

The Interplay of Helicopter Parenting, Self-Concept, and Rule-Breaking Behavior in Adolescent Males

Mavra Hafeez¹ & Muhammad Younas²

¹University of Westminster, Email: mavrahpsychologist@gmail.com

²Visiting Lecturer, Department of Applied Psychology, Government College University Faisalabad, Email: younasriaz@gcuf.edu.pk

Email: younasriaz@gcuf.edu.pk

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

Article History:

Received: June 16, 2025

Revised: July 15, 2025

Accepted: July 28, 2025

Available Online: August 07, 2025

Keywords:

Helicopter Parenting, Self-Concept, Rule-Breaking Behavior, Adolescent Boys, Pakistan


Corresponding Author:

Muhammad Younas

Email:

younasriaz@gcuf.edu.pk

OPEN



ACCESS

This study investigated the relationships among helicopter parenting, self-concept, and rule-breaking behavior in 300 adolescent boys (aged 16-18) from private and government colleges in Toba Tek Singh and Lahore, selected via multistage sampling. Data were collected using the Perceived Helicopter Parenting Scale (PHP), Self-Concept Scale (SCS), and Rule-Breaking Behavior Scale (RBBS), with 150 students from each institution type. Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient analysis revealed a significant positive relationship between positive self-concept (PSC) and rule-breaking behavior, but a negative relationship with negative self-concept (NSC) and helicopter parenting by fathers. No significant link was found between helicopter parenting and rule-breaking behavior, reflecting Pakistan's collectivistic culture where familial oversight mitigates deviance. Multiple Hierarchical Linear Regression identified PSC as a significant predictor of rule-breaking behavior. Adolescents in private colleges exhibited higher PSC and more rule-breaking than those in government colleges, while large family sizes correlated with increased NSC. Second-year students showed higher NSC and slightly more rule-breaking than first-year students. These findings highlight the influence of parenting and self-concept on adolescent behavior, suggesting the need for culturally tailored intervention programs and workshops to raise parental awareness. Future research should include both genders to explore these dynamics further.



Introduction

Adolescence is the intervening phase of one's life in the middle of teens and adult independence ages from 10-19, that depends on individuals' growth and social norms. It is forceful and fluctuating emotional state of adolescent span due to the changing of social perspective of this spell of life. At the time of adolescent, individual experience changes in the physique, mind and social surroundings as well. Turn from the teen life to adolescent life the bodily maturation alters the way a young person recognizes themselves and moreover how the society observe them and treat them. It's such a developing stage where the changes take place in the one's body, alteration of hormones, faster changes in their cognitive abilities and that embellish more sophisticated (Blakemore, 2019).

As mental health is a profound issue in adolescence phase so it can be lessened by means of protective and positive gestures by family or parental communication along with that will promote the social values in youth and also know about in what way to cope with the stressful events (Currie et al., 2012). According to the Bowlby attachment theory child get innate psycho-biological structure that assist or motivate them in finding or balance to near with the attachment figure that automatically prevent them from any kind of threat (Bowlby, 1988). Way of parenting actions mainly consider into three aspects; Behavioral indulgence, Relational and Material. Good quality things or gadgets provided by helicopter parents in material indulgence, whereas in relational parents try to overly protect their children from every threat and seek to fix stuffs for them and behavioral indulgence reveal that parents wish their child show responsible and respectful behavior (Cui et al., 2016).

Studies demonstrated that the mental health of the adolescents might be affected by the family, parenting style in the family and parental collaboration has an influence on the socialization and compatibility of teenagers (Khodabakhsh et al., 2014). Parenting is a complicated undertaking that involves a variety of particular attitudes that activate both independently and collectively to affect a child's actions. Baumrind (1967) theory give the conception of nurturing style that molded the persistent image of abundant sorts of parenting style supported in the positive and successful upbringing of the children. As claimed by the theory mentioned four basic parenting style: Authoritarian, Authoritative, Permissive and Neglectful that could significantly influence on the adolescent's educational accomplishment (Ibukunolu, 2013). On this point according to the research, parental deeply involved in a child's life such as helicopter parenting as it may be developmentally unsuitable, especially when the child reaches emerging adulthood (Padilla-Walker & Nelson, 2012) for the reason that it affects a child's feeling of self-control and psychological well-being and leaves them unprepared for adulthood evolutions.

Helicopter parenting is a sort of parenting that are excessively involved, high level of regulating emotions and low level of independency in their lives, pay extra concentration, and give warmth and always standing up behind their children as a back bone support; sometime these kinds of parents called "black hawks" (Segin et al., 2015). The notion of helicopter parenting was termed by Dr. Haim Ginott's on 1966 in his book "Parents and Teenagers" and according to him the teenager hovers like helicopter keenly observed wholly to their teenager activities and movements too. Parents who overly involved in the lifespan of their children and always around to take responsibility at any moment for their decisions and resolve their problems become consider in helicopter parenting (LeMoyen & Buchanan, 2011). Helicopter parenting can inhibit in the life time of emerging adulthood as one of the prior research projects reported that the college students who are under the weight of helicopter parenting style also perceive great level of anxiety, despair,

use recreational use of ache pills, low level of self-control, lower level of self-confidence, higher level of neuroticism and interpersonal dependency as well (Kwon et al., 2016).

This kind of parenting chic in adolescents make them vulnerable and develop the sense dependability throughout the life span of life. Studies disclosed too that the hover parenting prompted anxiety, depression and hopelessness in adolescents at school and in college level as well (Lythcott-Haims, 2015). As stated by the Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Dec, 2000) recommended that these kind of parenting attitudes with the adolescents who with the passage of time lost their confidence, feeling confused as well as this parenting behavior possibly will leads in college learners that they doing so for their parents and ultimate they have not their own goals, loss their motivations, also seek less efforts in their academics year with low level of motivation and under the pressure of the parents.

Other Family Enmeshment Theory postulated that parents mainly used their children for accomplishment of their own dreams, incomplete ambitions and nonstop give the anxieties for achieving and also these parents project their feelings and demands to achievement them by controlling them excessively and want to see them successfully attaining goals (Segrin et al., 2013). Another study found that family is greatly linked with the helicopter parenting that become the reason of developing deviant behavior, showing problematic attitude in school or college, and furthermore they may face difficulty in adjustment in society and with the familial relationships at home as well (Padilla-Walker et al., 2019). One trend research demonstrated that the connection between child-parent and over-controlling parenting significantly impact on the emerging adult's self-concepts and it cause the low level of self-concept in adolescence that effects on their physical and psychological well-being (Mabbe et al., 2015).

Self-concept is term of how one person thinks, perceived self and how far one is mindful from his/her own self-concept (Bharathi & Sreedevi, 2016). Beside this according to the Baumeister (1999) self-concept denotes that one's who certainty regarding himself/herself characteristics and what and who they self. According to the theory of Erickson who consider that the duration of development is most crucial but the time of adolescence think about the too critical and vital part of life because when the clear self-developed in the emergence adolescents.

According to the theory of Carl Roger (1951), humanistic psychologist the first who gave the notion of the self or self-concept. In the viewpoint of Carl Roger, the every individual motivated and encouraged by the intrinsic likelihood which ultimately motive the one's self (Schultz & Schultz, 2013). As stated by the Roger self is influence on the one's self and their surroundings and if the self-concept is persistent in the healthy minded person along their views, emotional state, and actions experiences would be consistent (Bharathi & Sreedevi, 2016). In his theory the Carl Roger talked about the 3 addictive of self; (Real-Self, Self-Worth and Self-Ideal) McLeod (2007). In real-self refers how the person thinks and feel and have a direct effect on the life of the person and by him self-image is an inner attribute of the individual personality, ideal-self mean a person act for striving to accomplish their goal and the self-worth based on the one's personal experiences that what kind of thoughts they have about himself of herself also the condition establish the person self-worth (Anderson, 1998).

Objectives

- To investigate the demographic difference across helicopter parenting, self-concept and rule breaking behavior.
- To determine the relationship between helicopter parenting and rule breaking behavior.

- To investigate the predictor for rule breaking behavior with helicopter parenting and self-concept.

Operational Definition of Variables

Perceived Helicopter Parenting

Helicopter parenting is defined as overly engaged protective parents providing significant assistance (e.g., financial, emotional, physical guidance) to their developing adult children, frequently meddling in their affairs and making choices for them (Cline, et al. 2014).

Self-Concept

Being conscious of oneself implies having a notion of oneself. According to Baumeister (1999), self-concept is defined as follows: The individual's self-perception, which includes the person's characteristics as well as who and what the self is.

Rule Breaking Behavior

Individual acts that "fail to correspond to the appropriate normative standards of the group" are referred to as rule breaking. According to this concept, rule violation can be either good or bad. (Kaplan, 1980).

Review of Literature

Adolescence is characterised by numerous continuously evolving mental - interpersonal worlds, such as shifting gender role identification, pubertal changes, greater parental engagement and expectations, and creating one's own sense of identity. Moreover, these preferences raise the chance of teenagers experiencing internalizing-externalizing difficulties (Saleem & Mahmood, 2011). This important growing phase is typically defined as the years between the start of teenage years and the attainment of social independence (Steinberg, 2014). Adolescence as an era of emotional and behavioural turmoil was apparent in future systematic originations. For example, Anna Freud identified the inherent issues that arise throughout this life stage and saw it as a widespread time of developmental instability (Freud, 1969). Similarly, a lot of studies have referenced to the emotive uncertainty, increased clashes with parents or risk-taking behaviour that arises throughout these years, which has contributed to our perception of adolescence as a phase of generalised difficulties (Steinberg & Morris, 2001).

The family environment is one of the most important social environments that influences the formation of self-concept in children and young people (Mishra & Bhatt 2021). Various studies have shown that one of the most important aspects in the growth and shaping of an adolescent's personality is the parenting methods of their parents (Belsky & Barends, 2002). The adolescent's success or failure is determined by the parenting style of the parents (Ooi et al., 2015). Parenting style is a crucial contributing element in the lives of teenagers, influencing major life domains such as decision making and self-concept (Rizvi & Najam 2015). Truthful and stable bond between paternities and their children's is one of the aspects influencing on their both somatic and psychological health (Kimble, 2014). One trend research demonstrated that the connection between child-parent and over-controlling parenting significantly impact on the emerging adult's self-concepts and it cause the low level of self-concept in adolescence that effects on their physical and psychological well-being (Mabbe et al., 2015).

Schiffrin et al., (2014) carried out research to see the effects of helicopter/ hovering parenting in college going students. The major objective of this study was to investigate how parenting styles

(helicopter vs. independence supporting) disturb adolescent's mental well-being through effecting college student's self-determination. For this study data was gathered from 297 college students between the age range of 18 to 23 through snowball sampling strategy used and who undergraduates at a public liberal arts college in the United State Mid-Atlantic area. Through measures basic Needs Satisfaction in General Scale (BNSG-S), Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS), Centre for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D), Anxiety Subscale of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression scale (HAD) answered questionnaire. The given results of this study shows that the students who reported having overbearing parents reported considerably greater levels of sadness and worse levels of life satisfaction. Moreover, the perceived violation of student's basic psychological necessities for autonomy and competence accounted for a substantial portion of the negative influences of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being.

In the given context of helicopter parenting the Self-determination theory describes three fundamental human requirements that are required for optimal growth and functioning. The basic desire for autonomy, or the freedom to choose one's own choices, is the first and most essential component of self-determination theory. The basic desire for competence, or feeling secure in one's talents and accomplishments, is the second component. The third component, relatedness, refers to the sense of being a member of really loving connections. When these basic psychological requirements are satisfied, a person's life satisfaction increases and depression levels decrease. Over-controlling parents may impair their adolescents feeling of autonomy and competence (Deci & Ryan, 2008).

Another study was conducted in which discover the helicopter parenting and psychological consequences among adolescents. The sample of the study where adolescent include 96 between the age of 15-18 from community-based catechism school in Peninsular Malaysia's. The basic agenda of conducting this research is to examine the consequence of helicopter parenting or over-involved parenting, psychological well-being of the adolescents. For the study purpose the data was cumulative by using the Helicopter Parenting Questionnaire (LeMoynave Buchanan, 2011), General Health Questionnaire (GHQ), and self-efficacy for learning scale were used. The results showed that helicopter parenting had a detrimental impact on teenage psychological fitness and was linked to low self-efficacy for learning. It was concluded that adolescents have their own distinct personalities, thus overprotecting and without permitting them to experience the world on their own would impair their development, leading to behavioral and psychological problems (Ganaprakasam et al., 2018).

It is stated that self-concept is linked to an individual's cognitive aspect and also depicts the individual's behaviour toward oneself (Ostagard-Ybrandt & Armelius, 2004). The negative self-concept and the positive self-concept are the two types of self-concept. Positive self-concept: individuals are self-assured, competent, sensitively stable, skilful of accomplishing goals, and have strong interactive skills and relationships with others. Behaving accurately in understanding yourself, appreciating yourself, befriending yourself and positive and reasonable thinking may all help to create a positive self-concept (Azizi et al., 2009). The negative self-concept (appears like they are not doing well in their lives). Individuals who have a poor self-concept are quickly dissatisfied with themselves and the events that occur around them.

On self-concept one study was conducted by Xu et al., (2019) on perceived social support and mental health for college students in China. For conducting this research 411 college students and the findings from the research expose that individual reported public support from blood relation (Parental figures), instructors, and peers was favourably linked with a positive constructive self-concept, and both self-concept and perceived societal provision were adversely related with

psychological well-being complications. The results also showed that all types of perceived societal provision possibly will benefit a college pupil cultivate a good self-concept.

Moreover, several self-development theories have stressed the significance of interpersonal interactions with parents and best friends for the development of SCC in adolescence (Chen et al., 2017). In a small number of longitudinal research, the parent/peer impacts theoretical approach has gained literature confirmation. Empirical evidences disclose that adolescent reported open communication with parents, for example, has been found to predict SCC over time in adolescence but not the other way around (Van Dijk et al., 2014).

One trend longitudinal research directed on adolescent's self-concept clarity and relationship quality with parents. The adolescent boys 497 between the age of 13-18 years being the part of this research and the basic purpose of conducted this research was to examine the connection among adolescent's self-concept clarity (SCC) and their bond value with paternities and best friends. The data was collected through online filling the questionnaire of SCC and the finding results showed that parental figure and children's effects are exist, with the direction of effects substantially influenced by the relationship environment. (Becht et al., 2017).

Empirical findings prove that that importance of family relationship quality and self-concept in the development of externalizing behavior among teen-agers. Family especially parent is a role model of children in the developing of behavior since the behavior are learnt in early childhood via socializing and observation process. Children who show early externalizing behaviors such as noncompliance and disruptive behaviors are likely to develop conflict-laden relationships with their parents (Campbell et al., 2010). Self-concept is recognized as an essential risk factor impacting social functioning and behavioral behaviors in adolescence, therefore leading to psychological well-being issues (Marsh et al., 2014),

Zakaria et al., (2018) directed study on relationship between self-concept, family relationship quality and externalizing behavior among adolescents. The purpose behind is to measure the degree of self-esteem, family connection quality, and externalizing behavior 19 Chapter II

among secondary school students, in this study the 400 participants were selected through multi stage clustering sampling technique. In order to data were gathered through self-administered questionnaires. The results indicate that the majority of teenagers have a moderate degree of self-concept, externalizing behavior and family relationship quality. In terms of gender differences, the findings revealed that family belief, family structure, and externalizing behavior varied significantly by gender Furthermore, the results revealed a negative significant connection between aggressive behavior and self-concept, family cohesiveness, and family structure. These findings showed that self-concept and family connection value are important determinants in teenage behavior development. (Zakaria et al., 2018).

Research Methodology

This chapter outlines the methodology used to investigate the relationship between helicopter parenting, self-concept, and rule-breaking behavior among adolescent boys in Southern Punjab, Pakistan. It details the research design, setting, sampling strategy, participants, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and measurement instruments, with strict adherence to ethical considerations during data collection.

A cross-sectional research design was employed to assess the associations between helicopter parenting, self-concept, and rule-breaking behavior in adolescent boys. This design facilitated data

collection from diverse individuals at a single point in time, varying by key characteristics such as age and educational level (Cherry et al., 2018).

Data were collected from private and government boys' colleges in Lahore and Toba Tek Singh, Southern Punjab, Pakistan. A multistage sampling technique was used, combining stratified and random sampling. Two strata were created based on educational level (1st and 2nd year intermediate students), with participants randomly selected from each stratum to ensure representative data collection.

Participants

The study included 300 adolescent boys aged 16–18 years, enrolled in 1st or 2nd year at private and government colleges. Participants were limited to boys studying in 1st or 2nd year of college. Students above or below the specified age range, those not in 1st or 2nd year, girls, and students with disabilities were excluded. Three validated scales and a demographic sheet were used for assessment: Captured participant details, including age, educational year (1st or 2nd year), institution type (government or private), family system (nuclear or joint), family size, birth order, and parents' professions.

Perceived Helicopter Parenting Scale (Kashaf & Khurshid, 2021)

A 24-item Likert scale (0 = never, 3 = most of the time) assessing maternal and paternal behaviors across two factors: restricting social activities and dominance/control.

Self-Concept Scale (Jabeen & Rehman, 2015)

A 21-item, 7-point Likert scale (1 = very, 7 = very) measuring positive and negative self-concept based on adolescents' perceptions of personal attributes.

Rule-Breaking Behavior Scale (Naeem & Mahmood, 2014)

A 50-item, 4-point Likert scale (0 = never, 3 = most of the time) evaluating rule-breaking behaviors across five factors: sexual rule-breaking, offensive rule-breaking, group rule-breaking, non-physical bullying, and in-group violence.

Results

This chapter of the present research describe the results of the study. In this study, three research measures were used to measure the Perceived Helicopter Parenting, Self-Concept and Rule Breaking Behavior in Adolescent boys including Perceived Helicopter Parenting (PHP), (Kashaf & Khurshid, 2021), Self-Concept Scale (SCS), (Jabeen & Rehman, 2015), Rule Breaking Behaviour Scale (RBBS), (Naeem & Mahmood, 2014). The results of the research were divided into three sections which are as follows:

Table 1: Mean and Standard Deviation of Adolescent Boys (N=300)

Variables	Age Range	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	15-20	17.12	0.81

Note. *M*= mean, *SD*= standard deviation

The results of descriptive analysis of age of the adolescent boys indicate that the average age of boys in our study is 17.12 years. Overall minimum and maximum age b/w 15-20 most of the participants.

Table 2: Frequency and Percentage of the Demographic Characteristics of Adolescent Boys (N=300)

Demographic Variables	Boys	
	<i>f</i>	%
Education Year		
1 st year	150	50%
2 nd year	150	50%
Educational Institute		
Private	150	50%
Government	150	50%
Family System		
Nuclear	173	57.7%
Joint	127	42.3%
Family Size		
Small Family Size (1-4)	190	63.3%
Large Family Size (5-9)	110	36.7%
Mother profession		
Working women	17	5.7%
Housewife	283	94.3%

Note. *f*= frequency, %= percentage

The given table indicates the descriptive expression of percentage and frequency of the demographics of the participants. Descriptive statistical characteristics of educational year, educational institute, family system, family size and mother profession.

The result of the table 2 indicates the frequency and percentages of the demographic characteristics of the participants of the current research. The results of the table 2 shows that the total population comprises on 300 adolescent boys out of which 150 boys' students were in first year, 150 adolescent boys were in second years, making 50% and 50% respectively. Furthermore, there are 150 adolescent boys in private college and 150 adolescent boys in Government College with 50% and 50% representative of the sample. There is a total of 73 adolescent boys belongs to nuclear family system and whereas 127 boys belong to joint family system with the percentage of 57.7% and 42.3% of the sample of adolescent boys respectively, which means there were more participants participate in the research who belongs to nuclear family system rather than joint family system.

While the adolescent boys belong to small family size range between 1-4 out of those 63.3% respectively large family size range between 5-9 with 36.7%. In this research the boys were more belongs to small family size than large family size. The boys were results further describe that 5.7% of the mother of the adolescent boys are working women, 94.3% are house wife and serving their family when it comes to mother's profession. As it mentioned above a huge range of boys were the son of housewife mother rather than working women.

Table 3: Mean Differences of Family Size on Perceived Helicopter Parenting (N=300).

	Family Size						95% CI		
Variables	Small (N=190)		Large (N=110)		<i>t</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
HPP Mother	24.53	7.23	24.96	7.26	.09	-1.58	1.75	—	
PHP Father	23.01	8.12	24.85	8.11	.96	-.95	2.79	—	
PSC	24.93	8.97	23.15	8.31	-.05	-2.07	1.96	—	
NSC	49.43	12.16	51.64	10.99	.76*	-1.66	3.76	0.19	
RBBS Total	17.42	16.45	14.51	13.54	-.43*	-4.37	2.77	0.19	
SRBB (F1)	2.14	3.66	1.55	2.94	4.66	-.60	.97	—	
ORB (F2)	3.21	4.21	2.58	3.36	-.22*	-1.08	.80	0.16	
RBIG (F3)	5.21	5.24	4.55	4.68	-.80	-1.63	.68	—	
NPB (F4)	2.61	2.89	2.05	2.33	-.63*	-.82	.42	0.21	
IGV (F5)	4.24	3.56	3.79	2.95	-.49	-.96	.57	—	

Note. df= 298 M=Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, CI= Confidence Interval, LL= Lower Limit, UL= Upper Limit, PHP= Perceived Helicopter Parenting, SC=Self-Concept, RBB=Rule Breaking Behavior Scale, * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

The above-mentioned table shows the significant difference in negative self-concept (PSC) factor which means that the boys in large family size have more negative self-concept issues as compared to the small family size. Moreover, the low significant difference also found in rule breaking behavior (RBB), offensive rule breaking (ORB) and non-physical bullying (NPB) factors which means the boys who belongs to small family's size tend to be perform less these kinds of behaviors as compared to the boys who belongs to the large family size.

Table 4: Mean Differences of Educational Institute on Perceived Helicopter Parenting and Rule Breaking Behavior (N=300).

	Educational Institute						95% CI		
Variables	Private (N=150)		Government (N=150)		<i>t</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>					
PHP Mother	24.99	7.62	24.4	6.84	.70	-1.05	2.23	—	
PHP Father	24.28	8.58	23.10	7.61	1.25	-.67	3.03	—	
PSC	24.70	9.70	23.85	7.71	.84**	-1.13	2.84	0.09	
NSC	48.22	12.91	52.26	10.17	-3.05***	-6.67	-1.39	0.34	
RBBS Total	19.01	17.78	13.73	12.34	2.98***	1.80	8.77	0.34	
SRBB (F1)	2.75	4.36	1.10	1.71	4.29***	.89	2.41	0.49	
ORB (F2)	3.73	4.64	2.23	2.89	3.34***	.61	2.37	0.38	
RBIG (F3)	5.55	5.48	4.39	4.51	1.99*	.01	2.29	0.04	
NPB (F4)	2.51	2.97	2.23	2.43	1.13*	-.26	.97	0.12	
IGV (F5)	4.39	3.71	3.77	2.93	1.60**	-.14	1.38	0.18	

Note. df= 298 M=Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, CI= Confidence Interval, LL= Lower Limit, UL= Upper Limit, PHP= Perceived Helicopter Parenting, SC=Self-Concept, RBB=Rule Breaking Behavior Scale, * $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$

The above table revealed the moderate significant difference in positive self-concept factor which means the boys of private institute possess more positive self-concept rather than the boys of government institute. Results also indicated the highly significant differences in rule breaking behavior scale, sexual rule breaking behavior (SRBB), and offensive rule breaking (ORB) factor which shows that the private institute boys indulge in these behaviors as compared to the government institute boys. Moreover, the low significant differences found in the rule breaking in groups (RBIG), Non-physical bullying (NPB) and In-group violence (IGV) which means that the private institute boys possess more these kinds of behaviors as compared to the government institute boys.

At the end, the results also revealed highly significant differences in negative self-concept factor which depict that the government institute boys having less negative self-concept as compared to the private institute boys.

Table 5: Mean Differences of Educational Year on Perceived Helicopter Parenting and Rule Breaking Behavior and Self-Concept (N=300)

						95% CI		
Variables	1 st year (N=150)		2 nd year (N=150)		<i>t</i>	<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
PHP Mother	24.44	7.24	24.95	7.25	-.60	-2.15	1.13	—
PHP Father	23.26	7.96	24.12	8.36	-.91	-2.71	.99	—
PSC	23.75	9.07	24.81	8.43	-1.05	-3.05	.92	—
NSC	48.82	13.10	51.66	10.12	-2.10***	-5.50	-.18	0.24
RBB Total	15.75	17.01	16.98	13.85	-.69*	-4.76	2.21	0.15
SRBB (F1)	1.79	3.84	2.06	2.97	-.67	-1.04	.51	—
ORB (F2)	2.89	4.38	3.07	3.44	-.38*	-1.06	.72	0.06
RBIG (F3)	4.95	5.56	4.99	4.51	-.08	-1.11	1.10	—
NPB (F4)	2.34	2.75	2.48	2.69	-.45	-.76	.47	—
IGV (F5)	3.77	3.61	4.38	3.05	-1.57	-1.37	1.53	—

Note. df= 298 M=Mean, SD= Standard Deviation, CI= Confidence Interval, LL= Lower Limit, UL= Upper Limit, PHP= Perceived Helicopter Parenting, SC=Self-Concept, RBB=Rule Breaking Behavior Scale, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

The result of the above table indicates the highly significant difference in self-concept factor which shows that the adolescent boys of the 2nd year class possess more negative self-concept as compared to the boys of 1st year class. Moreover, there is also a low significant difference in rule breaking behavior and offensive rule breaking factor which depicted that the boys of the 2nd year classes possess more rule breaking behavior than 1st year boys.

Table 6: Hierarchical Regression Analysis for Predictors of Rule Breaking Behavior in Adolescent Boys.

Variables	<i>B</i>	95% CI for B		<i>SEB</i>	β	R^2	ΔR^2
		<i>LL</i>	<i>UL</i>				
Step -1						.01	.00
Age	1.01	-1.20	3.21	1.12	.05		
Birth order	-.74	-1.81	.33	.54	-.08		
Family system	.49	-3.10	4.08	1.82	.02		

Step -2						.01	-.06
PHP Mother	-.13	-.54	.26	.20	-.06		
PHP Father	.11	-.24	.47	.18	.06		
Step -3						.05	.03**
PSC	.35	.15	.55	.10	.19**		
NSC	-.03	-.18	.12	.08	-.02		

Note. RBB=Rule Breaking Behavior, B=Unstandardized coefficient, SE B=Standard Error of Beta, β =Standardized Coefficient, R²=Coefficient of Multiple Determination, CI= Confidence Interval, LL= Lower Limit, UL= Upper Limit, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

In model I and model II there was no significant predictor of rule breaking behavior (RBB) in adolescent boys. Whereas, in model III positive self-concept factor of self-concept was a significant predictor of rule breaking behavior in adolescent boys. The first model accounted for 1% variance whereas model II accounted for 1% variance and model III explain 5% variance on rule breaking behavior in adolescent boys.

Table 7: Summary of Inter-correlations, Means and Standard Deviations of Perceived Helicopter Parenting Scale, Self-Concept Scale, and Rule Breaking Behavior Scale and their Factors (N=300)

	PHP M	PHPF	SC P	SCN	RBB (Total)	SRB (F1)	ORB (F2)	RBIG (F3)	NPB (F4)	IGV (F5)
PHPM	---	.79***	.02	-.10	-.01	-.04	.03	-.03	-.07	.07
PHPF	---	---	.03	-.12*	.02	-.01	.08	-.03	-.07	.09
SCP	---	---	---	-.16**	.21***	.15**	.19***	.13**	.21***	.21***
SCN	---	---	---	---	-.06	-.04	-.09	-.03	-.08	-.02
RBB Total	---	---	---	---	---	.77***	.87***	.90***	.79***	.80***
SRB (F1)	---	---	---	---	---	---	.69***	.50***	.51***	.43***
ORB (F2)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.60***	.50***	.50***
RBIG (F3)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.65***	.60***
NPB F4	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	.64***
IGV (F5)	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
M	24.69	23.69	24.28	50.24	16.37	1.92	2.98	4.97	2.41	4.07
SD	7.24	8.16	8.76	11.78	15.47	3.42	3.93	5.05	2.71	3.35

Note. M=Mean, SD=Standard Deviation, PHPM=Perceived Helicopter Parenting Mother, PHPF=Perceived Helicopter Parenting, SCP=Self-Concept Positive, SCN=Self-Concept Negative, RBBS=Rule Breaking Behaviour Scale, SRB=Sexual Rule Breaking, ORB=Offensive Rule Breaking, RBIG= Rule Breaking in Groups, NPB=Non-Physical Behavior, IGV=In-Group Violence, * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

In the above table, the correlation was tested on the factors and whole measures. The results disclosed highly significant, positive correlation between perceived helicopter parenting mother (PHP M) and perceived helicopter parenting father (PHP F) in adolescent boys.

Positive self-concept (PSC) in adolescent boys had a highly significant positive correlation with the rule breaking behavior and its factors, offensive rule breaking (ORB), non-physical bullying (NPB), and in-group violence (IGV) but moderate significant relationship with sexual rule breaking behavior (SRBB) rule breaking in groups (RBIG) which means that boys who have positive self-concept less likely to experience these kinds of behaviors.

The rule breaking behavior (RBB) and its four factors found the highly significant positive correlation with the sexual rule breaking behavior (SRBB), offensive rule breaking (ORB), rule breaking in group (RBIG), non-physical bullying (NPB), and in-group violence (IGV) which illustrated that adolescent boys more indulge in these types of behaviors.

Whereas the results also indicate that perceived helicopter parenting father (PHP F) and negative self-concept (NSC) had a weak but non-significant negative correlation. Lastly, the rule breaking behavior has moderate significant negative correlation with its factor offensive rule breaking (ORB).

Discussion

This study examined the impact of helicopter parenting on self-concept and rule-breaking behavior among 300 Pakistani adolescent boys in a collectivistic society. It tested hypotheses on relationships between these factors, educational year, institution type, and family size.

Helicopter parenting, particularly by fathers, significantly correlated with negative self-concept (NSC), consistent with findings that over-control lowers adolescents' self-perception, affecting mental well-being (Mabbe et al., 2015). In Pakistan, paternal overprotection is often viewed positively, fostering discipline and reducing NSC (Jabeen et al., 2013). However, no significant link was found between helicopter parenting and rule-breaking behavior, reflecting cultural family oversight that discourages deviance (Nelson et al., 2015; Muzaffar, 2017).

Positive self-concept (PSC) inversely predicted rule-breaking behavior, aligning with research linking low self-concept to deviance (Bharathi & Sreedevi, 2015). In Pakistan, cultural acceptance of male misbehavior and peer pressure amplify such behaviors, unlike stricter norms for girls (Khalid et al., 2018). Adolescents in private colleges showed higher PSC but more rule-breaking than those in government colleges, where resource constraints deter deviance (Hameed & Hameed, 2016).

Large family sizes (5-9 members) were associated with higher NSC compared to small families (1-4 members), due to diluted parental attention (Sears, 2007). Conversely, small families exhibited less rule-breaking, as greater parental focus fosters a supportive environment (Ali, 2013). Pakistan's collectivistic culture, with frequent parental comparisons, exacerbates NSC in large families (Abdullah & Rahman, 2015).

Second-year students displayed higher NSC and slightly more rule-breaking than first-year students, reflecting developmental and cultural influences (Lichner et al., 2021). These findings underscore the role of parenting and self-concept in adolescent behavior, highlighting the need for culturally tailored interventions in Pakistan.

Conclusion

The present research offered detailed information regarding the delicate subject of helicopter parenting and the adverse outcomes linked with this in the socio-cultural environment of Pakistan. This research makes it crystal clear that parental involvement is detrimental to teenage psychological health and has a detrimental impact on self-concept and rule-breaking behaviour on adolescents. Besides this over-controlling parenting has adverse effect on the adolescent's self-concept and play a vital role indulge in more deviant behaviors. This overly protective parenthood appears to be beneficial on the surface for parental figures even strangers, so this appears to have resulted in such a variety of bad behavior or mental disorders in teenagers.

Recommendations

- It is suggested that future researchers compare adolescent girls and boys to helicopter parenting styles which could assist us in fill the vacuum and find out the impact of helicopter parenting.
- Future study should investigate the effect of over-involvement parenting views vs. objective measurements of helicopter parenting activities, along with parent's assessments over their own behaviors or attitudes.

References

1. Abdullah, M., & Abd Rahman, N. A. B. (2015). Family role in deviant behaviour development of adolescents referring juvenile delinquency. A qualitative approach. *Science International*, 28(6), 5189-95.
2. Ali, H. O. (2013). Factors affecting students' academic performance in mathematical sciences department in tertiary institutions in Nigeria, Kogi State University,
3. Anderson, W.P. (1998). *Incongruence between Self-Concept and Experience: The Case of Thomas Merton*. Retrieved from Thomas Merton Center. University of Virginia.
4. Azizi, Yahya, Jamaluddin, Ramli, Yusof, Boon, Najib, Ghaffar, Zurihanmi, & Zakariya. (2009). Relationship between self-concept and personality and student's academic performance in selected secondary schools. *European Journal of Social Sciences*.
5. Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices antecedent three patterns of pre-school behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75 (1), 43-88.
6. Becht, A. I., Nelemans, S. A., Van Dijk, M. P., Branje, S. J., Van Lier, P. A., Denissen, J. J., & Meeus, W. H. (2017). Clear self, better relationships: Adolescents' self-concept clarity and relationship quality with parents and peers across 5 years. *Child development*, 88(6), 1823-1833.
7. Belsky, J., & Barends, N. (2002). Personality and parenting. in m. h. bornstein, *Handbook of Parenting* (415-438).
8. Bharathi, T. A., & Sreedevi, P. (2016). A study on the self-concept of adolescents. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 5(10), 512-516
9. Blakemore, S. J. (2019). Adolescence and mental health. *The lancet*, 393(10185), 2030-2031.
10. Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss, Attachment*. Hogarth Press, London.
11. Campbell, S.B., Shaw, D.S., & Gilliom, M. (2010). Early externalizing behavior problems: Toddlers and preschoolers at risk for later maladjustment. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 467- 488.
12. Chen K, Lay K, Wu Y, Yao G. (2017). Adolescent self-identity and mental health: The function of identity importance, identity firmness, and identity discrepancy. *Chinese Journal of Psychology*. 2017; 49:53-72.

13. Cherry, M. G., Fletcher, I., Berridge, D., & O'Sullivan, H. (2018). Do doctors' attachment styles and emotional intelligence influence patients' emotional expressions in primary care consultations? An exploratory study using multilevel analysis. *Patient Education and Counseling*, 101(4), 659-664.
14. Currie, C.; Zanotti, C.; Morgan, A.; Currie, D.; de Looze, M.H.; Roberts, C.; Samdal, O.; Otto, R.F.; Smith, V.B. Social Determinants of Health and Well-Being among Young People. In *Health Behaviour in School-Aged Children (HBSC) Study: International Report from the 2009/2010 Survey*; World Health Organization Regional for Europe: Copenhagen, Denmark, 2012.
15. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macro theory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(3), 182.
16. Freud, A. (1969). Adolescence as a developmental disturbance. In *adolescence*; Caplan, G., Lebovici, S., Eds.; Basic Books: New York, NY, USA, 5-10.
17. Ganaprakasam, C., Davaidass, K. S., & Muniandy, S. C. (2018). Helicopter parenting and psychological consequences among adolescent. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 8(6), 378-382.
18. Hameed, N., & Hameed, F. (2016). Effect of cultural factors on students of Pakistan. arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.01580.
19. Ibukunole, C. (2013). Payer and service to specific estimates. *Health Affairs Journal*, 28, 31- 72
20. Jabeen, F., Anis-ul-Haque, M., & Riaz, M. (2013). Parenting styles as predictors of emotion regulation among adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 28(1), 85-105
21. Kaplan, H.B., 1980. Deviant behavior in defence of self. Academic Press, New York.
22. Kimble, A. B. (2014). The parenting styles and dimensions questionnaire: A reconceptualization and validation. 41-58.
23. Kwon, K., Yoo, G., & Bingham, G. E. (2016). Helicopter parenting in emerging adulthood: Support or barrier for Korean college student's psychological adjustment? *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 25, 136-145.
24. LeMoyne, T., & Buchanan, T. (2011). Does "hovering" matter? Helicopter parenting and its effect on well-being. *Sociological Spectrum*, 31, 399-418.
25. Lichner, V., Petriková, F., & Žiaková, E. (2021). Adolescent's self-concept in the context of risk behavior and self-care. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 26(1), 57-70.
26. Lythcott-Haims, J. (2015, July 05). College-age depression is increasingly tied to helicopter parenting, studies show.
27. Mabbe, E., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Van Leeuwen, K. (2015). Do personality traits moderate relations between psychologically controlling parenting and problem behavior in adolescents? *Journal of Personality*, 84, 381-392.
28. Mabbe, E., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Van Leeuwen, K. (2015). Do personality traits moderate relations between psychologically controlling parenting and problem behavior in adolescents? *Journal of Personality*, 84, 381-392
29. Marsh, H.W., Parada, P.H., & Ayotte, V. (2014). A multidimensional perspective of relations between self-concept (Self-Description Questionnaire II) and adolescent mental health, *Psychological Assessment*, 16(1), 27-41.
30. McLeod, S. A. (2007). Carl Rogers Simply Psychology. Retrieved, 8th October 2013.
31. Mishra, M. A., & Bhatt, M. S. (2021) Perceived family environment and self-concept among young adults in Indian context.

32. Muzaffar, N. N. (2017). Role of family system, positive emotions and resilience in social adjustment among Pakistani adolescents. *Journal of Educational, Health and Community Psychology*, 6(2), 46-58.
33. Nelson, L. J., Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Nielson, M. G. (2015). Is hovering smothering or loving? An examination of parental warmth as a moderator of relations between helicopter parenting and emerging adults' indices of adjustment. *Emerging Adulthood*, 3, 282-285.
34. Ostagard-Ybrandt, H., & Armelius, B. A. (2004). Self-concept and perception of early mother and father behaviour in normal and antisocial adolescent. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 437-447.
35. Padilla-Walker, L. M., & Nelson, L. J. (2012). Black hawk down? Establishing helicopter parenting as a distinct construct from other forms of parental control during emerging adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence*, 35, 1177-1190
36. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and wellbeing. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
37. Saleem, S., & Mahmood, Z. (2011). Development of a scale for assessing emotional and behavioural problems of school children. *Pakistan Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 9, 73-78.
38. Schiffrin, H. H., Liss, M., Miles-McLean, H., Geary, K. A., Erchull, M. J., & Tashner, T. (2014). Helping or hovering? The effects of helicopter parenting on college students' well-being. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 23(3), 548-557.
39. Sears, M. (2007). Family size and academic performance of primary school pupils in Enugu. *Unpublished (B.Ed Project)*. University of Nigeria, Nsukka.
40. Segin, C., Givertz, M., Swaitkowski, P., & Montgomery, N. (2015). Overparenting is associated with child problems and a critical family environment. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24, 470-479.
41. Segrin, C., Wosidlo, A., Givertz, M., & Montgomery, N. (2013). Parent and child traits associated with overparenting. *Journal of Social and Clinical*
42. Steinberg, L. (2014). *Age of Opportunity: Lessons from the New Science of Adolescence*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt
43. Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). development A. *Adolescent Development. Annu Rev Psychol*, 52, 83-110.
44. Van Dijk, M. P., Branje, S., Keijsers, L., Hawk, S. T., Hale, W. W., III, & Meeus, W. (2014). Self-concept clarity across adolescence: Longitudinal associations with open communication with parents and internalizing symptoms. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 43, 1861-1876.
45. Xu, Q., Li, S., & Yang, L. (2019). Perceived social support and mental health for college students in mainland China: the mediating effects of self-concept. *Psychology, Health & Medicine*, 24(5), 595-604.
46. Zakaria, P., Noor, A. M., & Khir, A. M. (2018). Relationship between self-concept, family relationship and externalizing behavior among adolescents in selangor. *Malaysian Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities (MJSSH)*, 3(3), 6-16.
47. Cui, Y., Chen, Z., Wei, S., Wang, S., Liu, T., & Hu, G. (2016). Attention-over-attention neural networks for reading comprehension. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1607.04423*.
48. Naeem, A. T., Ihsan, F., & Mahmood, Z. (2014). The study of organizational justice, violation of psychological contract and its effect on job satisfaction in Paints Industry of Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(12), 2222-6990.

49. Ganaprakasam, C., Davaidass, K. S., & Muniandy, S. C. (2018). Helicopter parenting and psychological consequences among adolescent. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 8(6), 378-382.
50. Baumeister, R. F. (1999). Self-concept, self-esteem, and identity.
51. Rogers, C. R. (1951). Perceptual reorganization in client-centered therapy.