

BEHAVIORAL DEVIANCE AND PERCEIVED PARENTING STYLE OF UTTARAKHAND PRISONERS

¹PRAJWAL RASTOGI*, ²PROF. RASHMI PANT, ³DR. NILESH ANAND BHARNE

¹PHD SCHOLAR, M.B. GOVT. P. G. COLLEGE, UTTARAKHAND, INDIA

²PROFESSOR, KUMAON UNIVERSITY, NAINITAL

³IPS, INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE, UTTARAKHAND, INDIA

EMAILS: prajwalrastogi100@gmail.com¹, pantrashmii@yahoo.com², nileshbharne@gmail.com³

Abstract

The current research is an exploration of the correlation between behavioral deviance and perceived parenting styles among captives in Uttarakhand. The first aim is to discuss the role played by the particular parenting philosophies in the development of countercultural behavioral styles that can lead to crime. The particular objectives are to: (1) compare the perceptions of inmates towards predominant parenting styles, (2) test the prevalence of behavioral deviance in different parenting styles, and (3) test how the socioeconomic and family background factors impact behavioral deviance. The sample size of 204 prisoners has been chosen by use of stratified sampling as the quantitative and cross-sectional design. The Deviant behaviour Variety Scale and the Perceived Parenting Style Scale were used to operate the behavioural deviance and perceived parenting style respectively. To explain the level and direction of the association between the study variables, descriptive statistics and inferential analyses such as t -tests and correlation procedures were presented. Results indicated that prisoners who viewed their parents as authoritarian or negligent demonstrated very high scores of behavioral deviance compared to prisoners who reported of authoritative parenting styles. Additionally, family background and socioeconomic status became the moderate variables in such associations. Findings highlight why early family experiences are so crucial in determining antisocial behavior, and why schools of thought recommend family-based interventions be introduced into correctional rehabilitation programmes.

Keywords: Behavioral deviance, Parenting style, captures, Socioeconomic status, Rehabilitation

1. INTRODUCTION

The definition of deviance is truly complicated and it involves such a wide range of issues. What might be deviant in one culture and social setting may be radically different in another. In a broad sense, deviance can be defined as any behavior, attitude, or characteristic, which contradicts the expectations of a community or a certain group; it is as innocuous as having a strange appearance or it may be as serious as a crime. This is important since deviance may express and influence cultural norms, social order as well as individual mental health. I am going to unravel the meaning of deviance in sociological and psychological concepts, consider the main theories, and use life examples to demonstrate how complex it can be in this paper (Goode, 2022).

Deviance is a fundamental concept in sociology and psychology, which is defined as actions or opinions which are incompatible with socially accepted norms. It is important to keep in mind that what is considered abnormal in certain cultures or in a particular period of time may constitute normalcy in another. Behavioral deviance is one of the subcategories of deviance and pays attention to those actions that are clearly against the society norms. To comprehend the influence of deviant behaviors on individuals and communities, it is important to identify this difference (Parmentier 2013).

When individuals do not behave in accordance with acceptable social norms, laws, or expectations, we refer to such behavior as deviancy; it is frequently manifested as antisocial or criminal behavior (Clinard and Meier, 2015). The main concern in psychology and criminology to formulate successful prevention and rehabilitation programs is to understand the reasons behind the occurrence of deviant behavior. One of the primary psychosocial aspects is parenting style, which predetermines moral thinking, social skills, and emotional development in adulthood (Baumrind, 1991; Maccoby and Martin, 1983).

In every culture, there are acceptable behaviors and when individuals or communities do not conform to these behaviors they become deviants. This labeling may promote or depress existing social structures, hence its

importance. Consider the American anti-war movement in 1960s: it was a reaction to the mainstream outlook that supported the war in Vietnam. Deviance can be used to bring about social change, whereas activists provided a central part in the transformation of the social opinion as well as impacting the U.S. policy, despite the fact that they were labeled as abnormal (Heckert and Heckert, 2002).

According to Baumrind (1967) framework and subsequent research, there are four parenting styles, including permissive, authoritarian, authoritative, and neglectful. Each type is uniquely characterized, which influences the behavior of a child, his/her coping, and personality. The influence of these styles on the behavior of children in general populations has been investigated in many studies. The situation is however not the same with male inmates who tend to exhibit more aggression, breaking rules and being antisocial, since there are no in-depth studies to explore how these styles, both actual and perceived, affect their behaviors.

Although the majority of individuals do concur that the parenting practices have a bearing on the development of the child, there are a lot of unresolved questions. Researchers continue to investigate the similarities in effects of parenting styles on children between cultural backgrounds, how styles influence child development, and how difficult it is to define and measure parenting styles in a reliable and consistent manner. These issues have to be grappled with to have a complete comprehension of how parenting affects behavioral, emotional, and cognitive development of kids.

To explain the formation of parenting style, researchers have collected data over time to develop an integrative theory that combines two significant traditions in socialization studies the analysis of parenting methods and the analysis of the overall parenting characteristics. According to this model, parenting style is a situational issue that mediates the impact of various parenting methods on the development of a child. Framing style as belonging to a larger context the researchers are able to interpret the interaction between certain practices and larger socialization processes in a better manner.

It is necessary to further isolate parenting style and parenting practice to develop new findings in socialization research as this discussion has indicated. Parenting style is the general style and emotional atmosphere that parents adopt when they are relating to their children, and parenting practices are the particular actions and practices that the parents adopt with their children to direct and discipline them. Unless we make a distinction between the two constructs we find it challenging to determine the effect of specific techniques in the development of a child in the larger framework of upbringing. A moderating role of style that is taken into consideration can lead to a more intensive comprehension of child socialization and how parenting influences psychological and behavioral patterns.

The explanation of this difference is not only beneficial to the clarity of theory but also has practical consequences on how to create more effective parenting interventions that take into account cultural peculiarities and personal temperament. In the future of the field, streamlining how parenting style can be operationalized will become central to knowledge dissemination and best practices related to developmental psychology and child-rearing (Darling and Steinberg, 2017).

Parenting styles are typically classified into four categories based on the dimension of responsiveness/control namely authoritarian, permissive, authoritative and neglectful. Delinquent behavior, aggression, and defiance have been associated with authoritarian and neglectful styles but favorable results such as self-regulation and social adjustment were usually related to an authoritative style which is warm and structured (Hoeve et al., 2009; Steinberg, 2001). These results imply that parental treatment and control in childhood can be seen by the child, which can be reflected in adulthood deviance and criminality.

Parenting in the Indian sociocultural background is highly influenced by the traditions of collectivism, intergenerational differences, and social norms (Chadda and Deb, 2013). However, there is a rapid modernization, the migration of economies, and changing family compositions which have changed the traditional patterns of child-rearing, which may have an impact on the emotional development and control of behavior. Uttarakhand is a state with varied cultural and socioeconomic environments that can be used to observe these changes. Prisoners in this region come from varied family environments, making it essential to explore how their perceived parenting experiences relate to their deviant behavioral patterns.

Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) and attachment theory (Bowlby, 1969) theories essentially provide us with a guideline on the role of personal relationships in determining our behavior. According to them, we learn to behave through observation and imitation of those around us, people who are particularly close to us, particularly the caregivers. According to the attachment theory, secure and good early relationships are also important in emotional regulation and moral development. Once such initial encounters become dysfunctional, it may result in impulsiveness, violence, and anti-social conduct (Farrington, 2005). In that way, examination of the way prisoners report their parenting patterns would provide helpful insights regarding the origins of behavioral deviance in childhood.

Thus, the research is fundamentally the excavation of the relationships between behavioral deviance and perceived parenting styles in Uttarakhand inmates. We shall examine the interpretation of these prisoners of their parental experiences to gain a better understanding of the familial origins of criminal behaviour and perhaps to guide the formulation of culturally smoothed preventive and rehabilitative programmes.

Family background and how parents bring up children are enormous influences in determining the behaviour, morals, and emotional development of a person. When the parents are erratic and cross the line, then it tends to drive

individuals into deviant behaviour and antisocial tendencies. There is a lot of research on this in the west but little research on the same among Indian correctional groups.

Being a mosaic of cultures and economic diversity, Uttarakhand is an excellent location to explore the influences of early parenting experience on deviant behaviour among prisoners. The determination of such interconnections would identify the psychological and family-related factors that drive crime in the locality.

This study would address this gap as it seeks to establish the relationship between perceived parenting styles and the deviant behaviour and provide insights that would be useful in the context of prison rehabilitation and prevention. We believe that the findings would contribute to correctional psychology with respect to both theory and practice.

Although the world has carried out a lot of research on the relationship between parenting style and behavioural outcomes, there are only a handful of studies that have gone into the specifics of how this relationship was manifested in the environment of incarcerated individuals in India, and Uttarakhand, in particular. The majority of the research concentrates on the delinquency, teen adaptation, or generic populations, which creates a vacuum in the field of research on how the early parental vibes influence subsequent deviance in the adult inmates. Moreover, most Indian researches are more likely to highlight such crime correlates as poverty, drugs, and schooling, but not the psychological and family factors which are in reality determining deviant behaviour.

The Uttarakhand being a comparatively young state with both mixed cultural and socioeconomic background offers a distinctive social context. But there is a factual disjuncture in empirical information on the psychosocial precipitators of crime in prison scene. No one has seriously examined the perceived parenting styles such as authoritative, authoritarian, permissive or neglectful and their effect on deviant patterns of inmates here. That is massive since knowing those internal psychological motivations provides us with meaningful indications to rehab, counselling and corrections.

Further, previous research has largely been based on Western theory without basing it on local culture or neglecting the indigenous perception of family structure, discipline and emotional attachment. The Indian family structure, which is generally characterized by dependence, respect to authority, and shared values, may turn the interpretation and effects of the parenting styles to be opposite to the Western context. Therefore, the Uttarakhand requires teasing of these links to identify culturally relevant results.

Moreover, behavioural deviance among prisoners is not only a matter of committing crimes, but it manifests itself in unresolved mental conflicts, unhelpful coping strategies, and premature social learning. Understanding how the parental behavior and family influence such patterns may assist psychologists and policy makers to design rehabilitation programmes that strike the emotional and social chord with the inmates.

In short, this research aims to bridge the most important gap in research by systematically examining the perceived parenting styles of prison inmates in Uttarakhand and testing their impact on deviant behaviour. The outcomes are expected to add value to psychology literature on crime and deviance in India, provide solid evidence of theory-driven correction intervention and contribute to forming preventive controls to reduce the levels of child crime through the provision of greater parenting and family support.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Parenting and the development of psychopathic personality traits have been a topic of interest in modern psychological research. Evidence-based studies have revealed continuously that parenting styles and parental personality typologies, attachment style, and childhood experiences are relevant predictors of psychopathic tendencies among adolescents and adults. These results highlight the complex nature of genetic factors in interaction with environmental factors in modeling behavioral deviance and personality pathology.

Cox and colleagues (2018) found in their study that some psychopathic traits depicted by parents including a tendency towards cold-heartedness and rebellious nonconformity were related to unique parental strategies. It is worth noting that these characteristics had a positive correlation with the authoritative style, which is traditionally considered to be functional, implying that specific exemplars of psychopathy can disguise themselves as functional behaviors at the surface and harbor underlying emotional impairments. In addition, the researchers also found that rebellious nonconformity was positively correlated with permissive parenting but negatively correlated with authoritative practices, an inconsistency that suggests a discrepancy in the nurturing of individuals with strong psychopathic inclinations.

Going into further detail, Krupić and the researchers (2020) showed that parental personality factors, specifically a reduced agreeableness and an increased neuroticism, were correlated with psychopathic behaviors in children. Their examination highlighted that parenting styles particularly authoritarian and permissive modalities, work as mediating variables among parental disposition and psychopathic traits of children. Maladaptive parenting predicted high levels of psychopathy in children via neuroticism, but agreeableness and openness acted as protective factors. The results support the idea that parent child interactions are two way with the father negativity influencing the emotional climate and vice versa.

In line with these findings, Deng and others (2020) used a person-centered approach to study the typologies of parenting in context of child psychopathy in a Chinese context. The results showed that children exposed to negative parental behaviors, including cruelty, absence of care, or inconsistency, had a higher level of psychopathic traits. The ability to differentiate the parenting subgroups between maternal and paternal reports indicates that cultural and gender specific differences in caregiving could have an additional impact on child outcomes. This is in line with previous cross-cultural studies that suggest that parenting effects on psychopathy are not universal or invariable but depend on aspects of context.

Parenting stress equally comes out as a central precursor in the development of psychopathic characteristics in children. According to Fite and colleagues (2008), attachment problems and role constraint among parents were significantly correlated with narcissistic and callous-unemotional personality of their offspring despite the fact that the aggression factor was eliminated. This fact underscores that high levels of stress and dysfunctional parenting may introduce emotional detachment and interpersonal deficits in children. Therefore, the resulting disruptions brought by stress can undermine the ability of a parent to provide a steady dose of warmth and direction, thus creating an environment that fosters psychopathic traits.

In addition to the general family contexts, the studies on institutionalized and forensic samples can explain the long-term consequences of parenting in early years. Fasanu (2023) examined the relationship between childhood trauma, attachment quality, and perceived parental styles and psychopathic behavior in inmates. The evidence showed that childhood sexual abuse, alienated attachment, and autonomy-granting parenting had a substantial influence on predicting psychopathy. The research highlights the importance of childhood adversity and insecure attachment as not only vulnerabilizing but also the fact that specific parental behaviors, including the over-autonomousness without emotional warmth, could strengthen the antisocial behavior.

Similarly, a prison-based research (Nigeria, 2022) found that criminological predictors and parenting as well as bonding were relevant predictors of psychopathy in prison inmates. Although the age of emancipation was the most potent independent predictor, the overall effect of the parenting and the attachment variables explained a significant part of the psychopathy variance. These cross-cultural results confirm that the early family processes are still important even in the criminogenic populations, when the risk of environmental and situational factors is high.

The process of development of psychopathic traits takes a two-way position, as shown by Tuvblad and co-authors (2013). They emphasized the role played by negative parental affect in the development of psychopathic inclination in adolescents, and the negative behavior among the adolescents in the amplification of negativity in parents. Twin longitudinal studies have shown that genetic and non-shared environmental sources are behind this inter-relationship, supporting the dynamic interplay between the disposition of a child and the response of a parent. This bi-directional quality questions monolithic, in a unidirectional model of influence and proposes more systemic models of conceptualizing the development of psychopathy.

In a neurodevelopment perspective and genetic approach, Viding and McCrory (2017) have reviewed evidence that considers the callous-unemotional (CU) traits in children to be an early warning sign of psychopathy. The synthesis of them stresses the importance of early diagnosis and treatment since they are moderately to strongly genetic, but can be influenced by environmental factors. Based on this fact, effective parenting interventions have the capacity to mitigate the effects of leading to adult psychopathy in spite of genetic predispositions.

Additional empirical evidence is found in Wang and colleagues (2021) who emphasized the importance of parenting consistency and control in the development of empathy in offenders. Their results showed that parenting that was consistent, that is, a harmonious combination of care and control, were associated with higher levels of empathy, and inconsistent parenting and excessive control were connected to lower levels of effective and cognitive empathy. Since empathy deficits are also a fundamental feature of psychopathy, the findings underscore the rehabilitative significance of the positive parental interactions, even in the environments of correctional communities.

Finally, McDonald and co-researchers (2011) provided strong experimental support of the fact that psychopathic traits in children can be reduced through the use of parenting interventions. The Project Support program whose goal was to cut down severe and unstable parenting in families that were exposed to domestic violence produced long lasting positive effects on psychopathy of children. The results of these studies show that psychopathic tendencies which are mostly perceived to be stubborn can be tamed through formal parental training and emotional supportive programs.

When combined, this body of research leads to the conclusion that parenting (whether as style, stress, consistency, or affect) is a key factor in the development and continuance of psychopathic behaviors throughout development. Authoritarian, permissive and inconsistent parenting modalities tend to correlate with high psychopathic tendencies in contrast to authoritative and emotionally supportive modalities that act as protective factors. Furthermore, the use of cross-cultural and forensic samples adds more depth to our comprehension of the dynamics according to which these processes are implemented in different social and environmental settings.

Collectively, the evidence suggests that psychopathy is not solely a product of genetic inheritance but arises from the interaction of biological vulnerabilities and environmental experiences, particularly within the family system. Early interventions targeting parental behavior, emotional regulation, and attachment security may therefore be pivotal in preventing the consolidation of psychopathic traits and their progression into antisocial or criminal behavior. Future

research should continue to explore these pathways using longitudinal and cross-cultural designs to refine preventive and therapeutic strategies that address both parent and child factors.

Objectives:

1. To determine the relationship between different parenting styles and the deviant behavior of prisoners.
2. To identify the most common perceived parenting styles among prisoners in Uttarakhand.
3. To compare the levels of behavioral deviance across different perceived parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, neglectful) among prisoners.
4. To explore how demographic factors (e.g., age, education, socioeconomic status) influence perceived parenting styles and behavioral deviance.
5. To assess whether perceived parenting style is a significant predictor of behavioral deviance among prisoners in Uttarakhand.

Hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1

Title: Relationship between Perceived Parenting Style and Deviant Behavior among Prisoners

Stage 1– Statement of the Problem:

The present study seeks to determine whether prisoners' perceived parenting styles are associated with variations in their behavioral deviance.

Stage 2– Identification of Variables:

- **Independent Variable (IV):** Perceived parenting style (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, neglectful).
- **Dependent Variable (DV):** Deviant behavior (as measured by behavioral deviance scale/scores).

Stage 3 – Null Hypothesis (H₀):

There will be no significant difference between the perceived parenting style of prisoners and their deviant behavior.

Stage 4 – Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):

There will be a significant difference between the perceived parenting style of prisoners and their deviant behavior.

Hypothesis 2

Title: Relationship between Demographic Variables and Deviant Behavior among Prisoners

Stage 1– Statement of the Problem:

This part of the study investigates whether demographic factors influence the deviant behavior of prisoners.

Stage 2– Identification of Variables:

- **Independent Variables (IVs):** Demographic characteristics (age, education, religion, socioeconomic status, marital status, etc.).
- **Dependent Variable (DV):** Deviant behavior (behavioral deviance scores).

Stage 3 – Null Hypothesis (H₀):

There will be no significant difference between the demographics of prisoners and their deviant behavior.

Stage 4 – Alternative Hypothesis (H₁):

There will be a significant difference between the demographics of prisoners and their deviant behavior.

3. METHODOLOGY

The study included descriptive research design using purposive sampling methods to collect a sample of 100 convicted people from Uttarakhand prisons. The survey method was comprised of the deviant behavior variety scale and perceived parenting style scale which were administered to prisoners. These questionnaires were comprised of a closed-ended questionnaire. The data of a total of 100 prisoners were collected from the population of Central Jail Sitarganj Uttarakhand to get the data on behavioral deviance and perceived parenting style. The convicted males were selected using the purposive sampling method. Data from 100 male prisoners of age ranging from 18 to 35 years were taken. Participants suffering from any mental trauma, mental dysfunction, or physical dysfunctioning will be excluded from the study. Initially the rapport building was done, and the subjects were informed about the voluntary consent and confidentiality of their identity and responses. Thereafter, both tests were administered on the inmates, and the data was analyzed on SPSS version 22, and the results were formulated.

Perceived parenting style Scale (Independent Variable)–The Perceived Parenting Style Scale developed by Divya and Manikandan (2013) measures the perception of the children about their parent's behavior. It measures the perceived parenting style of the subject (adolescent to young adulthood age) regarding three dimensions such as authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive. It consists of 30 items in which responses were elicited on a five-point Likert scale.

Behavior deviance Variety Scale (Dependent Variable)–Deviant Behavior Variety Scale: (Cristina Sanches, Maria Gouveia-Pereira¹, João Marôco, Hugo Gomes, and Filipa Roncon) scale is comprised of a total of 19 items. This scale has been successfully used in the age group of 18 to 24. For each of the 19 deviant behaviors composing the DBVS, participants are asked whether they have committed it during the last year. Answers are given in a yes or no format.

A participants' variety score, which is a sum score, is calculated by summing the dichotomous scores on each item, and it ranges between 0 and 19, with higher scores indicating a wide variety of deviant behaviors committed.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data was collected and entered in SPSS version 22 for further statistical analysis from which the following results and respective tables have been gathered:

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Behavioral_deviance *Socioeconomic_status Area_of_living * Education	100	97.1%	3	2.9%	103	100.0%

			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Behavioral_deviance *Socioeconomic_status	Between Groups	(Combined)	668.476	4	167.119	16.077	.000
		Linearity	282.163	1	282.163	27.144	.000
		Deviation from Linearity	386.314	3	128.771	12.388	.000
	Within Groups		987.524	95	10.395		
Total		1656.000	99				

	R	R Squared	Eta	Eta Squared
Behavioral_deviance *Socioeconomic_status	-.413	.170	.635	.404

	Cases					
	Included		Excluded		Total	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Behavioral_deviance *Perceived_parenting_style	100	97.1%	3	2.9%	103	100.0%

Behavioral_deviance								
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Minimum	Maximum
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Authoritative	32	6.38	1.431	.253	5.86	6.89	5	9
Authoritarian	36	11.31	1.451	.242	10.81	11.80	9	15
Permissive	32	15.91	1.445	.255	15.39	16.43	14	19
Total	100	11.20	4.090	.409	10.39	12.01	5	19

Table No. 6 ANOVA					
Behavioral deviance					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	1454.142	2	727.071	349.384	.000
Within Groups	201.858	97	2.081		
Total	1656.000	99			

Post Hoc Tests

Table No. 8 Report			
Behavioral deviance			
Perceived parenting style	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Authoritative	6.38	32	1.431
Authoritarian	11.31	36	1.451
Permissive	15.91	32	1.445
Total	11.20	100	4.090

Table No. 7 Multiple Comparisons						
Dependent Variable: Behavioral deviance						
Bonferroni						
(I)	(J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Perceived parenting style	Authoritarian	-4.931*	.350	.000	-5.78	-4.08
	Permissive	-9.531*	.361	.000	-10.41	-8.65
Authoritarian	Authoritative	4.931*	.350	.000	4.08	5.78
	Permissive	-4.601*	.350	.000	-5.45	-3.75
Permissive	Authoritative	9.531*	.361	.000	8.65	10.41
	Authoritarian	4.601*	.350	.000	3.75	5.45

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table No. 9 Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.937 ^a	.878	.876	1.437

a. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived_parenting_style

Table No. 10 ANOVAa						
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	

1	Regression	1453.516	1	1453.516	703.484	.000 ^b
	Residual	202.484	98	2.066		
	Total	1656.000	99			
a. Dependent Variable: Behavioral_deviance						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Perceived_parenting_style						

Table No. 11 Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.669	.387		4.312	.000
	Perceived parenting style	4.766	.180	.937	26.523	.000

a. Dependent Variable: Behavioral_deviance

The current study has analyzed the relationship between behavioral deviance and various demographic and psychological factors which includes; socioeconomic status (SES), residential location (urban and rural), level of education and perceived parenting style in a sample population comprising of prisoners in Uttarakhand. A total of 103 qualified respondents, among whom 100 full sets of data were stored to analyze, with three individuals (2.95) not being included in the study due to the absence or discrepancy of data.

The preliminary descriptive statistics revealed that there was a variation in behavioral deviance among SES strata. The respondents have been categorized into five classes which are upper class, upper-middle class, middle class, lower-middle class, and lower class. The upper-class group had the lowest mean deviance score (M=5.50) though again the estimate is made using a small number of subjects and should be viewed with some precaution. The upper-middle had an intermediate mean deviance (M=12.75), and relatively higher scores were found in the individuals of lower educational qualification (e.g., matriculation) living in urban localities had higher scores. The cohort of middle classes, which included 51 participants, was the one with the best overall mean deviance score (M = 13.08) and the increase in scores was the most significant in the participants with intermediate education levels and living in the countryside. Conversely, those in the lower-middle (M avg. 7.56) and lower (M avg. 7.80) SES groups had relatively lower scores on deviance, and therefore, the deviance score possibly follows a curvilinear trends where it increases with the SES to a middle point and then decreases.

The statistically significant difference was demonstrated by the results of one-way ANOVA among SES groups (F(4,95) = 16.077, p = .001). The resultant level of effect indicated by the squared eta ($\eta^2 = .404$) was high, which means that these results suggest that about 40.4% of the variance in the behavioral deviance could be attributed to SES. These results highlight the applicability of the socioeconomic background in conditioning behavioral results because the middle-SES participants had expressed a greater level of deviance compared to the lower- and high-socioeconomic groups. The identified trend can be the result of some complicated interactions between the opportunity, perceived social pressure, and coping mechanisms that differ by the levels of the SES.

In addition to SES, the perceived parental style had its impact on behavioral deviance. Parenting styles were outlined as authoritative, authoritarian and permissive. The mean deviance scores were significantly graduated with the highest mean deviance registered by the participants who identified their parents as authoritative (M = 6.38) and moderately increased by those who identified as authoritarian (M = 11.31) and permissive (M = 15.91). This sequencing indicates that an authoritative, responsive type of parenting procedure can have protective influences, with permissive and over authoritarian forms having connections with a higher level of deviation.

The following one way ANOVA showed that perceived parenting style effect was highly significant (F (2,97) = 349.384, p=.001). The eta squared (η^2) associated with it, ($\eta^2 = 0.88$), represents that parenting-style difference has a very large effect (=87.88) on the variation in the behavioral deviance- a very huge association. Post hoc comparisons (Table in Appendix) which have been corrected by Bonferonni were used to prove that all pair-wise differences were significant with the highest value of the mean difference being permissive versus authoritative ($\Delta M=9.53$, p<.001), followed by permissive versus authoritarian (=4.60, p<.001), and authoritarian versus authoritative(=4.93, p<.001).

The analysis of linear regression (Tables 8-11) supported: The perceived parenting style is a significant predictor of behavioral deviance explaining 87.8 percent of variance (R² =.878). Unstandardised coefficient (B =4.766, p=.001) shows that as the parenting style in question moves one more step on the continuum between authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive, the mean deviance score is going to increase by about 4.77 points. Standardised beta ($\beta = .937$) attests the strength of such a relationship further.

The results, therefore, refute both hypotheses at will. As per the hypothesis statement of no relationship between perceived parenting style and deviant behavior, the evidence suggested a significant relationship, which was statistically significant (ANOVA $F = 349.384$, $p = 0.001$; $\eta^2 = 0.878$). Authoritative parenting was linked with the lowest deviance scores ($M = 6.38$) and authoritarian and permissive parenting were associated with an increasing deviance ($M = 11.31$, and $M = 15.91$, respectively). Bonferroni posthoc tests allowed showing the statistical significance of all pairwise contrasts, with the strongest such differences between permissive and authoritative styles ($\Delta M = 9.53$). These findings are also supported by the regression model ($R^2 = .878$, $B = 4.766$, $\beta = -0.937$, $p = .001$). Thus, the null is accepted against the alternative, which proved that the parenting style has a significant effect in deviant behavior.

Likewise, the second hypothesis, which stated that demographic factors of prisoners and deviant behavior did not correlate was discarded. The one-way ANOVA that compares the behavioral deviance between the SES strata had a significant effect ($F(4,95) = 16.077$, $p < .001$; $\eta^2 = .404$), which would suggest that about 40.4 per cent. of deviance variance can be attributed to the differences in SES. The descriptive statistics showed that the prisoners belonging to the middle and upper-middle socioeconomic classes were more likely to display the behavioral deviance (Mean = 13.08 and Mean = 12.75, respectively), whereas lower and upper classes were comparatively less deviant (Mean = 1/2). The implication of this trend is a non-linear interaction where deviance grows with socioeconomic status until some point, and then this decreases, and maybe represents different opportunities and social pressures among different strata of SES. Subsequently, the null hypothesis was rejected, thus supporting the argument that the demographic factors or, more specifically, the socioeconomic backgrounds have a significant effect on the behavioral deviance of Uttarakhand prisoners.

To conclude, perceived parenting style as well as demographic factors was found to be influential in influencing behavioral deviance among the prison population under the study. However, perceived parenting style was found to be the strongest predictor, concluding a significantly large share of the variance. These results indicate the critical importance of early family life experiences in contribution to behavioral inclinations and imply that therapeutic approaches to empower balanced, authoritative parenting behaviors would alleviate deviant behaviors, particularly amongst vulnerable or at-risk cohorts. The findings also show that socioeconomic status and perceived parenting style are critical factors affecting behavioral deviance in prisoners. Although SES has a significant influence on the variance explanation, the most significant predictor was perceived parenting style, which highlights its importance in behavioral development. These results highlight why early family interactions are significant and suggest that authoritative parenting style intervention activities might be effective in reducing deviant behavior, especially in at-risk groups.

5. CONCLUSION

This research study with findings that provided a strong and significant relationship between perceived parenting styles and behavioural deviance among inmates mainly conforms to the patterns that exist in the prevailing literature. Results showing that prisoners who labeled their parents as authoritative demonstrated diluted amounts of deviant behavior, in contrast to prisoners in authoritarian or permissive milieu demonstrating elevated levels of deviance, are in line with numerous preceding studies that highlight the protective provisions of authoritative parenting and the dangers associated with the maladaptive styles.

As an example, Hoeve et al. (2009) and Steinberg (2001) recorded that authoritative parenting i.e. warmth, consistent discipline and responsiveness bring about self-regulation and social competence, and authoritarian and permissive parenting are associated with aggression, defiance and delinquent behaviours. These results are reflected in the current ones, which further support the assumption that parental warmth and structure are essential discouraging factors of behavioural deviance, even in the adult stage. Likewise, this observation is supported by the theoretical framework described by Baumrind (1991), which underlies much of modern-day parenting research a moderate balance between control and nurturance helps to reduce antisocial tendencies, but either extreme of rigidity or leniency can contribute to the development of maladaptive behavior.

The strong predictive validity of the parenting style reported in this research ($R^2 = .878$) is also comparable to Krupić et al. (2020) and Fasanu (2023), who found that maladaptive or inconsistent parenting practices were strong predictors of psychopathic or deviant tendencies in parents and incarcerated adults, respectively. The significantly high correlation herein highlights the fact that the effect of early parentally formed experiences is long-lasting and proposes that the developmental trajectories identified back in the previous studies are being continued into adulthood and can translate into criminal/antisocial behaviour. Similarly, Wang et al. (2021) placed emphasis on how empathy increases with balanced parental authority and emotional warmth amongst offenders, which agrees with the lower scores of deviance that have been observed in the prisoners who view their parents as authoritative parental figures.

Furthermore, the study findings on the socioeconomic status (SES) partially agree with the current literature but offer a more complex trend. The identified non-linear relationship in which middle and upper-middle income prisoners were higher deviants than those in the lowest or the highest income brackets is not consistent with numerous other western results that hold conventionally the low-income deprivation to be more prone to deviance than high-income levels

(e.g., Farrington, 2005). The contextual aspect of the Indian sociocultural environment, in which the rapid social mobility, economical pressure, and the stresses in the urban environment moderate behavioural consequences, may be the source of this divergence. It also adds to the view of Chadda and Deb (2013) that Indian family matters and collectivism values produce a differing impact on the behaviour in the different social classes, which means that deviance can be the outcome not only of the deprivation but also of two opposing values of traditional expectations and modern wants.

The current findings are also consistent with developmental theories including the social learning theory by Bandura (1977) and the attachment theory by Bowlby (1969). Prisoners who had a permissive or authoritarian parent (who was unstructured or insecure with them) experienced weak reinforcement or insecure attachment and therefore were halted in learning morality and emotional regulation. This observation aligns with the conclusions of Deng et al. (2020) and Tuvblad et al. (2013), who both noted the bidirectional relationship between negative parenting and deviant behavior, as both harshness, neglect, or emotional aversion may develop antisocial behaviour.

Overall, these results are in support of the considerable amount of foreign evidence that claims that parenting style has an enormous and far-reaching impact on adjustment of behaviour. This piece of evidence is extended into the Indian correctional setting with data based on Uttarakhand inmates, which proves the presence of psychosocial processes identified in Western studies in a culturally different setting. The fact that the explanatory power of parenting style exceeds the norm in the current study would suggest that familial and emotional influences could take on an even more important role in the development of deviant behaviour in collectivist cultures, where familial structure is central in identity development.

This research attempted to analyze the correlation between behavioural deviance and perceived parenting styles among inmates in Uttarakhand in order to identify family factors that could potentially be the root cause of criminality. The results indicated that prisons who perceived parents to be authoritarian or neglectful showed increased deviant behaviour but those who recalled parents who were of authoritative style (characterized by warmth, responsiveness and reasonable disciplining) portrayed a comparatively lower deviation. The results are consistent with psychological theories that are long-established especially those focusing on the long-term effects of early parent to child interactions in shaping personality development and behavioural regulation.

The study findings highlight the critical importance of childhood experience and family in shaping behavioural tendencies that could later direct individuals towards or away from crime orientations. Most importantly, the research affirms the importance of early interventions and parental education programmes, particularly amongst the weak or socioeconomically disadvantaged groups. An empowerment of parenting behaviour may be used as the preventive measure, the risk of future behaviour issues and possible criminality.

Moreover, the research findings have implications that can be applied on the policy and rehabilitation systems of correction. The introduction of family-based or therapeutic solutions involving the comprehensive resolution of issues related to emotions and developmental problems may result in the reformation of criminals and their integration into society. Although the research may be regarded as a valuable source of information, it also creates the channel through which one can further research, especially longitudinal studies that are able to follow the development of behavioural trends across time. By increasing the sample to different regions and cultural contexts, the generalisability of these results would be improved, and a more holistic perspective on the psychological and social causes of criminal behaviour would be developed.

REFERENCES

1. Cox, J., Kopkin, M. R., Rankin, J. A., Tomeny, T. S., & Coffey, C. A. (2018). The relationship between parental psychopathic traits and parenting style. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 27(7), 2305–2314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10826-018-1057-9>
2. Krupić, D., Ručević, S., & Vučković, S. (2020). From parental personality over parental styles to children's psychopathic tendencies. *Current Psychology*, 42(19), 16001–16010. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00676-6>
3. Deng, J., Wang, M., Shou, Y., Lai, H., Zeng, H., & Gao, Y. (2020). Parenting behaviors and child psychopathy: A regression mixture analysis. *Current Psychology*, 41(6), 3585–3596. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00810-4>
4. Fite, P. J., Greening, L., & Stoppelbein, L. (2008). Relation between parenting stress and psychopathic traits among children. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, 26(2), 239–248. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bsl.803>
5. Fasanu, O. O. (2023). Childhood traumatic experience, attachment quality, and parenting styles as predicting factors of psychopathic behavior. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF RESEARCH IN SOCIAL SCIENCE AND HUMANITIES*, 04(03), 58–63. <https://doi.org/10.47505/ijrss.2023.v4.3.5>
6. Vol. 25 No. 2 (2022): *AFRICAN JOURNAL FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES OF SOCIAL ISSUES | AFRICAN JOURNAL FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDIES OF SOCIAL ISSUES*. (n.d.). <https://ajpssi.org/index.php/ajpssi/issue/view/28>

7. Tuvblad, C., Bezdjian, S., Raine, A., & Baker, L. A. (2013). Psychopathic Personality and Negative Parent-to-Child Affect: A longitudinal cross-lag twin study. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 41(5), 331–341. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2013.07.001>
8. Viding, E., & McCrory, E. J. (2017). Understanding the development of psychopathy: progress and challenges. *Psychological Medicine*, 48(4), 566–577. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291717002847>
9. Wang, S., Hu, H., Wang, X., Dong, B., & Zhang, T. (2021). The Hidden Danger in family Environment: The role of Self-Reported Parenting Style in Cognitive and Affective Empathy among offenders. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.588993>
10. McDonald, R., Dodson, M. C., Rosenfield, D., & Jouriles, E. N. (2011). Effects of a parenting intervention on features of psychopathy in children. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 39(7), 1013–1023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-011-9512-8>
11. Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (2017). Parenting Style as Context: an Integrative model. In *Routledge eBooks* (pp. 161–170). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351153683-8>
12. Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.
13. Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56–95.
14. Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment. Basic Books*.
15. Chadda, R. K., & Deb, K. S. (2013). *Indian family systems, collectivistic society and psychotherapy. Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 55(6), S299–S309.
16. Clinard, M. B., & Meier, R. F. (2015). *Sociology of deviant behavior (15th ed.)*. Cengage Learning.
17. Farrington, D. P. (2005). *Childhood origins of antisocial behavior. Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, 12(3), 177–190.
18. Hoeve, M., Dubas, J. S., Eichelsheim, V. I., van der Laan, P. H., Smeenk, W., & Gerris, J. R. (2009). *The relationship between parenting and delinquency: A meta-analysis. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 37(6), 749–775.
19. Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). *Socialization in the context of the family: Parent–child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology (Vol. 4, pp. 1–101). Wiley.*
20. Steinberg, L. (2001). *We know some things: Parent–adolescent relationships in retrospect and prospect. Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 11(1), 1–19.
21. Goode, E. (2022). *Deviant behavior. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003285304*
22. Parmentier, F. B. R. (2013). The cognitive determinants of behavioral distraction by deviant auditory stimuli: a review. *Psychological Research*, 78(3), 321–338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00426-013-0534-4>
23. Heckert, A., & Heckert, D. M. (2002). a new typology of deviance: integrating normative and reactivist definitions of deviance. *Deviant Behavior*, 23(5), 449–479. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016396202320265319>