Adolescents' Perception of Parenting Styles Vs Socioeconomic Status and Family Structure

Abstract

Adolescence is generally considered healthy times of life influenced by mainly family members and their interactions with adolescents. The present study was aimed to assess the family interactional styles with reference to SES and Family structures. The study was carried out on 200 adolescents (n=200) , in the age range of 16-18 years divided equally according to, SES (U:SES, M:SES) and family structures (JFs and NFs). The Ss were selected by systematic purposive sampling technique. Basic profile inventory and Kuppuswami's SES Scale were used to draw a final sample and children's perception of parenting styles (CPPS) were used for family interactional style assessment. The finding shows that 'Democratic parenting style' was 'highly' adopted parenting style as perceived by adolescents from two selected independent variables i.e. SES and Family structures with insignificant differences.

Keywords: Adolescence, Family Interactional Style, Socioeconomic Status, Family Structure.

Introduction

Adolescents need to have physical contact to be nurtured and to be comforted in distress, which is easily fulfilled in most of cases in family. In joint family, adolescents are provided with the adequate opportunity to express their emotions, choices, as well as opinion in different discussion where as in nuclear family system, the children are totally dependent over their parents for fulfilment of their basic emotional needs. In most of cases parents are working class, or not knowledgeable; to understand the child psychology, and step forward in giving their child proper emotional support Tewari and suryawanshi (2012).

Varghese and Thomas (2012) conducted study on use of Decision skills, Problem solving skills, Coping with emotions and Coping with stress skills in parenting practices, using an exploratory research design. 50 parents of adolescents aged between 13 to 19 years from Bangalore were interviewed using snowball sampling method. Self prepared semi structured interview schedule was used for collecting the required data from the sample. The results revealed that majority of the parents use their own skills in dealing with problematic situations of their teenagers than helping the teenagers' use theirs.

Globally, findings revealed that emotional separation and detachment are two distinct dimensions of the parent-adolescent relationship.Ingoglia, Coco, Liga and Cricchio (2011).

Varghese and Thomas (2010) analyze the use of life skills in Parenting Practices by the parents. Sample size was 50 parents of teenage children aged between 13 to 19 years from Bangalore. According to the study 58% of the parents solve problems for their adolescent children by using their problem solving skill. 80% of the parents think that their adolescent children are capable of taking own decision. 30% of the parents reported that the parents keep quiet when their adolescent children express anger.

The level of punishment in case of boys is more as compared to girls.The reason may be that at the adolescent stage boys are at the doorsteps of risk which has serious negative consequences. So to protect adolescent boy from risky behavior parents may use physical as well as affective punishment. Parents want to make their children learn socially appropriate behaviour and limit socially in-appropriate behaviours. But parents are often confused about effective ways to set limit and instil self

J. Meena

Assistant Professor
PG Dept. of Home Science,
University of Rajasthan,
Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

D.Narang

Retd. Associate Professor,
PG Dept. of Home Science,
University of Rajasthan,
Jaipur, Rajasthan, India

S. Meena

Assistant Professor,
Dept. of Home Science,
MPUAT,
Udaipur, Rajasthan, India

control in their child because of lack of education and knowledge of child rearing practices (Musick and Meier, 2010)

The presence of grandparent at home is a boon for the grandchildren (Edwards, 1998). Researchers have found that the unconditional love that grandparents bestow upon grandchildren, aid in their self- esteem and positive perception. During adolescence, grandchildren find it beneficial to tap the wisdom and ancestry of grandparents to assist in ego development. This positive psychosocial role that grandparents play suggest that family units as a whole may rely less on public social resources to aid with developmental tasks. Families in India are undergoing vast change like, divorce and separation, domestic intergenerational conflicts, modernizations and industrialization, in such a scenario the model of "Joint Family System" has also changed.

Role of Parents

Today, the functions of parents have radically changed. Parenting has become more difficult and complicated owing to a variety of factors. These factors are the result of the instability and discontinuity in the political, economic and social environment which had far-reaching effects on young couples and their offsprings.

Schaefer (1959) offered a two-dimensional model of child-rearing behaviours. He argued that most parental behaviour can be viewed as a blend of two bipolar dimensions, love-hostility and autonomy-control. Love-hostility refers to expressions of affection, support, anger, and criticism. Autonomy-control refers to setting and enforcing family rules.

Some parents set limits and strictly enforce them. Other parents invite children's opinions about limits and encourage children to reach their own decisions.

Hence, the present study was aimed to assess family interactional styles with reference to SES and Family structures.

Methodology

The study was carried out on 200 adolescents (n=200) derived from universe population of 430, in the age range of 16-18 years divided equally according to SES (U:SES, M:SES) and family structures (JFs and NFs). The Ss were selected by systematic purposive sampling technique. Basic profile inventory and Kuppuswami's SES Scale were used to draw a final sample. Dependent variables i.e. interactional styles of family were determined by using Children's Perception of Parenting Scale (CPPS)- Dr.Anand Pyari and Dr. Raj Kumari Kalra (2005)

Results

Children's Perception of Parenting Styles (CPPS)

Martinez and Garcia (2007) examined and found that there were no differences between the priority given by adolescents of authoritative and indulgent parents to any of the self-transcendence and conservation values, whereas adolescents of authoritarian and neglectful parents, in general, assign the lowest priority to all of the values.

SES Wise Differences on CPPS

The Ss were equally divided in two SE strata i.e.; Upper and Middle SES. The data were analyzed and presented SES wise in tables 1 to assess perception of the Ss regarding PSs.

Table 1: Frequency-Percentage Profile on CPPS on the Basis of SES (N=200)

	Parenting Styles	SES Group	Average	High	Very High
1.	Democratic	Upper	23(23)	61(61)	16(16)
		Middle	21(21)	50(50)	29(29)
2.	Autocratic	Upper	74(74)	26(26)	0
		Middle	74(74)	26(26)	0
3.	Accepting	Upper	27(27)	73(73)	0
		Middle	32(32)	68(68)	0
4.	Rejecting	Upper	100(100)	0	0
		Middle	100(100)	0	0
5.	Over protecting	Upper	66(66)	34(34)	0
		Middle	71(71)	29(29)	0
6.	Over demanding	Upper	43(43)	57(57)	0
		Middle	40(40)	60(60)	0

Table 1 presents the percentage profiles of the Ss on the CPPS and It can be interpreted for each parenting styles in both SES groups. In 'Democratic parenting style', 61% Ss from upper SES perceived 'highly' adoptive parenting style followed by 23% in 'average' and 16% in 'very high' level. Whereas 50% Ss from middle SES perceived 'Democratic parenting style' in 'high' level followed by 29% in 'very high' level and 21% in 'average' level. In the 'Autocratic parenting style' as well as other parenting styles follow same pattern in both SES groups i.e. 74% Ss from upper and middle SES perceived 'Autocratic parenting style' in 'average' level and 26% in 'high' level. Whereas 73% and 68% Ss from upper and middle SES perceive that their parents had 'high' level in 'Accepting parenting style' followed by 27% and 32% had 'average' level respectively. This is very surprisingly to see that 100% Ss from both SES group perceived 'Rejecting parenting style' in 'average' level. In 'Over protecting parenting style' 66% and 71% Ss perceived 'average' level and 34% and 29% in 'high' level. On the other hand, 57% and 60% Ss from upper and middle SES perceived 'high' level and 43% and 40% Ss in 'average' level respectively in 'Over demanding parenting style'.

Remarking An Analisation

Table 2: Mean, SD and 't' Value of Upper and Middle SES Subjects on CPPS

S.No.	Dimensions	SES	Mean	S.D.	't' value
1.	Democratic	Upper	27.9100	4.131	-1.243 NS
		Middle	28.700	4.831	
2.	Autocratic	Upper	23.838	3.727	-.783 NS
		Middle	24.2400	3.510	
3.	Accepting	Upper	30.5600	4.441	.426 NS
		Middle	30.2700	5.155	
4.	Rejecting	Upper	16.8400	6.190	-.854 NS
		Middle	17.6000	6.394	
5.	Over protecting	Upper	24.09	.7666	.581 NS
		Middle	24.03	.744	
6.	Over demanding	Upper	25.23	2.403	-.492 NS
		Middle	25.40	2.486	

****Significant at 0.01 level of significance. * Significant at 0.05 level of significance.
N.S. = Not significant**

Table no 2 indicated the difference among parenting styles between upper and middle SES group so it can be concluded that no SES wise significant difference was observed in all six parenting styles of CPPS. It is also clear that the parents adopt same parenting style irrespective of socio-economic status.

The findings are also supported by Mohanty and Devi (2010) which, revealed that good education and occupation of parents, positively and significantly affects the interpersonal relationship (IR) of the adolescents. It means that parents having good occupation have adolescents having the ability in establishing and maintaining mutually satisfying relationship characterized by emotional closeness and intimacy.

Again the relationship between adolescents and adolescents' family environment examined by Babcock (2009) concluded that poor family environment is linked to social rejection and antisocial behaviour.

Family Structure Wise Differences on CPPS

. The data were analyzed and presented in the following tables for studying the differences according to family structures in parenting styles perceived by adolescents:

Table 3: Frequency-Percentage Profile on CPPS on the Basis of Family Structure (JFs=100 and NFs=100)

S.No.	Parenting styles	Family structures	Average *f* (%)	High *f* (%)	Very High *f* (%)
1.	Democratic	JFs	21	50	29
		NFs	74	26	0
2.	Autocratic	JFs	74	26	0
		NFs	74	26	0
3.	Accepting	JFs	23	47	30
		NFs	13	55	32
4.	Rejecting	JFs	100	0	0
		NFs	100	0	0
5.	Over protecting	JFs	71	29	0
		NFs	66	34	0
6.	Over demanding	JFs	40	60	0
		NFs	43	57	0

Table 3 presents & interprets the percentage profiles of the Ss belonging to different family structures, 50% Ss from JFs perceived 'Democratic PS' as 'highly' adapted parenting style followed by 29% in 'very high' and 21% in 'average' level. Whereas 74% Ss from NFs perceived 'Democratic parenting style' in 'average' level followed by 26% in 'high' level. None of the Ss from NFs perceived 'Democratic parenting style' in 'very high' level. In the 'Autocratic parenting style' as well as other parenting styles follow same pattern in both family structures i.e. 74% Ss from JFs and NFs perceived 'Autocratic parenting style' in 'average' level and 26% in 'high' level. Whereas 47% and 55% Ss from JFs and NFs perceive that their parents had adapted 'Accepting parenting style' in 'high' level followed by 30% and 32% had perceived in 'very high' level and 23% and 13% had perceived in 'average level' respectively; but 100% Ss from both family structures perceived 'Rejecting parenting style' in 'average' level. 'Over protecting parenting style' was perceived by 71% (JFs) and 66% (NFs) Ss perceived in 'average' level and 29% and 34% in 'high' level respectively. Whereas 60% and 57% Ss from JFs and NFs perceived 'high' level and 40% and 43% Ss in 'average' level of adoption respectively in using 'Over demanding parenting style'.

Table 4: Mean, SD and 't' value of Ss Belonging to JFs and NFs on CPPS

S.No.	Dimensions	Family Structure	Mean	S.D.	't' value
1.	Democratic	JFs	28.6200	4.3711	1.668 NS
		NFs	27.6200	4.1016	
2.	Autocratic	JFs	24.1200	3.6021	1.676 NS
		NFs	25.0000	3.8191	
3.	Accepting	JFs	30.5900	5.1011	1.509 NS
		NFs	29.6100	4.0198	
4.	Rejecting	JFs	17.5600	6.2447	.664 NS
		NFs	17.0000	5.6764	
5.	Over protecting	JFs	24.0600	.77616	.055 NS
		NFs	24.0500	1.6476	
6.	Over demanding	JFs	25.2600	2.5009	.381 NS
		NFs	25.1200	2.6941	

**Significant at 0.01 level of significance. * Significant at 0.05 level of significance. N.S. = Not significant

In the table 4 calculated values of 't' were less than tabulated 't' value at .01 and .05 levels of significance (1.96 and 2.58) in all parenting styles between JFs and NFs Ss, so it can be concluded that no significant differences were observed in all six parenting styles of CPPS in both the family structures. It also indicated that the parents from both JFs and NFs families adopt same parenting style.

The results are in line with the study conducted by Moore et al. (2007) who found that children (13-16 years of age) who grow up in traditional family i.e. two biological parents household, tend to fare better on a wide variety of emotional well-being.

Lansford et al. (2010) examined children's perceptions of maternal hostility as a mediator of the links between physical discipline and harsh verbal discipline and children's adjustment. Physical discipline and harshness had direct effects on children's anxiety and aggression (mother's reports). In contrast, there were no significant direct effects of physical discipline and harsh verbal discipline on their own anxiety and aggression (children's report). Instead, both physical discipline and harsh verbal discipline had indirect effects on the outcomes through children's perceptions of maternal hostility. They identified a significant interaction between perceived formativeness' and use of harsh verbal discipline on children's perception of maternal hostility, but children's perception of the formativeness of physical discipline did not moderate the relation between physical discipline and perceived hostility. The effects of harsh verbal discipline were more adverse when children perceived that form of discipline as being non-normative than when children perceived that form of discipline as being normative. Results of this study are largely consistent with a theoretical model that the meaning children attach to parental discipline strategies is important in understanding associations between discipline and children's adjustment, and that cultural context is associated with children's interpretations of their parents' behaviour.

Varghese and Thomas (2010) analyzed the use of life skills in Parenting Practices by the parents. According to the study more than half of the parents solve problems for their adolescent children by using their problem solving skill and three fourth of the parents think that their adolescent children are capable of taking own decision, whereas one fourth of the parents reported that the parents keep quiet when their adolescent children express anger.

Conclusion

Adolescents' perceived 'Democratic parenting style' adopted at 'Very High' level. Only 'Rejecting parenting style' was perceived at an 'average' level by all the Subjects. Insignificant gender, SES and family structure wise differences were observed in adolescents' perception in all the parenting styles of CPPS under study.

References

Babcock, K. (2008). Conflict at home and problems with the peers, family peer linkage and role of adolescent dispersive symptoms and gender(Unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada.

Ingoglia, S., Coco, A. L., Liga, F., & Cricchio, M. G. G. (2011). Emotional separation and detachment as two distinct dimensions of parent-adolescent relationships. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 35(3), 271-281. doi:10.1177/0165025410385878

Lansford, J. E., Malone, P. S., Dodge, K. A., Chang, L., Chaudhary, N., Tapanya, S., Oburu, P., & Deckard, K. D. (2010). Children's perceptions of maternal hostility as a mediator of the link between discipline and children's adjustment in four countries. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 34(5), 452-461. doi:10.1177/0165025409354933

Mohanty, I. and Devi, L.2010.socio-personal variables and emotional intelligence of adolescents in secure attachment style. European journal of social sciences.8:215-222.

Mohanty, I., & Devi, L. (2010). Socio –personal variables and emotional intelligence of adolescents in secure attachment. Journal of

Indian Academy of applied psychology, 31,18-23.

Moore, K. A, Bronte – tinkew, J, Jekielek, S., Guzman, L, Ryan, S, Redd, Z. and matthews , G. (2007). Developing measures of healthy marriages and relationship handbook of measurement issues in family research. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence-Elbaum.

Musick, K., & Meier, A. (2014). Are both parents always better than one? Parental conflict and young adult wellbeing. J. Indian Assoc. Child Adolesc. Ment. Health, 10(1), 47-68.

Pyari, A. & Kalra, R. K.,(2005). Manual, Children's Perception of Parenting scale. Rakhi Prakashan. Agra.

Schaefer, E. S. (1959). A circumplex model for maternal behavior. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59, 226-335.

Tewari, P., & Suryawanshi, S.K. (2012). Emotional need fulfilment in adolescents of joint family and nuclear family: comparative study. International journal of interdisciplinary research in psychology. 13, 10-15.

Varghese, A. M., & Thomas, B. (2011). Use of life skills in parenting practice. Amity Journal of Applied Psychology, 2(2).

Varghese, A. M., & Thomas, B. (2012). Use of life skills in parenting practice. Amity Journal of Applied Psychology, 3(1).

Varghese, A. M., and Thomas, B. (2010). Use of life skills in parenting practice. Paper presented at the International Conference on Positive Psychology: a New Approach to Mental Health of ICPP-NAMH Amity University, Rajasthan.