

INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN PARENTING STYLES WITH HIGH-RISK BEHAVIOURS AMONG THE STUDENTS

Ali Afshari*

Assistant prof. Psychology, Dep of human science, faculty of psychology, University of Maragheh. Maragheh, Iran.

 OPEN ACCESS

Received: September 01, 2019

Accepted: September 26, 2019

Published: October 02, 2019

*Corresponding Author:

* ALI AFSHARI

Assistant prof. Psychology, Dep of human science, faculty of psychology, University of Maragheh. Maragheh, Iran.

Abstract

The aim of present study was to investigate the relationship between high-risk behaviours with parenting styles among the university students. The population in this study was all students, which we selected 150 students randomly with cluster sampling method. Research instruments were Bamerind parenting style questionnaire (1972), High-risk behaviour scale (IARS). The results of regression analysis showed that there was a significant relationship between high-risk behaviour of smoking and orientation to relationships and sexual behaviour with permissive parenting style, and high-risk behaviour of tendency to violence with despotic parenting styles. It can conclude that parenting style is a predictor of the prevalence of personality disorders and high-risk behaviour in students.

Key Words: risky behaviours, parenting styles, university students

Introduction

Family is first focus that underpins educative foundations in it and some argue that the causes of incompatible behaviours in adolescents and young adults, further related to family factors. Because human takes the first steps of socialization within the focus family (Akbari, 2005). Children and adolescents grow according to the different educative methods and styles (parenting) of Parents and other family members. However, extremes in their training (educative) method leads to the growth of defective educational growth and consequently cause abnormal behaviours in children. Children in the process of sociability in the family learn command and prohibition of parents, duplication and replication that are the most important ways of transmitting values, social norms and traditions. In fact, in the family is that children learn what is right or wrong. It is natural that family has important and significant role in the formation of character and behaviour of children (Sotodeh, 2004). At first, we can control behaviour by external factors and punishment and encourage him, forms his response.

Nevertheless, gradually forms conscience or superego in his existence. He pays attention to introjection of External values and judges about own behaviours. Therefore, we have to consider cases such as family structure, parent's characteristics and considerations related to growth in recognizing of abnormal behaviours. Therefore, the root of many problems, risky behaviour and personal deviations in adolescents and young adults must search in patterns and parenting styles of parents and their educative features (Palangi, 2013). It is worth noting that family characteristics have very strong impact on risky behaviour and social damages in adolescents. So that children whose parents engage in doing of behaviours such as smoking, consumption of alcohol and drugs, are involved risky behaviours to a greater extent (Jachik, Jaric & Leko, 2004, Bendtsen et al, 2013). Educational styles or parenting includes methods and behaviours that parents apply to educate their children. These methods of parenting have great impact on aspects of children's growth (Bamerind, 1991). Also, are predictor about growth of Mental

Health, academic performance, welfare of mental health and the behaviour of their children in the future (Ma, Yao & Zhao, 2013). In fact, the base and foundation of parenting represents the efforts of parents to control and socialization of their children. Although parents may have differences in how to control and socialization of their children. However, it seems all parents have role in education and supervision of children (Karimi, 2008). Parenting styles that families have in the education of their children divided into three categories: Permissive, despotic and democratic or logical – authoritatively. In the style of permissive parents, allow children to do everything that likes and knows reasonably and not have any control over him. In despotic style, mainly the opinion of the parents has importance and the child has not any comment or statement of belief. Otherwise, parents will be punished him. In the democratic style is monitored on his works reasonably, will allow him to comment in appropriate position (Bamerind, 1991, Zeligmane, 1999). Nowadays, the prevalence of high-risk behaviours in young people has converted to one of the most important and widespread concerns of human societies. High-risk behaviours is said to behaviours that mental health and well-being of the individual and other community people puts at risk and some of these behaviours cause some of deaths for adolescents and youth or have negative effects on societies. These are included consumption of drug, dangerous driving, high-risk sexual behaviours, violence, suicide and consumption of alcohol (Farnood, 2013). High-risk behaviours are behaviours that health and welfare of adolescents and young people put at risk. Accordingly, high-risk behaviours divided into two categories: The first group includes behaviours that their appearance threatens person's health. The second group includes behaviours that threatens health and wellbeing of other people in society. Since the rate of risk taking in youth and adolescents is higher than other age groups, has been seen more trend to kind of behaviours, including behaviours that are threatening to others and society. We can mention to anti-social behaviours such as robbery, aggression, running away from home, consumption of drugs such as cigarettes, alcohol and (unreliable) unsafe and illegitimate of sexual relationships (biglan et al, 2004, Translation of Jamalfar, 2008). High-risk behaviours such as violence and physical confrontation with others, smoking, consumption of cigarettes and alcohol and exhilarating drugs, risky sexual behaviours, are all of the behaviours that can cause increase of anxiety in teenagers. Also, to provide the ground for afflicting them a variety of

illnesses and even premature deaths. In addition, complications of high-risk behaviours are included: increasing depression, creating thoughts or suicide attempt (Hallfors, et al, 2004), poisoning caused by alcohol and or unpredictable drunkenness and excitability (Madu & Matla, 2000) performing the high-risk sexual behaviours (Unprotected sex and early, increasing the number of sexual partners and unwanted pregnancies, creation of sexually transmitted diseases and infections of HIV), increasing acts of violence and physical confrontations with others. Also has been reported increasing the likelihood of injury or death caused by alcohol and drug abuse (Stuve & O'Donnell, 2005, Kodjo et al, 2004). The aim of this study is to answer this question that; can have role kind of parenting style of family in the emergence of high-risk behaviours in students?

Method and materials

The present study aimed to analyse the relationship between parenting styles with high-risk behaviours in university students of miandoab. Present study is descriptive- fundamental in term of nature and is correlation in term of method. Statistical population of present study (research) includes all students of male and female in bachelor that are entrance (2012-2013), belonging to Payame Noor University Miandoab that their number was 2,300. Among statistical population, according to Morgan table (1975) 150 students selected by random cluster sampling as sample. Research data were analysed using descriptive statistics method of Pearson correlation and regression analysis by simultaneous way. Bamerind Parenting style Questionnaire and High-risk Behaviour Questionnaire were used to collect data. Bamerind Parenting style Questionnaire Buri (1988-1991) parenting authority questionnaire designed according to theory authority of Parenting Bamerind. The questionnaire contained 30 statements that involve three scales authoritative, despotic and permissive parenting and each scale has 10 items (ritman, 2002). Each item according to Likert scale is ranging from completely disagree up to agree (5 degrees) and it scored from zero to four (Turner, 2003). About validity and stability of parenting Questionnaire belonging to Bamerind, was used retest method. Stability obtained has reported for the permissive method for mother 0.81 and father 0.77, despotic method for mother 0.86 and father 0.85, authoritative method for mother 0.78 and father 0.88 (Buri, 1991). Esfandiari (1995) has used this questionnaire in Iran. Stability coefficient obtained from retesting questionnaire has reported for permissive 0.69, for despotic 0.77 and fo

authoritative 0.73. Psychiatrists and psychologists (Ebadi Asayesh, 2008) have approved nominal validity of questionnaire. High-risk Behaviour Questionnaire: Zadeh Mohammadi (2011) has designed Questionnaire of Risk-taking behaviours related to youth, which has 48 items and 7 subscales. These cases are included the tendency to drugs, tendency to alcohol, tendency to smoking, tendency to violence, tendency to sexual relationship and behaviour, tendency to the relationship with the opposite sex and the tendency to dangerous driving. Each item is based on a Likert scale of 5 degrees

(from strongly disagree to completely agree) and from 1 to 5 was scored. Total score of this questionnaire is of 38 to 160. Whatever score is higher, tendency to high-risk risky behaviours is more or greater. We used Cronbach's alpha in order to assess the stability of the mentioned questionnaire that the results obtained are as follows: Risk-taking Scale 0.93, tendency to alcohol 0.93, tendency to dangerous driving 0.88, tendency to smoking 0.91, tendency to drugs 0.83, tendency to sexual risk-taking 0.85 and tendency to violence 0.77.

Results and findings

Mean and standard deviation scores of students in research variables based on their gender (sex) have presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive data research variables

Variable	Gender	Number	Mean	standard deviation
Tendency to drugs	male	75	11.00	4.56
	female	75	8.81	2.54
Tendency to alcohol	male	75	8.37	3.34
	female	75	8.52	4.6
Tendency to smoking	male	75	8.50	4.36
	female	75	6.70	2.75
Tendency to violence	male	75	10.28	3.54
	female	75	8.60	2.99
Tendency to sexual relationship	male	75	9.55	4.12
	female	75	8.47	4.24
Tendency to the opposite sex	male	75	12.30	4.92
	female	75	10.79	4.10
Tendency to dangerous driving	male	75	12.65	4.39
	Female	75	10.64	5.18
Permissive parenting style	male	75	13.62	5.48
	female	75	13.80	5.14
Despotic parenting style	male	75	15.41	6.47
	female	75	15.19	5.04
Authoritative parenting style	male	75	17.85	9.28
	female	75	17.02	9.75

Table 2: Pearson correlation coefficient to investigate the relationships of research variables

Variable	Authoritative		Despotic		Permissive	
	p	r	p	r	p	r
Tendency to drugs	0.30	-0.09	0.93	0.007	0.06	0.17
Tendency to alcohol	0.78	0.02	0.10	0.15	0.88	0.01
Tendency to smoking	0.18	0.12	0.58	0.15	0.007	0.24**
Tendency to violence	0.62	0.04	0.01	0.21*	0.40	-0.07
Tendency to sexual relationship	0.49	-0.06	0.58	0.05	0.02	0.020*
Tendency to the opposite sex	0.10	-0.15	0.86	0.01	0.25	0.10
Tendency to dangerous driving	0.95	.005	0.96	-0.004	0.19	0.12

According to the results of Pearson correlation coefficient in the table above, there is a significant and positive relationship between permissive parenting styles with tendency to smoking and tendency to sexual

relationship. In addition, there is a significant and positive relationship between despotic parenting styles with tendency to violence. In the following hypotheses of research are analysed using step-by-step (stepwise) and simultaneous regression analysis.

Table 3: Simultaneous regression analysis for prevalence of tendency to smoking, based on parenting styles

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.273	0.075	0.050	3.77

Table 3 summary of predictor model of scores for prevalence of tendency to smoking shows according to parenting styles. As you see, the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.075. So 50/0 percent of the variance in the prevalence of tendency to smoking is explaining based on the styles of parenting.

Table 4: Analysis of variance test to investigate the significance of the regression model

Model	Source of changes	Sum of squares	Degrees of freedom	Mean of Square	F	p
1	regression	130.0263	3	43.354	3.042	0.032
	Remaining	1610.706	113	14.254		
	Total	1740.769	116			

Table 4 Analysis of variance test shows to evaluate significance of regression model to predict scores of prevalence of tendency to smoking according to parenting styles. As you can see, F is observed (3/042), which is statistically significant (P <0.032). Therefore, it can conclude that scores of prevalence of smoking according to parenting styles can linearly predict.

Table 5: Regression coefficients for the prediction scores about prevalence of smoking according to parenting styles

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Standard deviation	Beta		
(Constant)	3.960	1.474	-	2.687	0.008
Permissive style	0.182	0.068	0.252	2.676	0.009
Despotic style	0.055	0.061	0.085	0.902	0.369
Authoritative style	0.027	0.039	0.066	0.701	0.458

As can see in Table 5. Based on the results, permissive parenting style to predict Scores about prevalence of smoking.

Table 6: Simultaneous regression analysis for prevalence of tendency to violence, according to parenting styles

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.27224	0.050	0.25	3.37

Table 6 summary of predictor model of scores for prevalence of tendency to violence shows according to parenting styles. As can be seen, the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.050. So 25/0 percent of the variance in prevalence of tendency to violence explained based on styles of parenting.

Table 7: Analysis of variance test to investigate the significance of the regression model

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	67.923	3	22.641	1.983	0.121
Residual	1290.196	113	11.418		
Total	1358.120	116			

Table 7 shows analysis of variance test to investigate significance of the regression model to predict scores prevalence of tendency to violence according to styles. As you can see, F that you observe is equal to 1.983. Which is not statistically significant (P <0.121). Therefore, it can conclude that the scores prevalence of tendency to violence cannot predict according to parenting styles linearly.

Table 8: Regression coefficients for the prediction scores about prevalence of tendency to violence according to parenting styles

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Standard deviation	Beta		
(Constant)	8.030	1.319	-	6.088	0.000
Permissive style	-0.028	0.061	-0.044	-.461	0.646
Despotic style	0.199	0.054	0.208	2.139	0.030
Authoritative style	0.007	0.034	0.020	0.205	0.838

As we can see in Table 8. Based on the results, despotic parenting style to predict scores related to prevalence of tendency to violence.

Table 9: Simultaneous regression analysis for prevalence of tendency to sexual behaviour with regard to parenting styles.

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.257	0.066	0.41	4.10

Table 9 shows summary of predictor model about predictor of scores related to prevalence of sexual behaviour based on the styles of parenting. As we can see, the coefficient of determination is equal to 0.066. So 0.41 Percent of the variance in prevalence of tendency to sexual behaviour has explained According to parenting styles.

Table 10: Analysis of variance test to investigate the significance of the regression model

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	134.419	3	44.806	2.660	0.052
Residual	1903.137	113	16.842		
Total	2037.556	116			

Table 10 shows analysis of variance test to evaluate significance of regression model to predict scores of prevalence sexual behaviour according to parenting styles. As you can see, mentioned F is equal to 2.660 which is not significant statistically ($P < 0.052$). Therefore, we can conclude that the Scores related to prevalence of tendency to sexual behaviour cannot linearly predict according to styles of parenting.

Table 11: Regression coefficients for the prediction scores related to prevalence of tendency to sexual behaviour according to parenting styles

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Standard deviation	Beta		
(Constant)	6.161	1.602	-	3.846	0.000
Permissive style	0.196	0.074	0.250	2.649	0.009
Despotic style	0.081	0.066	0.166	1.232	0.220
Authoritative style	-0.56	0.042	-0.126	-1.337	0.184

As we can see in Table 11, based on the results permissive parenting style predicts scores related to prevalence of tendency to sexual behaviour.

Discussion and conclusion

There is a significant relationship among the prevalence of high-risk behaviours (Tendency to

drugs, tendency to alcohol, tendency to smoking, tendency to violence, tendency to sexual behaviour and relationship, tendency to opposite sex, tendency to dangerous driving) with parenting styles

(permissive, despotic, authoritative) in students. Results of correlation showed that there is a significant and positive relationship between permissive parenting styles with tendency to smoking and tendency to sexual behaviour and relationship. Also, that there is a significant and positive relationship between despotic parenting style with high-risk behaviour of tendency to violence. The results of the research by Ma, Yao & Zhao (2013) showed that dynamics and performance of family is effective on the teenagers' mental health and behavioural problems, such as their high-risk behaviours. Atash Nafas et al (2008) in a research showed that prevalence of high-risk behaviours among Iranian adolescents has been 8.8% that are included 34% relationships with the opposite sex, 30% experience of smoking. According to the results of previous researches, styles of parenting in families are important and crucial factors in the occurrence of personality disorders and high-risk behaviours. It predicts behaviours of young people and teenagers especially students. Providing non-conditional freedoms, paying too much attention to children, modelling children from parents about smoking in some families are the most important reasons of the emergence of this type of risky behaviour (Jamalfar, 2008). It is worth noting that family characteristics have very strong impact on risky behaviours and social damages in adolescents. So that students whose parents attempted to perform such as smoking, consumption alcohol and drugs are involved largely in risky behaviours. (Jachik et al, 2004, Rezaietalab et al, 2012, Mohammadpour Asl, et al, 2012 and Bendtsen et al, 2013). The above researches protect results obtained about risky behaviour of smoking. Liberally or freely education and permissive education is as a factor of predictor related to tendency to smoking. Among parenting styles in the first step despotic parenting style can alone explain more than 20% percent of prevalence tendency to violence in students. In other words, there is a significant relationship between despotic parenting styles with high-risk behaviour of tendency to violence. To do violence, disrespect, and vilification parents to teenagers (Robert, Kelin, 2003, Rosmalen et al, 2013) and or lack living with parents (Olivera et al, 2013) or Pale, weak and cold connection (Khakpour, 2004, lejobotonia, Galic and Jachik, 2004) increase young people's high-risk behaviours which we can apparently see in autocratic families such behaviours. This is an aligned and coordinated hypothesis with results of hypothesis 44. Among parenting styles, permissive parenting style can alone explain more than percentage 25 of the prevalence of tendency to relationship and sexual

behaviour in students. In other words, there is a significant relationship between permissive parenting styles with the prevalence risky behaviour of tendency to sexual behaviour and relationship. Because of cultural reasons, do not discuss in the case of problems related to high-risk sexual behaviour in the family. In addition, more freedom in during adulthood, lack of sufficient and necessary trainings of parents, to allow doing some of these behaviours (sexual) in some of permissive families are causes and factors the prevalence of high-risk behaviour in young people. Results obtained of our research and Ma & Zhao (2013) showed that dynamics and performance of family is effective on the teenagers' mental health and behavioural problems such as their high-risk behaviours. According Results obtained of previous researches permissive and despotic parenting style are crucial and important factor in the occurrence of high-risk behaviours. It predicts behaviours of young people and teenagers especially students. According to the three methods of parenting are included: permissive, despotic and authoritative, we can say that family function is usually more powerful, authoritative parenting style. In other words, families that in their parenting practices follow the principle of cooperation and democracy in relations, they have greater ability to adapt to changes and provide proper conditions for growth of children. In families with a healthy (Normal) pattern, members of family support together, expectations regarding the roles of the people is clear and flexible and regulations of family is clear and flexible and without border (borderless). As is evident (apparent) in the results of research, there is not any significant relationship between the prevalence of high-risk behaviours with authoritative parenting style.

References

- 1) Atashnafas, A, Tabatabaii, M & Ghorbani, R, (2008), Survey of High-risk behaviours the high school students and ways to prevent it. Research projects approved by the Council of Education Research in Semnan province. Moallem Institute. [In Persian]
- 2) Bakhshani N. M, Lashkaripour K, Bakhshani S, Hoseinbore M, (2007). Prev-alence of risk behaviors related to intentional and unintentional injuries among adolescent high school students of Sistan and Balouchestan, Southeast of Iran. *Tabib Shargh.*; 9(3), 199–208.
- 3) Bamerind, Daiana, (2010), Questionnaire of parenting styles, Translated by Karami Abolfzl, Tehran, Sina Research Institute of Cognitive-

- Behavioural Sciences (psyche tooling). [In Persian]
- 4) Bendtsen, P., Damsgaard, M. T., Tolstrup, J. S., Ersbøll, A. K., & Holstein, B. E. (2013). Adolescent alcohol use reflects community-level alcohol consumption irrespective of parental drinking. *Journal of Adolesc Health*, 53(3), 73-368.
 - 5) Burmaster E (1998). Prevention: school - based curriculum (Bulletin No.1996).
 - 6) Garmaroodi, J. Makarem. S. h., & Abbasi, Z. (2009), High-risk behaviour in adolescents in Tehran city, *Journal of monitoring*, 9, (1). 13-19.
 - 7) Godarzi, M. A., & Shirazi, M. (2005), Survey of The stimulation seeking (Basic sense of the arousal) and high-risk behaviour in driving. *Journal of Psychology*, 9 (1), 34-50.
 - 8) Hallfors, D. D., Walter, M. W; Ford ,C.A., Halpern, C.T; Brodish; P. H; Iritani, B. (2004). Adolescent depression & suicide risk: association with sex & drug behavior. *Am. J. Prev. Med.* 27, (3), 31-244.
 - 9) Jakic, M., Jaric - Klinovski, Z., Leko, V. (2004). The incidence of risk behaviors in high school students. *Lijec Vjesn.* 126 (5-6), 26-126.
 - 10) Karimi, Yousof, (2008), Educational Psychology. Tehran: Arasbaran. [In Persian]
 - 11) Khakpour, M, (2004), the role of the family in the girls running away from home. The first global congress of pathology of family in Iran. [in Persian]
 - 12) Kodjo, C., Auinger, P., & Ryan, S. (2004). Prevalence of, and factors associated with adolescent physical fighting while under the influence of alcohol or drugs. *Journal of Adolesc. Health.* 35 (4), 346-370.
 - 13) Kosari, M, (1994), Investigate the causes of relationship with the opposite sex in female students of middle school ,Region 18 of Education & Training of Tehran and to provide solutions to the problem, Master thesis of counselling psychology, Faculty of Educational sciences and Psychology of Allameh Tabatabaai, Available on the site. [In Persian]
 - 14) Lajunen, T., & Summala, H. (1998). Can we trust self-reports of driving? Effects of impression engagement on driver behaviour questionnaire. *Transportation Research, Part F*, 6, 97-107.
 - 15) Ljubotina D; Galic J; Jukic V (2004). Prevalence & risk factors of substance use among urban adolescents: questionnaire study. *Croat. Med. J.* 45(1), 88-98.
 - 16) Ma X; Yao Y; Zhao X. (2013). Prevalence of behavioral problems and related family functioning among middle school students in an eastern city of China. *Asia Pac Psychiatry.* 5(1), 1-8.
 - 17) Madu, S. N; Matla, M. Q. (2003). Illicit drug use, cigarette smoking & alcohol drinking behavior among a sample of high school adolescents in the Petersburg area of the Northern Province, South Africa. *Journal of Adolescence*, 26 (1), 36-121.
 - 18) Palangi, Maryam, (2013), Compare the parenting styles and personality traits in bully and non-bully students, Master's thesis, Faculty of Educational sciences and psychology, Tabriz University. [in Persian]
 - 19) Parker, G. (1983). Parental 'affectionless control' as an antecedent to adult. Depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 40, 956-960.
 - 20) Rezaeetalab, F; Rezaeitalab, F, Soltaneefa, A, Ghaznavi, M; Bakhshandeh, T; Saberi, S .(2012). The effect of smoking by family members and friends on the incidence of smoking among high school students. *Pneumologia.* 61(4), 234-6.
 - 21) Roberts, T. A., Klein, J. (2003). Intimate partner abuse & high - risk behavior in adolescents. *Arch. Pediatr. Adolesc. Med.* 157 (4), 375-388.
 - 22) Roehlkepartain, E., Scales, P. (2007). Developmental Assets: A framework for enriching service learning.
 - 23) Rolison, M. R & Scherman, A, (2002). Factors influencing adolescents' decisions to engage in risk-taking behavior, *Journal of Adolescence*, 37, (147), 585-597.
 - 24) Rosmalen-Nooijens, K. A., Prins, J. B., Vergeer, M., Wong, S. H., & Lagro-Janssen, A. L.(2013). "Young people, adult worries": RCT of an internet-based self-support method "Feel the ViBe" for children, adolescents and young adults exposed to family violence, a study protocol. *MC Public Health.* 15 (13), 226-335.
 - 25) Sotodeh, Hossein, (2004), Social pathology. Twelfth edition, Tehran, Avaye Noor, 18-23. [In Persian]
 - 26) Stuve, A., O'Donnell, L. N. (2005). Early alcohol initiation & subsequent sexual & alcohol risk behaviors among urban youth. *Am. J. Public. Health.* 95(5), 87-93.
 - 27) Sutherland I, Wilmer P. (1998). Patterns of alcohol, cigarette & illicit drug use in English adolescents. *Addiction.* 93 (8), 119-208.
 - 28) Toman, W. (1993). Family constellation: Its effects on personality and social behaviour (4th Ed.). New York: Springer Publishing.
 - 29) WHO, Report (2003) Value adolescents invest in the future: Educational package facilitator's manual. Regional office for the Western Pacific. Manila, Philippines.

- 30) Zadeh, M., Ahmadabadi, Z., Panaghi, L. & Heydari, M, (2010). Construction and normalization of risk-taking scale in youth, *Journal of Psychology*, 15, (2), 129-146.
- 31) Zimmeraman, M. (1994). Diagnostic personality Disorders: A review of issues and research methods. *Arch. Psychiatry*. 51. 225-245.
- 32) Zuckerman, M, Eysenck, S & Eysenck, H. I. (1978). Sensation seeking in England and America: Cross-cultural, age, and sex comparisons, *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 139-149.

