles and creativity in a sample of Jamaican Children, *Creativity Research Journal* (1), 19-128

- Fenton, P. M. (2015). A exploring the relationship between parental psychological control and emergent leadership, Master's thesis, University of Nebraska. USA
- Freud, S. (1933). *New introductory lectures in psychoanalysis*. New York: Norton.
- Gafoor, A. & Kurukkan, A. (2014). Construction and Validation of Scale of Parenting Style, *Guru Journal of Behaviourial and Social Sciences*, 2 (4), 315-323.
- Giselle, F. (2015). *The relationship between parenting style and the level of emotional intelligence in preschool-aged children*, PCOM Psychology Dissertations Paper 341.
- Glasgow, K.L., Dornbusch, S.M., Troyer, L., Steinberg, L., & Ritter, P.L. (1997). Parenting styles, adolescents' attributions, and educational outcomes in nine heterogeneous high schools. *Child Development*, 68, 507_529.
- Hassen, C. N. & Sen, M. H (2015). Relationship between parenting styles and academic performance among undergraduates, University of Putra, Malaysia .*Proceeding of ADVED 15 International Conference on Advances in Education Held in Istanbul, Turkey*
- Howitt, D., & Cramer, D. (2011). *Introduction to SPSS statistics in psychology for version 19 and earlier* (5thed), New York: Pearson.
- Hsieh, C. L. (1998). *Relating parenting styles and children's temperament to behavioral adjustment and academic achievement of Taiwanese children*, Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Tech University, USA.
- Jamieson, S. (2004). Likert scales: How to (Abuse) use them. *Medical Education*, 38, 1212-1218.
- Kaur, K. (2013). *Entrepreneurial orientation: Role of parenting, personality and entrepreneurial exposure*, Doctoral Dissertation, Punjabi University, Patiala. Punjab, India. Retrieved on 23/04/2016 from <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/4475>
- Kao, Y. W. R. (1999). Defining entrepreneurship: past, present and? *Creativity and Innovation Management*, 2 (1), 69-70.

- Kausar, R.& Shafiquen. (2008). Gender differences in perceived parenting styles and socio-emotional adjustment of athletes, *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 23 (3-4), 93-105.
- Keshavarz, S., Baharudin, R., SitiNor, Y., &Jopei, T. (2012). Parenting styles and locus of control: Could family income moderate the link?, *Elixir Psychology* 47, 8643-8647.
- Lahey, B. (1983). *Psychology: An introduction*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Lefebvre, J. E. (2004). *Parenting the preschooler: What's your parenting style?* Retrieved on 21/05/2016 from <http://www.uwex.edu/ces/fip/pp/>
- Longman Publishers (2009). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, Essex, England: Pearson Education
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. Mussen and E.M. Hetherington, (Eds), *Handbook of Child Psychology*, New York: Wiley
- Malach-Pines, A. & Schwartz, D. (2008). Now you see them, now you don't: Gender differences in entrepreneurship, *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 23 (7), 811-832.
- McClun, A. L., & Merrel, W. K. (1998). Examined the relationship of perceived parenting styles, locus of control orientation, and self-concept among junior high age students, *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(4), 381-390.
- McShane, L. S. & Von Glinow, A. M. (2008). *Organizational behavior* (4thed). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Miller, A. Lambart, D., A., & Neumeister, S. K. (2012). Parenting style, perfectionism, and creativity in high-ability and high-achieving young adults, *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, *Journal for the Education of the Gifted*, 35 (4), 344-365.
- Mohamadyari, G. (2013). *The relationship between parental style and emotional intelligence among students of Payamenoor University*, Proceeding of the Global Summit on Education Kuala Lumpur. Malaysia.

- Mwangi, M. M. A & Ngugi, K. (2014). Influence of Entrepreneurial Orientation on Growth of Micro and Small Enterprises In Kerugoya, Kenya. *European Journal of Business Management*, 1 (11), 417-438.
- Norman, G. (2010). *Likert scales, levels of measurement and the "law" of statistics*. *Advances in Health Science Education* 15(5), 625-632.
- Obi I., E., Okeke T., U. (2014). Influence of parenting styles on in-school adolescents achievement goal orientation and academic achievement, *Psychology Research*, 4(5), 364-375.
- Parker, G., Tupling, H., & Brown, L. (1979). A parental bonding instrument. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, 52(1), 1-10.
- Steinberg, L., Mounts, N.S., Lamborn, S. D., & Dornbusch, S. M. (1991). Authoritative parenting and adolescent adjustment across varied ecological niches. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 1, 19-36.
- Skinner, E., Johnson, S. & Snyder, T. (2005). Six dimensions of parenting: A motivational model, *Parenting science and practice*, 5(2), 175–235
- Tam, C-L., Lee, T-H., Kumarasuriar, V., & Har, W-M. (2012). Parental Authority, Parent-child Relationship and Gender Differences: A Study of College Students in the Malaysian Context, *Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences*, 6(2), 182-189.
- Tenibiaje, D.J. (2010). Personality traits, parenting and interest are precursors to successful entrepreneurial skills, *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies (JETERAPS)* 1(1)25-28.
- Terry, D., J. (2004). *Investigating the Relationship between Parenting Styles and Delinquent Behavior*, *McNair Scholars Journal*, 8(1), 85-95.
- Singh, K. (2011). Study of achievement motivation in relation to academic achievement of students, *International Journal of Educational Planning and Administration*. 1(2), 161-171.
- Yasmin, S & Kiani, A. (2015). Role of parenting styles in academic performance of college students <http://www.aiou.edu.pk/pakistan%20journals%5cvol-30%20issue1%202013article3pdf>.

- Yordanova, D. I., & Tarrazon, M., A. (2010). Gender differences in entrepreneurial intention: Evidence from Bulgaria, *Journal of Developmental Entrepreneurship*, 15(3)245-261.
- Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th.ed). New Jersey: Pearson-Prentice.
- Zarbaksh, M., Hassanzadeh, S., Abolghasemi, S., & Dinani, T. P (2012). Relationship between perceived parenting styles and critical thinking with cognitive learning styles, *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(10)10007-10011.