# PREDISPOSING FACTORS TOWARDS RISK-TAKING BEHAVIOURS AMONG IN-SCHOOL ADOLESCENTS IN IBADAN METROPOLIS, OYO STATE, NIGERIA

**ADEYEMI, Adetola O. Ph.D**
Department of Guidance and Counselling,
University of Ibadan, Ibadan.

and

**KOMOLAFE, Temitope Olamide,**
Department of Guidance and Counselling,
University of Ibadan, Ibadan.
E-mail: tollybis@yahoo.com

***ABSTRACT***

*The percentage rate of violence and societal menace rampant in the society today has been recorded to be a by-product of adolescent risk related behaviours. This created an interest in the investigation of predisposing factors towards risk-taking behaviours among in-school adolescents in Ibadan metropolis. The study adopted a correlational research design with a randomly sampled 300 male and female in-school adolescents. Data were collected,using questionnairemeasuring family dynamics (Inventory of parent and peer attachment ($\alpha$=0.78), self-esteem (Rosenburg self-esteem scale ($\alpha$=0.76), school connectedness (Youth transition survey($\alpha$=0.77) and risk-taking behaviour (Youth at-risk and general stability survey($\alpha$=0.82). Three research questions were raised and answered. The data were analysed using Pearson's Product Moment Correlation and Multiple Linear Regression at 0.05 level of significance. Result revealed a positive correlation between risk-taking behaviour and self-esteem and negative correlation with family dynamics and school connectedness.High family dynamics and school connectedness will reduce the likelihood of students engaging in risk-taking behaviours. The result also showed that three predictor variables (family dynamics, self-esteem and school connectedness) are potent predictors of risk-taking behaviour $F_{(3,396)} = 6.875$, $R^2$ 85, $=P<0.001$). The most potent factor was family dynamics, followed by school connectedness and self-esteem. Counseling intervention, such as self-monitoring, peer pressure management, self-regulation, values clarification, and thought-stopping, could help adolescents to withstand the likely effects of low family dynamics, school connectedness and high self-esteem all of which are implicated in this study. Finally, in-school adolescents from a positive family background and a high connection to school may not likely engage in risk-taking behaviours as a result of positive attitude they imbibe both from home and school. School programmes and counselling activities should be channelled towards building students' interest in schooling. Parents are also enjoined to provide social support to the adolescents by showing love, warmth, care and affection.*

**Keywords:** *Family dynamics, Self-esteem, School connectedness and Risk-taking behaviour*

## Introduction

Adolescence is a transitional developmental stage that bridges the gap between childhood and adulthood. This stage is often characterised by stress, storms of life and the battle of identity formation. Adolescence is such a crucial stage because it is neither childhood nor adulthood; it is an essential determinant of the future of any individual. At this stage, adolescents strive to create their world and experience a manifestation of surge in hormones responsible for their aggressive nature. While understanding or even over-estimating the likelihood that an action will result in harm, adolescents may place higher value on the benefits that might come from taking a particular risk.

In the same vein, adolescence is a period for developing independence and responsibility, which is a key part of growing up; adolescents exercise their independence by engaging in risks. Adolescent behaviours are often labelled deviant, rebellious and occasionally just plainly dangerous (Johnson, 2000). This is because adolescents start asserting themselves by demanding rights and privileges and if they are not properly guided and welltrained in behaviour, these dispositions could bring them to conflict with relevant authorities.

To take a risk implies consciously choosing a behaviour that is potentially dangerous to one's physical or mental health and may result in injury, disability, and even death. A lot of activities are included under the phrase "risk-taking" behaviour. Examples of risk-taking behaviours are alcohol and drug consumption and abuse; unsafe sexual behaviour, dangerous vehicle use; school-related problems such as underachievement, failure, and dropping out; anti-social and delinquent behaviours (crime and violence); behaviour associated with accident and injury; running away from home; suicide and suicide attempts. Adolescents' engagement in risk-taking behaviours today may be because they are maturing at a much earlier time in addition to having more risky opportunities that tempt them. Even individuals at late childhood take risks, which is especially worrisome since they are much more vulnerable (Muuss & Porton 1998).

Risk-taking is the most dangerous hazard to adolescents' mental and physical health.Adolescents, however, usually view their risks as bringing them short-term satisfaction, and they do not usually see the potentially harmful consequences their actions can bring.This makes their attitude towards risk-taking most lenient. While risk-taking is viewed as a necessary driver of adolescent development, its hazards are obvious. Adolescents are known to engage in more risk-taking behaviours than children or adults. They are more likely than older or younger individuals to drink alcohol, smoke cigarettes, have casual sex partners, engage in violent and other criminal behaviours, and to involve in fatal or serious automobile crashes, the majority of which are caused by risky driving under the influence of alcohol (Steinberg, 2008).

Irwin & Millstein in Klem & Connell (2004) argued that the mortality rate of 15-25-year-old adolescents has been increasing while the overall mortality rate of humans has been decreasing. Interestingly, adolescent females have about half the mortality rate of adolescent males. A major cause of death among adolescents is accident.These accidents also result to the largest number of non-fatal injuries among adolescents (Milstein, 1986). Therefore, this research examined family dynamics, self-esteem and school connectedness as correlates of disposition towards risk-taking

behaviours among in-school adolescents. It investigated how these three variables affect risk-taking behaviour among adolescents.

Family dynamics, in this study refers to family structure and parenting styles. Family structure comprises nuclear family, extended family, single parenthood and non-marital union such as a male and a female living together as couples without being legally married. Parenting style involves types of methods adopted by parents on how to rear, nurture and impact a child. It could be authoritarian, democratic or uninvolved parenting style. The focus on the family, as a significant domain in this study, warrants increasing attention, given the transformation of family structure that has occurred in recent years all over the world. Over the past three decades, the proportion of children living in non-marital unions has increased substantially (Brown, 2004).

Non-legally married couples which manifest in co-habitation and single parent households, has increased dramatically, and there is no indication that the reduction of this trend is imminent. Based on information from the National Center for Health Statistics, children or child birth from illegally married couples in the U.S. increased from 18% to 40% between 1980 and 2007.And according to the National Vital Statistics Report (2010), it grew to 40.6% in 2008. Adolescents accounted for 22% of child birth from unwed couples which represents 6 of 7 adolescent births (National Vital Statistics Report, 2010).These figures assume more gravity when one considers that, in 1960, 88% of all children lived with both parents, compared to 68% in 2007 (U.S. Census, 2008). Among children under age 18 in 2005, 23% lived with only their mothers, 5% lived with only their fathers, and 4% lived without either parents (Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics, 2006). Children are more likely to be present in the minority than in White cohabiting couple households (67% of Black, 70% of Hispanic, and 35% of White households) (Manning & Bulanda, 2006).

Cohabitation, or "marriage-life," has become a predominant choice in non-marital unions, and an increasing proportion including children (Schimmele, 2010). Co-habitation accounts for at least one half of first unions in the U.S., and almost half of cohabiting couples have children (Bachman, 2004). Compared to marriage, cohabitation represents an "incomplete institution" because it lacks common meaning and predictability. Cohabiting relationships are also more unstable than marriages. It has more conflicts, and more than half of such "marriage" dissolves within five years (Morgan, 2000) and it may result in low self-esteem of an adolescent. This environment is unlikely to provide the stability adolescents need as they search for direction when making transition to adulthood. Cohabiting unions are sufficiently different from marital relationships. Family dynamics (family structure and parenting styles) is an important variable in determining children's behavioural outcomes, particularly, in terms of their connection to school. It is also among the factors considered to have a significant impact on adolescents' decision to engage in risky behaviours.

Family dynamics provides information about the social family environment in which one lives, but the dynamics and relationships supporting the structure are less evident, thereby making it difficult to explain their role in promoting adaptive developmental outcomes (Brown, 2004). It is generally accepted that the best interest of children is served when they reside with both biological parents who are

married to each other because they are more capable of providing the economic and parental resources needed to achieve positive developmental outcomes, such as self-esteem and positive connection to school. The parents' involvements and social support given to their children can motivate them through techniques that promote independent problem-solving, choice and participation in decisions which in a way foster their self-esteem.

It is also important to understand the dynamics of self-esteem and its significance in the family. Self-esteem refers to an individual's sense of his or her value or worth, or the extent to which a person values, approves of, appreciates, prizes, or likes himself or herself (Blascovich & Tomaka, 1991). Self-esteem is a set of attitudes and beliefs that a person brings with himself or herself when facing the world. It includes beliefs as to whether he or she can expect success or failure, how much effort should be put forth, whether failure at a task will "hurt," and whether he or she will become more capable as a result of difficult experiences (Coopersmith, 1981). In basic terms, self-esteem is an internal belief system that an individual possesses about himself or herself. Adolescents with reasonable dose of self-esteem often display risk related behaviour associated with drinking and smoking behaviour.

Coppersmith in Apel and Kaukinen (2008) lists four major factors important in the development of self-esteem. They include the treatment and acceptance received from significant others in life, a person's past successes, the values and aspirations which modify and interpret a person's experiences, and how one responds to devaluation. Self-esteem is described by Coopersmith as a process of integration, where the individual becomes a member of the group and internalises ideas and attitudes as mirror image, via key figures and by observing actions and attitudes. Self-esteem is a form of self-protection as any loss of self-esteem can bring feelings of distress, since the presence of anxiety can minimize ones self-esteem, defenses and allow the maintenance of an idealised image. The events and people that surround the individual have a direct relationship with the development of self-esteem (Diaz, 1984). Literature on self-esteem promotes the outlook of self-esteem as a construct that explains a person's ability to adapt to the environment. The inner balance and stability which each person achieves is directly related to his or her emotions, social relationships, and behaviours (Apel & Kaukinen, 2008).

Beside self-esteem, the family creates a key social environment that promotes compliance to socially sanctioned behaviour. There have, however, been contradictory findings regarding whether family structure is a key explanatory factor in adolescents' sexual activity and other risk-taking behaviours. Based on the literature on psychology and adolescents' development, the parent-child relationship is considered to be a stronger predictor of adolescents' outcomes and the transition to adulthood (Apel & Kaukinen, 2008). Given the unprecedented transformation that has occurred in family structure in recent decades, it is even more imperative to determine if, indeed, empirical evidence suggests that the type of family structure in which adolescents are raised has a stronger association than parent-child relationships concerning their involvement in risky behaviours. It is this premise that informed the need for this research work.

Parental resources also constitute their involvement, autonomy support, and

structure. Involvement reflects parents' active interest in the child, knowledge about the child, and time and resources dedicated to the child-rearing process. Autonomy support pertains to the framework with which parents motivate their children, through techniques that promote independent problem-solving, choice, and participation in decisions. Structure is the extent to which parents provide clear and consistent guidelines, expectations, and rules for behaviour because children need to be aware of the association between their actions and outcomes. On the other hand, Cohabiters have less parental resources, because the uncertainty of their relationships and the inherent stressors manifest relatively at higher levels of depression and a diminished capacity for effective parenting. The cohabiters are only living together for a sexual relationship and not legally married. They are not yet in the process of parenting which is important to child rearing.

Parenting styles can be explained as the various patterns nurturing parents employ in bringing up their wards. It coincides with authoritarian parenting, and permissive parenting. Parenting styles, as part of family dynamics, may be more important to a child's outcomes than the specific family structure experienced by the child. This is because parenting styles may lead to more negative outcomes regardless of the family structure. Parental behaviours ( for example, the strength and warmth of the parent-child bond, parental involvement and investment, and the parenting practices used in monitoring, disciplining and supervising children) too are also important factors. These are all what this research examined under family dynamics and risk-taking behaviour in adolescence.

School connectedness can be described as having a positive attitude towards schooling. It has been explained in different ways, but common indicators include liking school, a sense of belonging at school, positive relations with teachers and friends at school, and an active engagement in school activities (Thompson, Iachan, Overpeck, Ross, & Gross, 2006). School connectedness is the feeling of belonging and acceptance in school, a student's interest, emotional involvement, and motivation to learn in school (Klem & Connell, 2004). Having a strong sense of connection to school is related to positive outcomes, including increased school success and decreased risky behaviours (Bonny et al., 2000). Despite its widespread appeal, empirical evidence supporting the relationship between school connectedness and adolescent development is limited and there is little understanding of why some adolescents feel connected while others do not (McNeely & Falci, 2004).

Similarly, positive family relationships and self-esteem can promote academic achievement and protect against risky behaviours. Supportive and caring relationships with adults and peers at school (that is, school connectedness) encourage academic success among adolescents (McNeely, 2004). The ADD Health study found that school connectedness is a leading school-based protective factor against these risk-taking behaviours. Positive connections to adults reduce youth involvement in risk-taking behaviours. Based on this backdrop, this research examined the relationship between family dynamics, self-esteem and school connectedness and how they affect risk-taking behaviours in adolescents, particularly, among in-school adolescents in the Ibadan metropolis. The persistence of contemporary problems facing the adolescents suggests that there is an inherent risk in being an adolescent because a child at

this point transits from childhood to adulthood and this transition is accompanied by occasional stress and turmoil. It is apparent that risk-taking behaviours have consequences such as dropping out of school, unintended pregnancy, sexually transmitted infections (STIs), injuries and untimely death.

**Research questions**

The following are the research questions raised in this study:

1. What is the relationship between the independent variables (family dynamics,self- esteem and school connectedness) and the dependent variable (adolescents' risk-taking behaviours) among in-school adolescents?
2. What is the joint contribution of the independent variables (family dynamics, self- esteem and school connectedness) to the prediction of the dependent variable (adolescents' risk-taking behaviours) among in-school adolescents?
3. What is the relative contribution of the independent variables (family dynamics, self- esteem, and school connectedness) on the prediction of the dependent variable (adolescents' risk-taking behaviours) among in-school adolescents?

**Method**

The study adopted the correlational research design. This design was appropriate because the researchers were interested in examining the relationship that exist between independent variables and criterion variable. Moreover, the researchers have no direct control over the independent variables. Inferences about relations among variables were made without direct interaction from concomitant variation of independent (in this case, family dynamics, self-esteem and school connectedness) and the dependent variables (in this case, adolescents' risk-taking behaviours).

**Population**

The population of the study comprised all in-school adolescents in Ibadan-North Local Government, Oyo State. Ibadan North Local Government area is the largest local government in the Ibadan metropolis. It was suitable for this study because it had heterogeneous potential which enhances the generalisation of the findings of this study.

**Sample and sampling technique**

The study adopted the simple random sampling technique. Five schools were randomly selected in Ibadan-North Local Government. Sixty (30 male and 30 female) students were selected through the same procedure, leaving the researcher with three hundred (300) participants for the study.

**Instrument**

The following scales were used in eliciting data from the respondents.

Family Dynamics Scale: The Family Dynamics Scale was adapted from Inventory of Parent and Peer Attachment (IPPA; Armsden & Greenberg, 1987). It was designed to measure the quality of parent-child relationship in terms of warmth, care and love. It was a ten- item modified scale, structured on a four- point format: 1=Almost never, 2=Sometimes, 3=Often, 4=Always. The scale recorded a Cronbach alpha value of 0.78.

The School Connection Scale: The School Connection Scale was adapted from Youth Transition Survey (2000). It was a ten-item subscale. It measured students love for school. It was scored on a four point response format, from Strongly agree (1) to

Strongly disagree (4). The scale recorded a Cronbach alpha value of 0.77

Risktaking Behaviour Scale: The Risk-taking Behaviour Scale was adapted from the Youth At-risk and General Stability Survey (2011). It was a six- item scale. It measured adolescents' rate of risk taking and daring. It was scored on a four point's response format: 1-Always, 2-Sometimes, 3-Occassionally, 4-Never. The scale recorded a Cronbach alpha value of 0.82.

Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale: The Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale was originally developed by Rosenberg (1965) for the purpose of measuring global self-esteem. It is a ten item scale. It measures the extent to which a person is generally satisfied with his/her life, considers his/herself worth, holds a positive attitude toward him/herself, or, alternatively, feels useless and desires more respect . It is scored on a four point response format, ranging from 1 = Strongly disagree to 4 = Strongly agree. The scale recorded a Cronbach alpha value of 0.76.

**Method of data analysis**

Pearson Product-Moment Correlation (PPMC) and Multiple Regression Analysis were used to analyse the data generated in this study. Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to determine the relationship between each of the independent variables and the dependent variable. It was also used to establish the interrelationship among the independent variables. Multiple Regression Analysis was used to determine the relative and combined effects of the independent variables on the prediction of the dependent variable.

**Results**

**Research Question One:**

What is the relationship between the independent variables (family dynamics, self-esteem, school connectedness) and (dependent variable) risk-taking behaviours

**Table 1: Correlation matrix showing the relationship between study variables**

| Variables | Mean | Std.Dev | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Risk taking behaviours | 58.60 | 10.336 | 1.000 | | | | |
| Self- esteem | 23.70 | 4.716 | .149** | 1.000 | | | |
| Family dynamics | 30.50 | 3.137 | -.126** | .211** | 1.000 | | |
| School connectedness | 22.66 | 2.507 | -.140* | .295** | .149** | 1.000 | |

*Correlation is significant at 0.05(2-tailed)

** Correlation is significant at 0.01(2-tailed)

Table1 reveals the relationship of each independent variable (family dynamics, self-esteem and school connectedness) with the dependent variable (risk-taking behaviours): Risk-taking behaviours positively correlated with self-esteem ($r = .149$, $p<0.001$), but negatively correlated with school

connectedness (r= -.140, p<0.05), and family dynamics (r= -.126, p<0.001). This implies that high self-esteem increases the tendency for high student risk-taking behaviours; while high family dynamics and school connectedness will reduce the likelihood of students engaging in risk-taking behaviours.

**Research Question Two:**

What is the joint contribution of the independent variables (family dynamics, self-esteem, school connectedness) to the prediction of dependent variable (risk-taking behaviours)?

**Table 2: Summary of regression showing the joint contributions of independent variables to the prediction of risk-taking behaviours.**

R =.292
R Square =.085
Adjusted R square =.073
Std. Error =9.95244

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Regression | 2723.929 | 3 | 680.982 | 6.875 | .000[a] |
| | Residual | 29220.071 | 296 | 99.051 | | |
| | Total | 31944.000 | 299 | | | |

Table 2 reveals a significant joint contribution of the independent variables (family dynamics, self-esteem, school connectedness) to the prediction of risk-taking behaviours. The result yielded a coefficient of multiple regressions R= 0.292, multiple $R^2$ = 0.85 and Adjusted $R^2$ =.073.This suggests that the three independent variables combined accounted for 7.3% (Adj.$R^2$= .073) variation in the prediction of students' risk-taking behaviours. The other variables accounting for the remaining 92.7% were beyond the scope of this study. The ANOVA result from the regression analysis shows that there is a significant joint effect of the independent variables on students' risk-taking behaviours, F (3,296) = 6.875, P<0.001. This implies that all things being equal, the independent variables have various levels of contribution to the variation of students' risk-taking behaviours.

**Research Question Three:**

What is the relative contribution of the independent variables (family dynamics, self-esteem, school connectedness) to the prediction of the dependent variable (risk-taking behaviours)?

**Table 3: Summary of regression for the relative contribution of the independent variables to the prediction of risk-taking behaviours.**

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | T | Sig. |
| 1 | (Constant) | 84.296 | 10.105 | | 8.342 | .000 |
| | Self-esteem | .281 | .131 | .128 | 2.148 | .033 |
| | Family dynamics | -.796 | .204 | -.242 | -3.897 | .000 |
| | School connectedness | -.184 | .067 | -.172 | -2.766 | .006 |

Table 3 shows that the three predictor variables (self-esteem, family dynamics and school connectedness) are potent predictors of risk-taking behaviours. The most potent factor is family dynamics (Beta = -.242, t = -3.897, P<0.001), followed by school connectedness (Beta = -.172, t = -2.766, P<0.05), and self-esteem (Beta = .128, t = 2.148, P<0.05). This implies that an increase in the influence of family dynamics and school connectedness will reduce the tendency for students' engagement in risk-taking behaviours; while increase in self-esteem will increase the tendency for students' engagement in risk-taking behaviours.

**Discussion of the findings**

The study investigated the correlation of family dynamics, self-esteem, and school connectedness as predictors of risk-taking among in-school adolescents in Ibadan metropolis.

The result from the research question one revealed that there was a significant relationship between the independent variables (family dynamics, self-esteem, school connectedness) and the dependent variable (risk-taking behaviours); risk-taking behaviours positively correlated with self-esteem, but negatively correlated with school connectedness, and family dynamics. This implies that high self-esteem increases the tendency for high student risk-taking behaviours, while high family dynamics and school connectedness reduce the likelihood for students engaging in risk-taking behaviours. This corroborates the study of Loromeke (2007) on family dynamics. She states that African tradition emphasizes the use of high control, authority and punishment in bringing the best out of a child. Utti (2006) also notes that authoritarian parenting style influences adolescents' academic performance positively, which invariably reduce the likelihood of risk-taking behaviours. For instance, a family without love, warmth, care, affection but with harsh and aggressive parents may make the adolescent run away from home, rebellious and have negative associations and other risk-taking behaviours. On the other hand, in a home where the parents provide children's needs, good food, shelter, water, love, warmth, affection, education, control, monitoring, dialogue, and the like, the children exhibit less delinquent behaviours. Authoritative parenting style is characterized by parental "demandiness" as well as "responsiveness".

The dimension of parental form of child-rearing is flexible and responsive to child needs but also enforces reasonable standards of conduct (Ang and Goh, 2006).

The second research question examined the joint contribution of the independent variables (family dynamics, self-esteem, school connectedness) to the prediction of risk-taking behaviours. The result showed that there was a significant joint contribution of the independent variables to the prediction of the dependent variable. The result yielded a coefficient of multiple regressions Adjusted $R^2$ =.073.This suggests that the three independent variables combined accounted for 7.3% (Adj.$R^2$= .073) variation in the prediction of adolescents risk-taking behaviours. This confirms the National Longitudinal Study on Adolescent Health (Resnick et al., 1997), which found school connectedness to be the leading school-based protective factor against risk-taking behaviours including violence, alcohol and drug use, depression, and suicide. It also stated positive school connectednesss as an essential factor in students'engagement in healthy behaviours. Other studies which corroborate this finding are Goodenow,(1993), Voelkl,(1995), Battistich & Hom,(1997), Lee, Smith, Perry, & Smylie,(1999),Croninger & Lee (2001), and Catalano et al.,(2004). They argue that teachers reported several benefits to positively connecting students to school. Most teachers cited "creating a positive school climate," "increasing students' self-esteem," "increasing students' involvement in positive behaviours," and "increasing academic achievement." Teachers also mentioned increase in academic achievement as an important benefit of positively connecting students to school. These studies indicated a positive relationship between connecting students to school and academic achievement, educational motivation, classroom engagement and attendance rates. Furthermore, teachers tend to perceive connected students as paying closer attention in school, having a greater degree of focus on studies having greater motivation, and scoring higher on tests and in overall academic subject areas. Klem and Connell (2004) found a strong relationship between school connectedness and academic achievement. Specifically, school engagement was a strong predictor of academic achievement among students of all socio-economic levels. Students actively engaged at school earned higher grades overall and also scored higher on achievement tests. Students with a strong connection to school were also more likely to attend daily and less likely to drop out of school or engage in any form of risk-taking behaviours.

The third research question examined the relative contribution of the independent variables (family dynamics, self-esteem and school connectedness) to the prediction of the dependent variable (risk-taking behaviours).The result showed that the most potent factor was family dynamics, followed by school connectedness and self-esteem. This presupposes that an increase in the influence of family dynamics and school connectedness will reduce the tendency for students' engagement in risk-taking behaviours, while increase in self-esteem increases the tendency for students' engagement in risk-taking behaviours. Chen and Faruggia (2002) assert that self-esteem plays a great role during the developmental stage of adolescence, when the adolescent is swiftly nearing adulthood, and it is beginning to take on adult roles and responsibilities. Mandara et al. (2009) observe that a substantial developmental task of adolescence is the formation of a complete and positive sense of self. The

finding in this study reveals that some students may have previously achieved a higher developmental level of self-esteem which could lead to a higher level of risk-taking behaviours. However, this finding contradicts Wadsworth's (2007) view on self- esteem. He is of the opinion that children need to have a high self-esteem to overcome some life struggles and school challenges. The respondents in his study who reported lower self-esteem scores are also more likely to engage in risk-taking behaviour. The negative direction of this path and the statistically significant result did not provide ample support for research question three. Some studies however, support the result on family dynamics which confirms Baumrind's (1991) hypothesis for some outcomes, Baumrind contends that parental support with firm control is the most successful parenting style for promoting adolescent competence. In addition, the findings indicate that parental hierarchy reduces risk-taking behaviours. In other words, parental support such as fairness, understanding, pride, and trust, facilitates positive development and helps teens avoid risk.

## Conclusion

Adolescents are prone to risk-taking behaviours which give this study a lot of practical and clinical implications for parental counselling, school counseling and child-rearing practices in the Ibadan metropolis. Family dynamics and school connectedness may likely affect in-school adolescents' disposition towards risk-taking behaviours. In-school adolescents from a positive family background and a high connection to school may not likely engage in risk-taking behaviours, basically due to the positive attitude they imbibe, both from home and the school. Self-esteem has also been confirmed to have positive correlation with risk-taking behaviour among in-school adolescents; that is an increase in self-esteem would likely lead to an increase in risk-taking behaviours.

## Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, certain disposition capable of preventing risk-taking behaviours among in-school adolescents are explained and recommended below:

To prevent risk-taking behaviours among in-school adolescents, counselling psychologists should assist in building up their orientation concerning risk and its lifelong consequences. Counselling interventions such as self-monitoring, peer pressure management, self-regulation, value clarification, and thought-stopping could help adolescents withstand the likely effects of poor family dynamics. School programmes and counselling activities should be channelled towards building students' interest in schooling (that is, school connectedness). Parents are enjoined to provide social support to the adolescents by showing love, warmth, care and affection, which could go a long way in reducing their proximity to risk-taking.

Stakeholders should organise enlightenment campaign for both parents and schools on how to manage children at this critical period. School authorities should organise workshops on school connectedness strategies and evaluate school connectedness trainings in school for effectiveness.

## References

Alexander, T. (2001). Defining self-esteem. What is self-esteem and why does it matter? Self-esteem as an aid to understanding and recovery. *Mental Healthcare*, *4*(10), 332-335.

Allen, J. P., Hauser, S. T., & Borman-Spurrell, E. (1996). Attachment theory as a framework for understanding sequelae of severe adolescent psychopathology: An 11-year follow-up study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 64*(3), 254-265

Apel, R., & Kaukinen, C. (2008). On the relationship between family structure and anti-social behaviour: Parental cohabitation and blended households. *Criminology, 46* (1), 35-70.

Arnett, J. (1992). Reckless behaviour in adolescence: A developmental perspective. *Developmental Review, 12*, 339-373.

Bandura. A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.

Battistich, V., Solomon, D., Kim, D., Watson, M., & Schaps, E. (1995). Schools as communities, poverty levels of student populations, and students' attitudes, motives, and performance: A multilevel analysis. *American Educational Research Journal, 32*, 627–658.

Biglan, A., Mrazek, P. J., Carnine, D., & Flay, B. R. (2003). The integration of research and practice in the prevention of youth problem behaviours.*American Psychologist,58*(6-7), 433-440.

Blascovich, J., & Tomaka, J. (1991). Measures of self-esteem.In J. P. Robinson, P. R.

Blum, R. (2005). *School connectedness: Improving students' lives.* US Department of Defense: Washington, DC.

Branden, N. (1994).*Six Pillars of Self-Esteem.* New York: Bantam.

Brown, J. E. & Mann, L. (1990). The relationship between family structure and process variables and adolescent decision making.*Journal of Adolescence,13*, 25-37.

Brown, J. E. & Mann, L. (2004). The relationship between family structure and process

Catalano, R. F., Haggerty, K. P., Oesterle, S. Fleming, C. B., & Hawkins, J. D. (2004). The importance of bonding to school for healthy development: Findings from the social development research group. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 252-261.

Center for Substance Abuse Prevention. (2001). *Underage drinking prevention: Action guide and planner.* Rockville, MD: National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information.

Clarke-Stewart, A. & Dunn, J. (Eds.) (2006).*Families count: Effects on child and adolescent development.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Coopersmith, S. A. (1981). *The antecedents of self-esteem.*San Francisco Freeman.Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Youth Risk Behaviour Surveillance – United States, Surveillance Summaries, 2009, MMWR 2010: 59(No.SS-5).

Diaz, Joseph O. P. (1984). A cross-cultural study of the reliability of the cooper smith self-esteem inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 44*, Defense: Washington, DC. 575- 600

DiClemente, W. B. Hansen, & L. E. Ponton (2000).*Handbook of Adolescent Health Risk Behaviour.*New York: Plenum Press.

Du Mont, P. M. (1998). The effects of early menarche on health risk behaviors. *Dissertation* 25 *Abstracts International, 60* (7-B), 3200.

Hankin, B. L. (2006). Adolescent depression: Description, causes, and interventions. *Epilepsy Behavior, 8*(1), 102-114.

Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency.* Berkeley, California: University of California Press.

Hussey, D. L., & Singer, M. I. (1997). Adolescents: Direct practice. In R. L. Edwards (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of social work*, (19th ed.). Washington DC: NASW Press.

Igra, V., & Irwin, C., (1996.) Theories of adolescent risk-taking behavior. In R. J. DiClimente & H.B. Hansen (Eds.), Hand book of adolescents health risk behaviour (pp35-51). New York; Plenum Press

Irwin, C. E. & Millstein, S. G. 1986. Biopsychosocial correlates of risk-taking behaviors during adolescence: Can the physician intervene? *Journal of Adolescent Health Care, 7*(suppl 6), 82-96.

Klem, A.M. & Connell, J.P. (2004). Relationships Matter: Linking Teacher Support to Student Engagement and Achievement. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 262-273.

Loromeke, C. JK. (2007). Relationship Among parenting Styles, Self-Concept and Students Career Dispositions in Uvwie Local Govt. Area of Delta State. Unpublished M.Ed Thesis of Delta State University, Abraka.

Mandara, J., Richards, M., Gaylord-Harden, N., & Ragsdale, B. (2009).The effects of changes in racial identity and self-esteem on changes in African American adolescents' mental health.*Child Development*, *80*(6), 1660–1675.

McNeely, C., & Falci, C. (2004). School connectedness and the transition into and out of health-risk behavior among adolescents: A comparison of social belonging and teachers support. *Journal of School Health, 74*(7), 284-292.

McNeely, C. (2004). Associations among adolescent risk behaviours and self-esteem in six domains. *Child psycho psychiatry.* 2004454-467

Millstein, S. G. & Igra, V. (1995). Theoretical models of adolescent risk-taking behavior. In J. L. McGraw Hill.

Muuss & H. D. Porton (2002). *Adolescent behaviour and society* (pp. 422-431). New York:

National Association of Social Workers. *Partners in programme planning for adolescent health (PIPPAH) pack.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Institute on Drug Abuse. (2005). *Preventing drug abuse among children and adolescents.* Retrieved July 7, 2014 fromhttp://www.drugabuse. gov/prevention/risk.html

Pruitt, D. B.(1999). T*he American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry: Your adolescent: Emotional, behavioral, and cognitive development from early adolescence*

*through the teen years*. New York: Harper Collins.

Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *52*, 83-110.

Schimele C.M. (2010). Change in and stability in cohabitation and children educational adjustment. *Journal of comparative family study*. 557-579

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2007). *The Surgeon General's call to action to prevent and reduce underage drinking*. U.S. Department of Health andHuman Services, Office of the Surgeon General: Washington DC.

United States Department of Health and Human Services. (2001). Youth violence: A report of the Surgeon General. Retrieved June 30, 2008 fromwww.surgeongeneral.gov/-librar/youthviolence/toc.html.

Utti, A. (2006). Relationship Between Parenting Styles and Students Academic Achievement in Secondary Schools in Ethiope East L. G. A of Delta State.Unpublished M. Ed Thesis of Delta State University, Abraka.

Wadsworth N. (2007). *.Addressing self-esteem through the use of bibliotherapy in literature circles.* An Action Research Project submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate Program for Education, Westminster College, Salt Lake City, Utah