CHAPTER-I
INTRODUCTION

PARENTING STYLE:

Parenting style has a major influence on the development of the child and there has been a growing awareness of the importance about parenting style and its impact on the upbringing of child among researchers. Not only do both parents interact with their child, they also interact with each other, possibly take account of each other, and appear at times to be influenced by each other (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Mother-father similarity in parenting has been shown to be greater when the couple is more similar in personality characteristics. Therefore, there will be consistent parenting and few disagreements between the parents (Russell & Russell, 1994).

It is claimed in the literature that what the mother or father thinks, values, or does as an individual parent is, through various possible processes, coordinated with or influenced by what the other parent thinks, values, or does. In this sense, mothers and fathers are said to form a co-parenting alliance and thereby constitute an interrelated subsystem with the family. Therefore, mothers and fathers within families are assumed to influence each other mutually and to be interdependent; that is, within families, mothers' and fathers' parenting behavior, attitudes, and values should be related (Russell & Russell, 1994).

Belsky, Robins, and Gamble (1984) defined competent parenting as “the style of child rearing that enables the developing person to acquire the capacities required for dealing effectively with the ecological niches that she or he will inhabit during childhood, adolescence, and adulthood”. Competent parenting has been found to be related to warmer, more accepting, and more helpful styles of parenting (Bogenschneider et al., 1997). Authoritative parenting is competence-inducing in that it recognizes the child’s need for control and individuality, views the rights and duties of parents and children as complementary, and is characterized by sensitivity to children’s capabilities and the developmental tasks they face (Belsky et al., 1984).

Belsky’s (1984) model of the determinants of parenting guides the research based on the assumption that the determinants of parent resources, child characteristics, and sources of stress and support influence the relationship between parenting and child outcomes. Based on this assumption, this model provides the framework in which the current study will investigated the
relationship between parenting styles and children’s classroom motivation. This model provides a direct link between parenting and child outcomes.

Baumrind (1966) proposed a widely used model of parenting style. Her conceptualization of parenting style probably is best known and has been pivotal in showing that effective parenting consists of multiple elements that are melded together to form distinct styles. She developed her conceptualization via a parenting classification scheme that represents the interaction between parents and their children along two dimensions: parental expectation and parental guidance. With the two dimensions, Baumrind (1966) and Maccoby and Martin (1983) developed four different parental styles: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive, and indifferent-uninvolved pattern. The authoritarian style consists of low guidance and high expectation. The authoritative style consists of both high expectation and guidance. The permissive style consists of high guidance and low expectation. The indifferent/uninvolved style consists of both low expectation and guidance and brief description of each is given below:

**Authoritarian**

The authoritarian parenting style is characterized by low warmth and high control. It has its roots in the seventeenth and eighteenth century puritanical belief system that finds virtue in unquestioning obedience (Baumrind, 1978). Authoritarian parents are often emotionally detached, but restrictively controlling. They use force and punitive measures in order to curb their children’s self-will. Although they are consistent in discipline, these parents are less likely to use rational methods of control (Baumrind, 1973). Authoritarian parents often use power assertion, which involves the idea that the parent should be obeyed because she is bigger, more significant, and more powerful than the child. The power assertion used to guide their children, however, leaves no room for questioning or discussion. In an early study by Baumrind (1973), authoritarian parents admitted to frightening their children as a means of control. This parenting style has been negatively associated with academic achievement, expressiveness, and independence in children (Hill, 1995; Shumow et al., 1998). While children of authoritarian parents show high levels of obedience. Research studies have shown this parenting style to also produce some negative outcomes in children’s development, such as low levels of self-concept (Lamborn, et al., 1991) and poor adjustment at school (Shumow et al., 1998).
Permissive

Permissive parents typically display high levels of warmth and low levels of control in interactions with their children. This style of parenting dates back to the philosopher Rousseau in the eighteenth century and was strongly promoted in the 1970s by the Children’s Movement (Baumrind, 1978). Baumrind (1978) described the idea behind permissive parenting as selfactualization, or the natural tendency of children to learn on their own all they need to know, and to act on this knowledge when ready to do so. This parenting style is characterized by an affirmative, accepting, and benign manner that frees children from restraint. Permissive parents are warm, loving, and child-centered, but they are prone to sudden outbursts of anger when they reach their capacity of tolerance. These parents often use love withdrawal and ridicule as a means of discipline. Though they often grant their children’s demands for independence, they fail to engage in independence training of their children (Baumrind, 1973). Like children in authoritarian homes, children reared in permissive homes also display some negative developmental outcomes. These children generally express high levels of self-confidence, but are prone to drug abuse, delinquency, and a lack of interest in school during adolescence (Lamborn et al., 1991). They are also more likely to use tobacco and alcohol as minors (Cohen & Rice, 1997).

Authoritative

High levels of warmth and high levels of control characterize the authoritative parenting style. Authoritative parenting provides a balance between authoritarian and permissive parenting. Authoritative parents use reasoning and consistency in interactions with their children, placing high value on verbal give-and-take (Baumrind, 1978). These parents are more likely to use positive reinforcement and induction to guide their children. Induction involves explaining reasons and consequences to aid children in forming and internalizing the concepts of right and wrong. Authoritative parents communicate clearly with their children, and they encourage their children’s independent strivings (Baumrind, 1973). Contrary to previously described parenting styles, “authoritative discipline tends to foster in children a particular kind of social competence which is associated with success in Western society” (Baumrind, 1978, p. 245). Authoritative parenting has been associated with numerous positive child outcomes, such as self regulation, high social competence, positive social adjustment, and low psychological and behavioral...
dysfunction (Grolnick & Ryan, 1989; Lamborn, et al., 1991). Hill (1995) found authoritative parenting to be positively correlated with organization, achievement, and intellectual orientation in children. Additionally, children of authoritative parents have also been shown to possess higher levels of autonomy than children of authoritarian and permissive parents (Deslandes, 2000).

Hill (1980) theorized that children of very critical parents, with unrealistically high expectations, might develop anxiety during the preschool years. Kaushik and Rani (2005) have stated that perfectionist attitude of mothers is positively related with anxiety among children. Similarly, unreasonable parental expectations; especially when accompanied by faulty parental behavior pattern adversely affect the child's psychological wellbeing (Wang, 2002). According to Thergaonkar and Wadkar (2007), inculcating a democratic style of parenting and greater acceptance of parents among children may prevent anxiety. Researchers have examined the four parenting styles developed by Baumrind (1971) and found the authoritative parenting style is recognized as the most successful style for developing competent and confident children (Berk, 2002; Berns, 2004).

Lung et al. (2004) noted that a parental bonding directly affect personality characteristics. Emmelkamp (2006) suggested that a significant amount of variance of Type A behavior can be counted for by perceived parental characteristics, especially rejection and lack of emotional warmth and negative evaluation of children by their parents may lead to an internalized maladaptive cognitive set in the children. In a study Muris et al. (2000) reported that parental rearing behaviors, in particular rejection and anxious rearing were positively associated with worry.

Furnham and Cheng (2000) examined the paternal and maternal rearing styles and reported that a reasonable discipline exercised by mothers toward their children was particularly beneficial in enhancing the off springs' self-esteem. A close perusal of the review of studies revealed that parenting rearing style has greatest influence on the development of child personality and personality traits. Psychological literature is replete with studies regarding relationship between parental behaviors and personality traits.
Other parenting styles

There is no single or definitive model of parenting. With authoritarian and permissive (indulgent) parenting style on opposite sides of the spectrum, most conventional and modern models of parenting fall somewhere in between. The model or style that parents employ depends partly on how they themselves were reared, what they consider good parenting, the child's temperament, their current environmental situation, and whether they place more importance on their own needs or whether they are striving to further their child's future success. Parents who place greater importance on the child's physical security may be more authoritarian, while parents who are more concerned with intellectual development may push their children into a number of organized extra-curricular activities such as music and language lessons.

One of the biggest effects on parenting is socio-economic status, in reference with ethnicity and culture as well. For example, living in a dangerous neighborhood could make a parent more authoritarian due to fear of their environment. Parents who are more highly educated tend to have better jobs and better financial security, and this reduction of potential stressors has a significant effect on parenting.

- Attachment parenting – Seeks to create strong emotional bonds, avoiding physical punishment and accomplishing discipline through interactions recognizing a child's emotional needs all while focusing on holistic understanding of the child.
- Christian parenting – The application of biblical principles on parenting, mainly in the United States. While some Christian parents follow a stricter and more authoritarian interpretation of the Bible, others are "grace-based" and share methods advocated in the attachment parenting and positive parenting theories. Particularly influential on opposite sides have been James Dobson and his book *Dare to Discipline*, and William Sears who has written several parenting books including *The Complete Book of Christian Parenting & Child Care* and *The Discipline Book*.
- Concerted cultivation – A style of parenting that is marked by the parents' attempts to foster their child's talents through organized leisure activities. This parenting style is commonly exhibited in middle and upper class American families.
2) Dynamic Approaches: These approaches focus on interactions between hidden needs motives and impulses to produce person's behavior. Psychoanalytic theory of Freud, Jung's analytical psychology and individual psychology of Adler, Horney's interpersonal theory are the main personality theories of this category.

3) Learning and Behavioral Approaches: The behavioral view emphasizes Skinner's ideas, which stress the importance of operant conditioning in determining personality. Acc. To these theories the behaviors that make up personality are conditioned or learned. Where social learning theorists believe behaviorists have missed much or the richness in personality by not studying how people process information about their world. Acc. to social learning theorists, cognitive processes mediate the relationship between the environment and behavior and early social learning theory of Dollard and Miller.

4) Humanistic Approaches: Humanistic theorists as a group all agree that personality should be studied with a human model, not that personality is much more than a mechanical mirror of the environment. Theories belonging to this family include Roger's self theory and Maslow's self-actualization theory.

Out of all these theories which theory is best? We can't give answer with confidence that this theory is good in itself. Infect, there is some goodness and some useful insight in many of the major personality theories, but Cattell's theory shows the fullest and most accurate picture of personality dimensions in short.

CATTELL'S STRUCTURE OF PERSONALITY: FACTOR THEORY

The trait theory given by Cattell, tried to describe and predict the behavior of the individual on the basis of their personality traits, Cattell (1965) used factor analysis to identify sixteen basic personality factors, including emotional stability, out goingness, assertiveness, self assurance & self discipline. According to Cattell, traits relatively permanent and broad reaction tendencies and serve as the building blocks of personality. He distinguishes between constitutional and environment moulded traits; ability temperament and dynamic traits, surface and source traits, common and unique traits.
I (i) Constitutional Traits:- Traits that are determined by biology or nature i.e. they are innate, present at birth and some of them we have received through genes.

(ii) ENVIRONMENTAL MOULD TRAITS:- Traits that are determined by experience i.e. by interactions with the environment and are thus nurture determined. These traits are susceptible to change & modification.

II (a) ABILITY TRAITS: Refer to the person's skill in dealing with the complexity of a given situation. Thus, intelligence is an ability trait.

(b) TEMPERMENT TRAITS:- Refer to stylistic tendencies e.g. excitable, moody, irritable, bold or easy going.

(c) DYNAMIC TRAITS:- Refer to the person's motivation & interests & gives an answer to the why of behavior. An individual may be characterized as ambitious, power seeking or sports-oriented.

III (1) SURFACE TRAITS:- According to Cattell there are some 20 surface traits or groupings in personality. If we observe any one of them in an individual, we are very likely to observe the others as well. They are simply a collection of trait elements of greater or less or amounts which go together in many different individuals & circumstances. "They are based upon frequently occurring observed behavior. They can be recognized by manifestations of behavior like curiosity, dependability, and tactfulness.

(2) SOURCE TRAITS:- They are underlying structure or sources that determine behavior they are thus, building blocks of personality. Cattell has found 16 basic or source trait dimensions, named as factors such as
Factor A represents Reserved Vs Outgoing

Factor Q₄ represent Relaxed Vs Factors.

These kinds of traits differ in ‘depths’ with deeper source traits more stable & more general in their effects upon behavior.

IV (i) COMMON TRAITS:-The traits are found widely distributed in general population like honesty, aggression & cooperation.

UNIQUE TRAITS:-Traits unique to a person such as temperamental traits, emotional reactions.

**ERGS and METAGERS:-**

Source traits of constitutional origin are called ergs source traits of environmental origin are Metagers. According to Cattell, personality develops by the changes of Ergs & Metagers, one example of Metagers is a person do & an idealistic goal of what that person would like to do.

Thus, Cattell’s theory is far more comprehensive & fully developed theory. It is unique to determine the relative contribution of heredity & environment on traits. Finally, he has devised an inventory by the name of 16 PF, Cattells. Personality Factor, Inventory with the help of Factor Analysis Technique.

**Academic achievement**

Academic achievement is the outcome of education — the extent to which a student, teacher or institution has achieved their educational goals. Academic achievement is commonly
measured by examinations or continuous assessment but there is no general agreement on how it is best tested or which aspects are most important — procedural knowledge such as skills or declarative knowledge such as facts. Research also shows that children’s emotional development is helpful in increasing academic achievement.

Individual differences influencing academic performance

Individual differences in academic achievement have been linked to differences in intelligence and personality. Students with higher mental ability as demonstrated by IQ tests (quick learners) and those who are higher in conscientiousness (linked to effort and achievement motivation) tend to achieve highly in academic settings. A recent meta-analysis suggested that mental curiosity (as measured by typical intellectual engagement) has an important influence on academic achievement in addition to intelligence and conscientiousness.

Factors associated with the academic performance of Aboriginal students are analysed from four perspectives:

- Student level factors — including the student’s own physical health and social and emotional wellbeing
- Carer level factors — such as socioeconomic status, and the physical and mental health of carers.
- Family and household environment factors
- School environment factors.

Teacher ratings of overall academic performance were used as the primary measure of academic performance. Students most at risk of low academic performance

Results from statistical modelling in this chapter identified three major factors associated with low academic performance of Aboriginal students.
• **School attendance.** Improvements in school attendance remain a key strategy for addressing low academic performance of Aboriginal students. Data modelling shows that students absent from school for 105 days or more were two times more likely to have low academic performance compared with students that were absent for 10 days or less.

• **Risk of clinically significant emotional or behavioural difficulties.** The academic performance of Aboriginal students is substantially lower in the presence of an emotional or behavioural difficulty. Students at high risk of clinically significant emotional or behavioural difficulties were over two and half times more likely to be rated at low academic performance relative to students rated at low risk of such difficulties.

• **Carer education.** Higher levels of carer education were a protective factor in terms of the academic performance of Aboriginal students. Students in the primary care of a person who had completed 13 or more years of schooling were over two times less likely to have low academic performance than students whose primary carer had between 1–9 years of education.

Lack of association between student’s physical health and academic performance

Associations between a range of physical health indicators and Aboriginal students’ academic performance were also tested. Of the physical health factors tested, only two were found to be significantly associated with academic performance — students that had trouble saying certain sounds; and students that needed help with the basics of daily living such as eating, dressing and bathing.

The data analysed in this chapter strongly suggest that a sole focus on improving physical health in Aboriginal students (while important in its own right) will not lead to improved academic outcomes for Aboriginal students. There are other factors independent of physical health impacting on the academic performance of Aboriginal students that need to be addressed before improvements in academic performance are realised.

**Other significant factors associated with low academic performance**
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A number of other student, career, family and household and school level factors were found to be significant in terms of the likelihood of Aboriginal students having low academic performance.

**Student** level factors included:

- *Speech difficulties*. Students that had trouble saying certain sounds were one and a half times more likely to have low academic performance than students who did not have trouble saying certain sounds.

- *Main language spoken in the classroom*. Students that spoke Aboriginal English in the classroom were over two times more likely to be rated at low academic performance than students who spoke English in the classroom.

- *Where the student usually studies*. Students that usually did their homework or studies in homework classes were over two times more likely to have low academic performance relative to students that usually studied at home.

**Carer** level factors included:

- *Primary carer labour force status*. Students whose primary carer was not in the labour force were 40 per cent more likely to have low academic performance compared with students whose primary career was employed.

**Family and household** factors included:

- *Gambling a cause of problems in the household*. Students living in households where gambling was a cause of problems were over two times more likely to have low academic performance relative to students living in households where gambling did not cause problems.

**School environment** factors included:
• **Student to teacher ratio.** Students attending schools where the student to teacher ratio was 20 or more were 1.8 times less likely to have low academic performance than students attending schools where this ratio was 10 or less.

• **Unexplained absence from school.** Students with more than 10 days of unexplained absence from school were almost two times more likely to have low academic performance than students who did not have any unexplained absence.

• **School suspension.** Students suspended from school on two or more occasions were over three times more likely to have low academic performance than students who had never been suspended.

With this much background we may pass on to next chapter dealing with review of pertinent literature.