CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Parenting is the most important phase in the life of an adult. Looking at growing children is a pleasure. But if the parents are not ready to take the responsibility of the child, than it may be very difficult phase of their life. The parenting of a person is affected by many factors. Some of the factors are internal and some are external in nature. For example the personality of parents and the marital adjustment between the husband – wife are some of the factors that influence the parenting.

1. Personality

1.1 Introduction and Definitions:

Personality plays very important role in all walks of life. There is an impact of personality on our all activities. It affects our psychological world. Almost every day we describe and assess the personalities of the people around us. Whether we realize it or not, these daily musings on how and why people behave as they do are similar to what personality psychologists do. The personality psychologists study how and why people behave as they, in a scientific way.

While our informal assessments of personality tend to focus more on individuals, personality psychologists use conceptions of personality that can apply to everyone. The research about personality has led to the development of a number of theories that helps to explain how and why certain personality traits are developed.
While there are many different theories of personality, the first step is to understand exactly what is meant by the term personality. A brief definition would be that personality is made up of the characteristic patterns of thoughts, feelings and behaviors that make a person unique. In addition to this, personality arises from within the individual and remains fairly consistent throughout life.

"Personality" is a dynamic and organized set of characteristics possessed by a person that uniquely influences his or her cognitions, motivations, and behaviors in various situations. The word "personality" originates from the Latin persona, which means mask. Significantly, in the theatre of the ancient Latin-speaking world, the mask was not used as a plot device to disguise the identity of a character, but rather was a convention employed to represent or typify that character. Personality also refer to the patterns of thoughts, feelings and behaviors consistently exhibited by an individual over a time that strongly influence our expectations, self-perceptions, values and attitudes, and predicts our reactions to people, problems and stress. In a phrase, personality is not just who we are, it is also how we are.

Personality concerns the most important, most noticeable parts of an individual's psychological life. Personality concerns whether a person is happy or sad, energetic or apathetic, smart or dull. Over the years, many different definitions have been proposed for personality. Most of the definitions refer to a mental system -- a collection of psychological parts including motives, emotions, and thoughts. The definitions vary a bit as to what those parts might be, but they
come down to the idea that personality involves a pattern or global operation of mental systems. Here are some definitions:

- “Personality is the supreme realization of the innate idiosyncrasy of a living being. It is an act of high courage flung in the face of life, the absolute affirmation of all that constitutes the individual, the most successful adaptation to the universal condition of existence coupled with the greatest possible freedom for self-determination”. - Carl Gustav Jung, 1934

- "Personality is not an existing substantive entity to be searched for but a complex construct to be developed and defined by the observer." (Smith & Vetter, 1982, p.5)

A contemporary definition for personality is “Personality is a dynamic organization, inside the person, of psychophysical systems that create a person’s characteristic patterns of behaviour, thoughts, and feelings.” Carver & Scheier (2000, p.5)

- "Personality is the entire mental organization of a human being at any stage of his development. It embraces every phase of human character: intellect, temperament, skill, morality, and every attitude that has been built up in the course of one's life." (Warren & Carmichael, 1930, p. 333)

- "Personality is the essence of a human being." (Hall & Lindzey, 1957, p. 9, characterizing statements by Gordon Allport)

- "An individual's pattern of psychological processes arising from motives, feelings, thoughts, and other major areas of psychological function. Personality is expressed through its influences on the body, in conscious mental life, and through the individual's social behavior." (Mayer, 2005)
From all the above definitions we can conclude some of the fundamental characteristics of personality:

- **Consistency** - There is generally a recognizable order and regularity to behaviors. Essentially, people act in the same ways or similar ways in a variety of situations.

- **Psychological and physiological** - Personality is a psychological construct, but research suggests that it is also influenced by biological processes and needs.

- **It impacts behaviors and actions** - Personality does not just influence how we move and respond in our environment; it also *causes* us to act in certain ways.

- **Multiple expressions** - Personality is displayed in more than just behavior. It can also be seen in our thoughts, feelings, close relationships and other social interactions.

Personality gets shape through many ways. There are some determinants of the personality. Which are as follow:

**a) Brain**

Brain is one of the most important factors of personality determinant. It is generally believed that the father and the child adopt almost the same type of brain stimulation and the later differences are the result of the environment in which the child has been grown up.
Electrical Stimulation of the Brain (ESB), Split Brain Psychology (SBP), the outcomes of genetic transmissions, are the tools that are used by the management of any organization to mould and amend the employee’s behavior to a more positive and proper one.

b) Physical Factors

One of the most important factors in determining personality is the ‘Physical Characteristics’ of an individual. It is believed that this factor plays a vital role in determining one’s behavior in any organization. Physical features may involve the height of a person (short or tall), his color (white or black), his health status (fat or skinny) and his beauty (handsome or ugly).

These factors are involved when interacting with any other person and thus contribute in the personality development in many ways.

c) Social Factors

A social factor also plays an important role in determining one’s personality. The things that revolve and evolve around us on a regular basis determine our personality. The society that we live in, the cultural environment that we face daily, the community we get interacted to, all are included in this factor. Relationships, co-ordination, co-operation, interaction, and environment in the family, organizations, workplaces, communities, and societies all these contribute in some way or another as personality determinants.
d) Cultural and Religious Factors:

The culture is one in which one lives, that may involve traditional practices, norms, customs, procedures, rules and regulations, precedents and values, all are important determinants of personality.

Moreover, the creed, religion and believes are also very important factors of personality determinants.

e) Heredity Factor:

The heredity is what one gets from the parents. It is one of the major factors that determine the physical health of the individual. It is decided quite before the birth. It is fixed at the time of conception.

Personality is the favorite topic of study. Many studies have been done regarding personality. Personality is studied through different perspectives. Every approach has tried to deal with personality and understand it thoroughly. These are some of the perspectives:

- Biological Perspective
- Psychoanalytic Perspective
- Learning Perspective
- Trait Perspective
- Type Perspective
- Phenomenological Perspective
- Cognitive Perspective
1.2 Personality types models and theories:

As a general introduction to all of these theories and models, it is important to realize that no-one fully knows the extent to which personality is determined by genetics and hereditary factors, compared to the effects of up-bringing, culture, environment and experience. Nature versus Nurture: no-one knows. Most studies seem to indicate that it's a bit of each, roughly half and half, although obviously it varies person-to-person.

Perhaps half our personality is determined by the influences acting upon us after we are conceived and born, it is interesting and significant also that no-one actually knows the extent to which personality changes over time.

The Four Temperaments, also known as the Four Humours, is arguably the oldest of all personality profiling systems, and it is fascinating that there are so many echoes of these ancient ideas found in modern psychology.

The idea of Four Temperaments can be traced back to the traditions of the Egyptian and Mesopotamian civilizations over 5,000 years ago. In which the health of the body was connected with the elements, fire, water, earth and air, which in turn were related to body organs, fluids, and treatments. Some of these thinking survive today in traditional Eastern ideas and medicine.

The ancient Greeks however first formalised and popularised the Four Temperaments methodologies around 2,500 years ago, and these ideas dominated Western thinking about human behaviour and medical treatment for over two-thousand
years. Most of these concepts for understanding personality, behaviour, illness and treatment of illness amazingly persisted in the Western world until the mid-1800s.

The Four Temperaments or Four Humours can be traced back reliably to Ancient Greek medicine and philosophy, notably in the work of Hippocrates (c.460-377/359BC - the 'Father of Medicine') and in Plato's (428-348BC) ideas about character and personality.

In Greek medicine around 2,500 years ago it was believed that in order to maintain health, people needed an even balance of the four body fluids: blood, phlegm, yellow bile, and black bile. These four body fluids were linked (in daft ways by modern standards) to certain organs and illnesses and also represented the Four Temperaments or Four Humours (of personality) as they later became known. As regards significant body fluids no doubt natural body waste products were discounted, since perfectly healthy people evacuate a good volume of them every day.

1.2.1 Carl Jung's psychological types:

Given that Carl Jung's psychological theory so fundamentally underpins most of the popular and highly regarded personality systems. Carl Jung was among many great personality theorists who drew inspiration and guidance from the ancient Greek Four Temperaments model and its various interpretations over the centuries. Carl Jung's in his book explained and extended his theories about personality type was Psychological Types, published in 1921. His theory of Psychological Types was part of a wider set of
Jung divided psychic energy into two basic 'general attitude types': **Introverted** and **Extraverted**.

These are effectively two 'type' behaviours that combine with others explained later to create Jung's psychological types. Moreover Jung's Introvert and Extravert 'general attitude types' feature strongly as two opposite characteristics within very many modern personality systems.

Jung's book “Psycho Type” published in 1921 was translated in 1923 where the words Introverted and Extraverted were used to describe these types, which in German language would have been Introvertiert and Extravertiert. Some interpretations of Jung's ideas use the alternative words Introvert and Introversion, and Extravert and Extraversion to describe Jung's types. The word Extravert was devised by Jung, which is how it appears in German. He formed it from the Latin words 'extra' means outside, and 'vertere' means to turn. The words extrovert, extroverted and extroversion are English adaptations which appeared soon after Jung popularised the word in German. Both 'extra' and 'extro' versions are acceptable in English. Jung formed the word Introvert from the Latin 'intro' means inward and 'vertere' means to turn.
1.2.2 Hans Jurgen Eysenck

British psychologist Hans Jurgen Eysenck (1916-97) did an extensive research and prepared questionnaires to build a personality inventory which he related to Galen's Four Temperaments. Eysenck's concepts are particularly interesting, and provide a valuable additional perspective compared to the Four Temperaments because they explore and analyse a personality dimensions related to emotional stability.

Eysenck's 1950s theory (he later added a third dimensions) measures personality using two scales:

- introversion-extraversion
- stability-instability (unemotional-emotional*)

Eysenck's theory also refers to instability as unstable, emotionally unstable, or neurotic.

By surveying many thousands of people, using many and various adjectives (traits) representing behaviours and types, Eysenck built a scalable model which also formed the basis of what became the Eysenck personality test.

Eysenck's theory regards the choleric and melancholic temperaments as being emotionally unstable (let's say 'emotional'), and the sanguine and phlegmatic temperaments as being emotionally stable (unemotional). The theory sees the phlegmatic and melancholic temperaments as being introverted, and the choleric and
sangine temperaments as being **extraverted**. At this point there is clear divergence from the Eysenck model and certain recent interpretations of the Four Temperaments.

Eysenck's (1950s) theory measures personality according to two scalable dimensions, **introversion-extraversion** and **stability-instability**; whereas traditional Four Temperaments ideas simply seek to define personality according to one of the four temperaments. In this respect Eysenck's model is far more sophisticated, and indeed adds an extra dimensions (stable-unstable) that is not found at all in popular systems such as Keirsey and Myers Briggs. In this respect Eysenck's model offers a highly significant and helpful additional perspective to the Four Temperaments, Jung's Psychological Types.

Form the above description of the ‘temperament’ the characteristic and understanding of the two dimensions extraversion and introversion is as follow:

**a) Extraversion**

*Extraversion* is "the act, state, or habit of being predominantly concerned with and obtaining gratification from what is outside the self". Extraverts tend to enjoy human interactions and to be enthusiastic, talkative, assertive, and gregarious. They take pleasure in activities that involve large social gatherings, such as parties, community activities, public demonstrations, and business or political groups. Politics, teaching, sales, managing and brokering are the fields that favor extraversion. An extraverted person is likely to enjoy time spent with people and find less reward in time spent alone. They tend to be energized when they are in the gathering, and they are more prone to boredom when they are alone.
Extroverted people are in the more outgoing group of people. They are the "social butterflies" of our society. They are the ones who are more apt to greet people and just join into the group that has already formed. An extrovert loves to be around other people. In fact, they often thrive on it.

Extroverts are also more likely to immerse themselves into the more fast paced jobs and other aspects of society. Slower jobs that take a long time to complete hence such types of people get frustrated. They do not possess the patience to complete these tasks efficiently. They like a variety in their work with lots of change and lots of action. They do not mind being interrupted from their tasks by things such as a telephone calls etc. Extroverts like to see the results of their jobs and enjoy seeing how other people do the same job. They are quick workers, but dislike jobs that are complicated.

Extroverts are also very good communicators especially verbally. With this there are also some downfalls, though. They often will act or speak quickly without thinking. This can sometimes be a dangerous and put them into trouble. They also learn how to do things much better through their verbal communication and hands on learning.

b) Introversion

Introversion is "the state of or tendency toward being wholly or predominantly concerned with and interested in one's own mental life". Some popular writers have characterized introverts as people whose energy tends to expand through reflection and dwindle during interaction. This is similar to Jung's view, although he focused on
psychic energy rather than physical energy. Few modern conceptions make this distinction.

The common modern perception is that introverts tend to be more reserved and less outspoken in groups. They often take pleasure in solitary activities such as reading, writing, using computers, hiking and fishing. The archetypal artist, writer, sculptor, engineer, composer, and inventor are all highly introverted. An introvert is likely to enjoy time spent alone and find less reward in time spent with large groups of people, though he or she may enjoy interactions with close friends. Trust is usually an issue of significance: a virtue of utmost importance to an introvert choosing a worthy companion. They prefer to concentrate on a single activity at a time and like to observe situations before they participate, especially observed in developing children and adolescents. Introverts are easily overwhelmed by too much stimulation from social gatherings and engagement. They are more analytical before speaking.

Introversion is not seen as being identical to shy or to being a social outcast. Introverts prefer solitary activities over social ones, whereas shy people (who may be extraverts at heart) avoid social encounters out of fear, and the social outcast has little choice in the matter of his or her solitude.

Introverts are exactly opposites of extroverts in many ways. They are the shyer, quieter people of the world. They often have trouble in remembering names and/or faces of people they have met. They prefer to work alone lost in their own thought rather than working with other people on a project. Introverts are often seen as the "loners" of society.
Introverts enjoy working on jobs that require a lot of thinking and that take long periods of time to complete. They are very detail oriented and think everything through thoroughly rather than making quick judgments about something. An introvert does not mind working on a single project for a long period of time and prefers to do so without any interruptions. They like things to be quiet to aid in their concentration. They are also interested in the idea behind their job rather than how to do it.

Introverted people are better communicators through writing and other non-verbal techniques. They like to take the time to think before they speak and act and writing gives them the time that they need. Introverts sometimes have trouble getting their ideas across to others effectively. They find it easier to learn things through reading about it rather than experiencing it.

No matter which of these categories a person falls under, it is not a set stereotype. Many people carry attributes from both categories with varying degrees. A person labeled as one or the other does not need to hold true to the stereotype. Everyone is different. These are only the extremes on a wide spectrum of personality types and should be coupled with other factors to create a more accurate personality analysis.

c) Ambiversion

Although many people view being introverted or extraverted as a question with only two possible answers, most contemporary trait theories (e.g. the Big Five) measure levels of extraversion-introversion as part of a single, continuous dimensions of personality, with some scores near one end, and others near the half-way mark.
Ambiversion is a term used to describe people who fall more or less directly in the middle and exhibit tendencies of both groups. An ambivert is normally comfortable with groups and enjoys social interaction, but also relishes time alone and away from the crowd.

**Biological factors**

The relative importance of nature versus environment in determining the level of extraversion is controversial and is a focus of many studies. The study on twins found a genetic component of 39% to 58%. In terms of the environmental component, the shared family environment appears to be less important than individual environmental factors that are not shared between siblings.

Eysenck proposed that extraversion was caused by variability in cortical arousal. He hypothesized that introverts are characterized by higher levels of activity than extraverts and so are chronically more cortically aroused than extraverts. The fact that extraverts require more external stimulation than introverts has been interpreted as evidence for this hypothesis. Other evidence of the "stimulation" hypothesis is that introverts salivate more than extraverts in response to a drop of lemon juice.

Extraversion has been linked to higher sensitivity of the mesolimbic dopamine system to potentially rewarding stimuli. This in part explains the high levels of positive affect found in extraverts, since they will more intensely feel the excitement of a potential reward. One consequence of this is that extraverts can learn more easily the contingencies for positive reinforcement, since the reward itself is experienced as greater.
One study found that introverts have more blood flow in the frontal lobes of their brain and the anterior or frontal thalamus, which areas are dealing with internal processing, such as planning and problem solving. Extraverts have more blood flow in the anterior cingulated gyrus, temporal lobes, and posterior thalamus, which are involved in sensory and emotional experience. This study and other research indicate that introversion-extraversion is related to individual differences in brain function.

**Behavior**

Extraverts and introverts have a variety of behavioral differences. According to one study, extraverts tend to wear more decorative clothing, whereas introverts prefer comfortable clothes. Extraverts are likely to prefer more upbeat, conventional, and energetic music than introverts. Personality also influences how people arrange their work areas. In general, extraverts decorate their offices more, keep their doors open, keep extra chairs nearby, and are more likely to put dishes of candy on their desks. These are attempts to invite co-workers and encourage interaction. Introverts, in contrast, decorate less and tend to arrange their workspace to discourage social interaction.

Although extraverts and introverts have personality and behavior differences, it is important to avoid pigeonholing or stereotyping by personality. Humans are complex and unique, and because extraversion varies along a continuum, they may have a mixture of both orientations. A person who acts introverted in one scenario may act extraverted in another, and people can learn to act “against type” in certain situations. Jung's theory states that when someone's primary function is extraverted, his secondary function is always introverted (and vice versa).
Extroverts vs. Introverts

Extroverts are directed towards the objective world whereas Introverts are directed towards the subjective world. The most common differences between Extroverts and Introverts are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extroverts</th>
<th>Introverts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• are interested in what is happening around them</td>
<td>• are interested in their own thoughts and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are open and often talkative</td>
<td>• need to have own territory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• compare their own opinions with the opinions of others</td>
<td>• often appear reserved, quiet and thoughtful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• like action and initiative</td>
<td>• usually do not have many friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• easily make new friends or adapt to a new group</td>
<td>• like concentration and quiet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• say what they think</td>
<td>• do not like unexpected visits and therefore do not make them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• are interested in new people</td>
<td>• work well alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• easily break unwanted relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. ADJUSTMENTS.

2.1 Introduction and Definitions:

The dictionary meaning of the word ‘adjustment’ is, to make suitable, adapt, arrange, modify, harmonize or make correspondent. Thus, when we make an adjustment between two things, we adapt or modify one or both of them to respond to each other. *Adjustment* (from late Latin *ad-juxtare*, derived from *juxta*, near, but early confounded with a supposed derivation from *Justus*, right) means regulating, adapting or settling in a variety of contexts.

“The term adjustment is often used as a synonym for accommodation and adaptation. Strictly speaking, the term denotes the results of equilibrium, which may be affect by either of these processes” (Monroe, 1990).

It is used to emphasize the individual’s struggle to survive in his or her social and physical environment.

- Good (1959) sates that “adjustment is the process of finding and adopting modes of behaviour suitable to the environment or the changes in the environment.”
- Kulshrestha (1979) explained that the “adjustment process is a way in which the individual attempts to deal with stress, tensions, conflicts etc., and meet his or her needs. In this process, the individual also makes efforts to maintain harmonious relationships with the environment.”
- Shafer (1961) emphasized that “adjustment is the process by which a living organism maintains a balance between its needs and the circumstances that influence the satisfaction of these needs.”
The process of adjustment has two main elements: the need of living organism, and the circumstances that influence those needs. These needs may be biogenic, sociogenic, personal or communal, or arising from any other conceivable source. On the other hand, the circumstances influencing these needs also can either be inside the individual that influence these needs are his physical and mental states, capacity, attitudes, interests, etc.

Adjustment is the behavioral process by which humans and other animals maintain equilibrium among their various needs or between their needs and the obstacles of their environments. A sequence of adjustment begins when a need is felt and ends when it is satisfied. Hungry people, for example, are stimulated by their physiological state to seek food. When they eat, they reduce the stimulating condition that impelled them to activity, and they are thereby adjusted to this particular need.

2.2 Process of adjustment:

An analysis of the process of adjustment will reveal the presence of the following three main elements:

1. Motives: - The process of adjustment in the living being is set in motion by the presence of some motive or need.

2. Thwarting conditions: - when the environment is such that tends to become obstacle in the fulfillment of these needs, then the adjustment is natural, facile and effortless, and no problem arises. But if circumstances create obstacles in the path of such fulfillment, then the process of adjustment continues.
3. Responses: - Once the fulfillment of a need has been obstructed, the individual indulge in various actions which are the reaction to the obstacle. Such a reaction may be normal, just as much as it may be abnormal.

4. Solution:- As a result of these reactions and responses the individual achieves a degree of adjustment with the circumstances. The problem of adjustment is thereby solved.

2.3 Areas of Adjustment

Adjustment in the case of an individual should consist of personal as well as environmental components. These two aspects of adjustment can be further subdivided into smaller aspects of personal and environmental factors. Adjustment, although a universal characteristic or quality may have different aspects and dimensions, by the numerous efforts of measuring adjustment through inventories and other techniques, these aspects have been identified and various tests have been constructed to assess their dimensions. For example Bell (1958) has taken five areas or dimensions in his adjustment inventory namely, home, health, social emotional and occupational. Arkoff (1968) in his book: ‘Adjustment and Menial Health’ enumerated the family, school or college, vocation and marriage as the important areas of adjustment. Recently, Joshi (1964) and Pandey in their research study covering school and college students, have given I I areas or dimensions of an individual’s adjustment:. 1Finance. 2. Living conditions and employment. 3.Social and recreational activities. 4.Courtship, sex and marriage. 5.Social psychological ideations. 6.Personal psychological relations. 7. Moral and religious. Home and family. 8.Inutile—vocational and educational. 9.Health and physical
development 10. Adjustment to school and college work. 11. Curriculum and teaching. In this way adjustment of a person is based on the harmony between his personal characteristics and the demands of the environment of which he is a part. Personal and environmental factors work side by side in bringing about this harmony.

2.4 Characteristics of a Well-adjusted Person

A well-adjusted person is supposed to possess the following characteristics:

1. *Awareness of his own strengths and limitations.* A well-adjusted person knows his own strengths and weaknesses. He tries to make capital out of his assets in some areas by accepting his limitations in others.

2. *Respecting himself and others.* The dislike for one-self is a typical symptom of maladjustment. An adjusted individual has respect for himself as well as for others.

3. *An adequate level of aspiration.* His level of aspiration is neither too low nor too high in terms of his own strengths and abilities. He does not try to reach for the stars and also does not repent over selecting an easier course for his advancement.

4. *Satisfaction of basic needs.* His basic organic, emotional and social needs are fully satisfied or are in the process of being satisfied. He does not suffer from emotional cravings and social isolation. He feels reasonably secure and maintains his self-esteem.

5. *Absence of a critical or fault-finding attitude.* He appreciates the goodness in objects, persons or activities. He does not try to look for weaknesses and faults. His observation is scientific rather than critical or punitive. He likes people, admires their good qualities, and wins their affection. *Flexibility in behavior.* He is not rigid in his
attitude or way of life. He can easily accommodate or adapt himself to changed circumstances by making necessary changes in his behavior.

6. The capacity to deal with adverse circumstances. He is not easily overwhelmed by adverse circumstances and has the will and the courage to resist and fight odds. He has an inherent drive to master his environment, rather than to passively accept it.

7. A realistic perception of the world. He holds a realistic vision and is not given to flights of fancy. He always plans, thinks and acts pragmatically.

8. A feeling of erne with the surroundings. A well-adjusted individual feels satisfied with his surroundings. He fits in well in his home, family, neighborhood and other social surroundings. If a student, he likes his school, school-mates, teachers, and feels satisfied with his daily routine. When he enters a profession, he has a love for it and maintains his zeal and enthusiasm despite all odds.

9. A well-adjusted person has a philosophy which gives direction to his life while keeping in view the demands of changed situations and circumstances. This philosophy is centered around the demands of his society, culture, and his own self so that he does not clash with his environment or with himself.

2.5 Adjustment and Personality

The implication of adjustment is the balance between an individual’s needs and the circumstances that satisfy them. Hence the evaluation of the adjustment achieved by a person will require the knowledge of two things: firstly the requirement of this person and secondly the conditions and circumstances that influence the satisfaction of his need. Once these two are known it will be necessary to find the balance that is stuck between
them. If the balance is good and desirable, then the individual can be said to be properly 
adjusted, but if the balance is disturbed then the person will be considered maladjusted. 
Evidently this adjustment will differ from person to person, since their needs and the 
conditions that satisfy them need not be common. In this manner, the criterion of 
personality adjustment is relative to the individual. The traits that are required for 
adjustment to particular circumstances will be specific.

The intensive study of normal personalities leads inevitably to the recognition 
of the tremendously vital role of this type of socialized anxiety in the integration and 
direction of the personality, notably in the development of individuals of middle status. 
One of the certain gains for social science, in the recent studies of normal individuals 
living in their social contexts, has been the discovery that many concepts of personality 
economy developed by psychopathology do not hold for individuals in our own culture who are not mentally ill. The tendency of the psychopathologist to extend the concept of 
the neurotic, maladaptive, irrational type of anxiety, for example, to all anxiety 
has been a dangerous generalization. In the same way many other concepts of 
maladaptive functions, based upon clinical study of the delinquent, the criminal, or the 
mentally ill have been applied wholesale to the analysis of the personality dynamics of 
normal people by mental hygienists, psychiatric caseworkers, and by other students of 
personality development. These supposedly symptomatic traits include, among others, 
such motivations as hostility, guilt feelings, intimidation, inferiority feelings, chronic 
frustrations, as well as anxiety.

The fact is, however, that all of these motivations not only appear in the normal 
range of human personalities in American society, but these instigations may be all

23
cultural useful and may be integrated in some form into the adaptive behavior of the well-adjusted and socialized child or adolescent. For example, most young children of middle-status families are trained in the basic cultural forms with regard to property, exploration of the adult world, and aggression largely through those feelings of shame, of age inferiority, of guilt, and of anxiety which are instilled by the parents and other adults in accord with the necessary modes of child training in a society like that of American middle class. Even aggression and hostility must be taught to the child through culturally approved forms. With regard to overt aggression, the middle-class boy must learn, for example, (1) to fight when attacked by another boy, (2) not to attack a boy unless he has been struck, (3) not to attack girls or supervisory adults under any circumstances, but also (4) not to withdraw when in a normal, approved competitive situation. A child without the cultural approved, adaptive type of aggression in a competitive and status-structured society like ours is himself abnormal.

We are born, as human beings, with a great many internal needs, the frustration of which leads to discomfort and sometimes death. Many of these are physiological. If we don't eat, we become hungry and uncomfortable. If we don't drink, we experience the unpleasant reaction of thirst. Other such physiological, internal needs are sleep, defecation, and temperature regulation. In childhood we soon discover that there are certain ways of gratifying these needs, and we behave accordingly whenever an unpleasant state of tension associated with some need exists. In the course of development, additional internal needs emerge, which are primarily social rather than physiological. We need human company, social approval, a sense of self- and social esteem, and love.
3 Marital Adjustments

3.1 Introduction and Definitions

One of the most important relationships between a man and women is marriage. It involves emotional and legal commitment that is quite important in any adult life. Moreover, selecting a partner and entering into a marital contract is considered both maturational milestone and personal achievement. There is no doubt that the choice of marital partner is one of the most important decisions one makes in his / her lifetime. People marry for many reasons, like; love, happiness, companionship, and the desire to have children, physical attraction, or desire to escape from an unhappy situation. Marriage is a commitment with love and responsibility for peace, happiness and development of strong family relationships. Marriage as "socially legitimate sexual union, begun with a public announcement and undertaken with some ideas of permanence; it is assumed with more or less explicit marriage contract, which spells out the reciprocal rights and obligations between the spouses and future children”

Marital relationship is the foundation of family life because it involves the union between a man and a woman as husband and wife. Marriage is a component part of the culture usually formalized by the custom, law and occasionally solemnized by religion. It is a means by which physiological, procreation, social, emotional and security needs are satisfied. The human family has become one of the most widely discussed issues in recent times. Its importance to human existence led to the United Nations declaration of 1994 as the international year of the family. Human society is essentially developed from marital relationship when married persons are wedded, they always make commitment to remain in the bond of unity and love “until death do us part”. However, available
statistics of marital breakdown show that many married persons who make such vows do not keep them to the end (National Centre for Health statistic, 1994). The break-down of marital relationship has become a global phenomenon affecting both the rich and the poor: from the royal families of princes and princesses down to the peasant farmers in our contemporary time.

Marital adjustment as ‘the state in which there is an over all feeling in husband and wife of happiness and satisfaction with their marriage and with each other’. All the marriages are aimed at happiness in one or another way. Most couples marry filled up with expectations. Some of the expectations will be realistic while others unrealistic. This is due to the complex nature of marriage and each individual is as complex as a universe. Therefore, in marriage two universes close together. Marital adjustment calls for maturity that accepts and understands growth and development in the spouse. If this growth is not experienced and realized fully, death in marital relationship is inevitable. A relationship between couples is not instantaneous rather a slow progress. “It is like the undetected cancer that kills silently and softly”.

The core component of marital adjustment is marital satisfaction and it has been extensively studied as a standalone concept. As such it deserves separate consideration. Marital satisfaction has been defined as:

“The subjective feelings of happiness, satisfaction, and pleasure experienced by a spouse when considering all current aspects of his marriage. This variable is conceived as a continuum running from much satisfaction to much dissatisfaction.”

Marital satisfaction is clearly an attitudinal variable and thus is a property of individual spouses (Hawkins 1968,p648)
The study of marital satisfaction and happiness merged about the same time that a new era of scientific research in family behavior was beginning. Since then, marital adjustment, happiness, satisfaction, or related terms that attest to the relationships subjective quality (or character) of marriage have been some of the most popular subjects of family research over the past 50-year period (Burr, 1967; Hicks & Platt, 1970; Nye, 1988; Spanier & Lewis, 1980).

Scientists have long been interested in understanding which factors contribute to success in marriage and which to failure. As early as the 1920s Gilbert Hamilton (1929) conducted research on marital satisfaction by using thirteen clusters of questions. In 1939 Ernest Burgess and Leonard Contrell published predicting success or failure in Marriage, in which they systematically discussed marital adjustment. They defined adjustment as “the integration of the couple in a union in which the two personalities are not merely merged, or submerged, but interact to complement each other for mutual satisfaction and the achievement of common objectives.”

Since Burgess and Contrell’s formulated, scientists have examined extensively the factors constituting marital adjustment. Although there has been no consensus among researchers, factors constituting marital adjustment include agreement, cohesion, satisfaction, affection, and tension. Agreement between spouse on important matters is critical to a well adjusted marriage, though minor difference may broaden their perspectives, major difference between the spouses in matters such as philosophy of life, political orientations, and attitudes toward gender roles are detrimental to marital adjustment.
In addition, agreement on specific decisions about family matters must be reached in good accord. Marital cohesion refers to both spouses’ commitment to the marriage and the companionship experienced in it. In a well adjusted marriage, both spouses must be satisfied and happy with the marriage. Unhappy but long marriages share affection and a well adjusted marriage is minimal, and when tension arises it is resolved amicably, probably in discussion, and the level of tension and anxiety is usually low.

3.2 Marital Adjustment and personality:

Both interpersonal and intrapersonal factors can influence marital relationships. Prominent intra-personal factors are personality traits—the emotional, relational, experiential, attitudinal, and motivational styles of an individual that are assumed to be stable over time (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Many studies suggest that specific personality factors can predict marital adjustment. For example, personality factors were better predictors of marital instability measured 4 years later than demographic variables, such as the age, the educational level, or the history of previous divorces of the individual (Bentler & Newcomb, 1978). Relationships between personality factors and marital outcomes have been observed using cross-sectional designs (e.g., Hjemboe & Butcher, 1991; Long & Andrews, 1990; Miller, Lefcourt, Holmes, Ware, & Saleh, 1986; Russell & Wells, 1994; Snyder & Regts, 1990) and longitudinal designs (Bentler & Newcomb, 1978; Karney & Bradbury, 1995; Kelly & Conley, 1987; Kurdek, 1991; Shaver & Brennan, 1992). The criterion variable was marital adjustment scores or marital status (i.e., divorced vs. still married).
In addition to considering how personality influences marital adjustment, assessing how the personal characteristics of one member of the couple influence the marital adjustment of the other member is also important (Kashy & Snyder, 1995; Kenny, 1996; Kurdek, 1997; Robins, 1990). Indeed, marital clinicians and theoreticians have shown that one partner's emotions, thoughts, or behavior can affect the other partner's functioning (Christensen, Jacobson, & Babcock, 1995; Johnson & Greenberg, 1995) and that partners are expected to influence each other. Stable emotions, stable thoughts or behavior are manifestations of an individual's personality traits. Results of empirical studies indicated that several personality traits of husbands were related to wives' marital adjustment. More specifically, the levels of neuroticism, other-directedness, and ambivalence in the emotional expressiveness of husbands were negatively associated with their wives' marital adjustment, whereas the levels of agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, and perspective taking were positively associated (Botwin, Buss, & Shackelford, 1997; Buss, 1991; King, 1993; Long & Andrews, 1990; Richmond et al., 1991; Russell & Wells, 1994). The results were a little less consistent for wives. Some studies found that the wife's personality did not influence the husband's marital adjustment (King, 1993; Richmond et al., 1991). However, more studies found significant relationships between wives' personalities and husbands' adjustment. Wives' neuroticism, perspective taking, openness, and agreeableness were associated with husbands' marital adjustment. The first related negatively to marital adjustment, and the last three related positively (Botwin et al., 1997; Geist & Gilbert, 1996; Long & Andrews, 1990; Russell & Wells, 1994).
3.3 Marital adjustment refers to the adjustment in the following areas:

i) Adjustment to a mate:-
- The first major adjustment problem in marriage is adjustment to a mate.
- Interpersonal relationship play as important a role in marriage as in friendships and business relationships.
- The more experience in interpersonal relationships both the man and the woman have had in the past, the greater social insight they have developed and the greater their willingness to co-operate with others, the better they will be able to adjust to each other in marriage.
- Far more important to good marital adjustment is the ability of husband and wife to relate emotionally to each other and to give and receive love.
- A husband and wife who have the habit of not expressing affection will have difficulty establishing a warm and close relationship because each interprets the other’s behaviour as an indication of “not caring”.

ii) Sexual adjustments :-
- The second major adjustment problem in marriage is sexual adjustment.
- This is unquestionably one of the most difficult adjustments to marriage, and it is the one most likely to lead a marital discord and unhappiness if it is not satisfactorily achieved.

iii) Financial Adjustment.
- the third major adjustment problem in marriage is financial.
- Money or lack of it has a profound influence on adults adjustments to marriage.
- Many men also find financial adjustments very difficult, particularly if the wife worked
after they were married and then must stop with the arrival of the first child.

- Not only is their total income reduced, but the husband’s earnings must now cover a wider area of expenses.

- First friction may develop if the wife expects her husband to share the work load.

- Second, if a husband is unable to provide his wife and family with the marital possession they want, they may feel resentful of him, and a frictional attitude develops.

iv) In-law Adjustments.

- the fourth major adjustment problem in marriage is to the in-laws.

- With marriage, every adult acquires a whole new set of relatives, the in-laws.

- Both husbands and wives must learn to adjust to their in-law if they are to avoid frictional relationship with their spouses.

- When the married couple is young and inexperienced for the in-laws to try to exert some control over their lives, especially if they are partially or totally responsible for their support.

- By contrast, the couple is older, more experienced and better established financially, in law interference with their lives is less likely to occur.

- In-law problems are also eased if the marriage is between persons of the same religions, if the in-laws have similar pattern of social activities and if husband and wife accept each other’s family as their own.

The importance of marital adjustments: Every human being needs to make adjustments in life to blend into his or her environment in fact adjustments are a continuous process from birth to death. Ironically people are seen making adjustments in
their office set up to even when in the company of friends – but it is in marriages that adjustments is much talked about and often an unresolved issue.

3.4 Criteria of successful marital adjustment.

a) Happiness of Husband and Wife: A husband and wife who are happy together derive satisfaction from the roles they play. They also have a mature and stable love for each other, have made good sexual adjustments and have accepted the parental role.

b) Good parent-child relationships: Good parent-child relationships reflect successful marital adjustment and contribute to it. If parent-child relationships are poor, the home climate will be marked by friction, which makes marital adjustment difficult.

c) Good adjustment of Children: Children who are well adjusted, well liked by their peers and successful and happy in school are proof of their parent’s good adjustment to marriage and parental roles.

d) Ability to deal satisfactorily with disagreements: Disagreements between family members, which are inevitable, generally end in one of three ways; there is a temporary truce with no solution, one person gives in for the sake of peace, or all family members try to understand the other’s point of view. In the long run, only the latter leads to satisfactory adjustments though the first two help to reduce the tension that friction gives rise to.

e) Togetherness: When marital adjustments are successful, the family enjoys spending time together. If good family relationships are built up during the early, formative years, men and women will retain close ties with their families after they grow up, marry and establish homes of their own.

f) Good financial adjustments: In many families, one of the most common sources of
friction and resentment centers around money. Regardless of the income, a family that learn to budget its expenses so as to avoid constant debts and to be satisfied with what it can afford to have and do is better adjusted than one in which the wife constantly complains about the husband’s earning power or takes a job to supplement his earnings.

**g) Good In-law adjustments**: Husbands and wives who get along well with their in-laws, especially parents, brother and sister-in-laws are far less likely to have frictional relationships.

### 4. Parenting style:

#### 4.1 Introduction

The construct of parenting style is used to capture normal variations in parent’s attempts to control and socialize their children (Baumrind, 1991). Parenting style is defined as the distinctive patterns of child rearing behaviours culled across time and situation (Lamborn et al., 1991). Some psychologists (Darling & Stienberg, 1993) are of the view that parenting style is the climate in the family, a set of attitudes and values rather than a set of specific parenting practices or behaviour. The most influential proposal about styles of child rearing has come from Baumrind (1991). She proposed various dimensions of parenting viz. a) warmth or nurturance; b) levels of expectation (maturity demands); c) clarity and consistency of rules (control); and d) communication between parent and child.

She posited 3 specific combinations of these characteristics namely **authoritative style**, **authoritarian style** and **permissive style**. Authoritative style involves parenting that is warm, responsive, involved, yet unintrusive and in which parents set reasonable limits and expect appropriately mature behaviour. Authoritarian style refers to parenting that is
harsh, unresponsive, rigid where parents tend to use power assertive methods of control.

Permissive style is characterized by parenting that is lax, and in which parents exercise inconsistent discipline and encourage children to express their impulses freely.

Maccoby and Martin (1983) extended Baumrind’s typology and added the fourth parenting style of ‘neglecting’ or ‘uninvolved’. Recently, Robinson et al. (2001) derived parenting dimensions from the afore given parenting styles and they are physical coercion, verbal hostility, punitive, connection, autonomy, regulation, indulgent, rejecting, neglecting and indifferent.

Certain parenting styles are conducive for the optimal development while others hamper the path of positive growth. Steinberg (1994) found that teenagers from authoritative families showed higher self reliance and social competence, better grades, fewer indications of psychological distress, and lower levels of school misconduct, drug use and delinquency. While teenagers from authoritarian families had low social competence, self-reliance, were more aggressive; and those from neglectful families were impulsive, antisocial and quite low on school achievement.

Parent-child interaction is not static but is dynamic in nature, meaning that influences in the family system flows both ways. The theories of temperament-environment bi-directionality (Buss & Plomin, 1994; Rothbart & Ahadi, 1998; Thomas & Chess, 1977) have depicted empirical links of temperament and environment assuming that such interactions may either strengthen or modify the basic temperamental patterns. Children’s temperament elicits responses from others in the environment in ways that
strengthen their behaviour. They actively seek environments that are in harmony with their predispositions (also referred to as “niche-picking”; Teglasi, 1998).

A child’s temperament also affects both the ways parents feel about themselves and the way they function as parents, e.g., easy infants make their parents feel happy, competent and successful while difficult infants have been shown to influence their parents’ self-esteem, satisfaction as parents, marital harmony and mood (Carey, 1998).

For generations, people have assumed that parenting matters (Okagaki & Luster, 2005). It is both a biological and a social process; and is fundamental to the survival and success of the human race (Lerner et al., 2002).

The term “parenting”, rooted in the Latin word “pario” meaning life-giver, captures the focused and differentiated relationship that the young child has with the adults who are most emotionally invested in and consistently available to him or her (Scher & Sharabany, 2005; Shonkoff & Phillips, 2002). Biological and adoptive mothers, fathers, single-parents, divorced and remarried parents can be children’s principal caregivers, but when siblings, grandparents and non familial caregivers mind children their parenting is pertinent as well (Bornstein, 2005).

Parenting is carried out by members of a species that function to ensure the reproduction, survival, nurturance, and socialization of the next birth cohort or generation of that species (Lerner et al., 2002). It refers to the set of behaviours that work individually or together to influence child outcomes (Sharma, 2004), beginning with the assumption of responsibility, wherein the primary object of attention and action is the child and involving giving birth to, and caring for a child's physical, psychological, emotional, moral and intellectual development (Baumrind & Thompson, 2002; Karraker
& Coleman, 2005). It includes genetic endowment and direct effects of experience that manifest themselves through parents’ beliefs and behaviors as well as indirect influences that take place through parents’ relationships with each other and their connections to community networks (Bornstein, 2005). Thus, parenting encompasses a number of different aspects, including beliefs, attitudes, values, expectations, goals, practices and behaviours (Bornstein, 2002; Wise & da Silva, 2007).

The findings depict that though children were an important and integral part of the family, they were not the sole focus (French, 2002). Parenting and parenting research has come a long way since earlier times. In the field of psychology it was only during the 1960s and 1970s that parenting began to become widely recognized as an important element in family relationships with a sudden increase of publications with parenting as the subject (Couchman, 1983; French, 2002). Interest in parental influence on child development stemmed from the Freudian and behaviourist theories (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). The Freudian contention was that the basic determinants of development were biological and inevitably in conflict with parental desires and societal requirements. The interaction between the child's libidinal needs and the family environment was presumed to determine individual differences in children's development. While child behaviorists were interested in how the patterning of reinforcement in the near environment shaped development (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).

Despite their differences both theories illustrate the influence of parenting on child development. But, it was not until Baumrind’s (1966) seminal work that a theoretical model emerged that incorporated the emotional and behavioral processes that underlie earlier models of development into a conceptualization of parenting style that
was anchored in an emphasis on parents' belief systems. Her model profoundly altered subsequent thinking about parenting (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). Since then parenting has been a centerpiece of developmental inquiry, reflecting the firm belief that childrearing makes the child (Shonkoff & Phillips, 2002). Consequently, opinions about parenting abound.

Parenting has emerged as playing a critical role in child development and family well being (Kotchick & Forehand, 2002). Contemporary parenting studies are diversified, pluralistic, and specialized (Bornstein, 2005). Based on the accumulating empirical and theoretical work, contemporary parenting researchers have developed a keen awareness of the inherent complexity of this area of study. These studies illustrate that, not only are multiple factors involved in determining parenting and its effects, but many relations among the relevant factors are bi-directional, multidirectional, and nonlinear (Karraker & Coleman, 2005).

Parenting can influence, and be influenced by, child characteristics such as temperament (Chen & Luster, 2002), as well as aspects of the macro social system in which children grow up, such as war, the political climate and policies of multiculturalism and assimilation (Rosenthal, 2000). It is affected by physical and social contexts, childrearing customs, socio-economic status and the psychological characteristics of adults (Boushel, 2000; Rosenthal & Roer-Strier, 2001).

Parenting style reflects how parents select to monitor their offspring's behavior and allows researchers to capture suites of the specific qualities that characterize parent-child relationships within a categorical framework (Darling et al., 1997; Patock-Peckham & Morgan-Lopez, 2007). It represents trait model of child rearing that suggest stable,
recurrent patterns of behavior embodied by parents, consistent across time, situation and children as the core of parenting (Holden, 1997).

Parenting style is generally perceived as a constellation of attitudes (that form the context in which parenting behaviour occurs), characteristics of parents, their behaviour which describe the parent child interactions, alters the efficacy of socialization efforts for the child, over a wide range of situations thus creating an emotional and interactional climate reflecting their global pattern of style (Bee & Boyd, 2004; Brown et al., 1993; Darling and Steinberg, 1993). This climate, as reflected in global patterns of style (e.g., Baumrind’s authoritative and authoritarian styles), is thought to help children be more open to the parental input and direction that are reflected in specific practices (Wu et al., 2000). Moreover, in addition to representing the emotional climate, parenting styles, also, reflect parental control of parent – child relationships (Carlo et al., 2007).

4.2 The Psychodynamic view:

According to Darling and Steinberg (1993) the psychodynamic theorists focused their efforts on the emotional relationship between the parent and child and its influence on the child’s psychosexual, psychosocial, and personality development. Their models were unidirectional. They posited that individual differences in the emotional relationships between parents and children must necessarily result from differences in parental attributes, and many researchers focused on attitudes as the attributes of importance (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). They reasoned that as attitudes help determine both parental practices and the more subtle behaviors that give those practices meaning, assessing parental attitudes would capture the emotional tenor of the family milieu that
determined the parent–child relationship and influenced the child's development (Baldwin, 1948; Darling & Steinberg, 1983, Orlansky, 1949; Schaefer, 1959).

4.3 The Learning model:

Theorists from behaviorist and social learning perspectives categorized parenting style according to parental behaviors and focused on parental practices rather than attitudes (Darling & Steinberg, 1993). According to them differences in children's development reflect differences in the learning environment to which they had been exposed. Consequently, measures of parenting style were designed to capture the patterning of behaviors that defined these environments (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Sears et al., 1957; Whiting & Child, 1953). They employed factor analysis to identify control as a behavioral attribute underlying the pattern of correlations among such practices as a parent's use of physical punishment, failure to enforce rules, tolerance of masturbation, sanctions against aggression and rules for use of common living areas (Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Teti & Candelaria, 2002). Behaviorist used the concepts of conditioned and unconditioned stimuli, reinforcement and reinforcement schedules, punishment, and extinction to explain the manner in which parents shaped behavior in children, with a focus on actual behaviors practiced by parents (Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

4.4 Models of Parenting Style

Earlier parenting theories differed in their emphasis on control (Watson, 1928) and nurturance (Freud, 1933; Rogers, 1960). Consequently, the particular dimensions that went into parenting style varied across studies (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).
According to Symonds (1939), the various dimensions of parenting style included acceptance/rejection and dominance/submission.

Baldwin (1955) postulated emotional warmth/hostility and attachment/involvement as dimensions of parenting style. Sears et al. (1957) contended warmth and permissiveness/strictness to be the dimensions of parenting style. For Schaefer (1959), love/hostility and autonomy/control; and for Becker (1964), warmth/hostility and restrictiveness/permissiveness served as the particular dimensions of parenting style. In their seminal paper, Darling & Steinberg (1993) pointed out the similarity among the dimensions proposed by various researchers.

Despite these varied conceptualizations of parenting style and its dimensions, the most sweeping and influential treatment of the construct is reflected in the work of Baumrind (1966; 1967; 1970; 1980; 1989; 1991; 1996), who made great strides towards identifying components of parenting style.

a) Baumrind’s Model

Diana Baumrind (1966), with her pivotal model, proffered an operationalization of parenting style that set her apart from earlier researchers. Her paradigm of parenting style not just encompasses the parenting practices but also focus on the parents' values and the beliefs they hold about their roles as parents and the nature of children. Baumrind’s conceptualization of parenting style was configurational in nature, taking into account patterns of parenting behaviors across four parenting dimensions (Baumrind, 1966; 1971). These dimensions were: Control, included use of specific disciplinary techniques used by parents. Clarity of communication reflected the effectiveness and directionality of communication between the parent and the child.
Maturity demands, defined as parental expectations, conveyed directly to children, so that they function at a level that is commensurate with their developmental level. Nurturance, reflecting the degree to which parents express warmth, concern, involvement, and pleasure in parenting.

However, further factor analyses yielded two orthogonal factors, responsiveness and demandingness (Baumrind, 1991; 1996).

1. Responsiveness refers to the extent to which parent fosters individuality and self-assertion by being attuned, supportive, and acquiescent to children’s needs, demands and requests. Emotional neglect and the absence of parental responsiveness have been found to be even more important than restrictive, coercive discipline in the etiology of behavioural problems among children. Important facets of responsiveness include warmth; reciprocity; clear communication and person-centered discourse; attachment; and autonomy support (Baumrind, 1991; 1996). Warmth refers to the parent’s emotional expression of love. The notion of reciprocity encompasses processes of synchrony or attunement in parent-child interaction.

Parental communication can be either position-centered or person centered.

Position-centered parental communication legitimizes parental authority on the basis of assigned roles and, as such as, is often experienced by the child as coercive, where as elaborated and person-centered parental communication legitimizes parental authority by persuasion and, therefore, tends to be better accepted by the child. Person-centered communication has been shown to be more effective form of parent-child social interaction than position-centered communication. Person-centered reciprocal
interactions between parents and children produce transformations in thought and action for both.

Attachment refers to an affective bond between parents and children. The notion is that children form affective bonds with parents that have continuity over time, and that parents form reciprocal relationships with their children. Moreover, relations between attachment and children’s and adults’ functioning have been repeatedly reported (Baumrind, 1991; 1996).

Parental autonomy support can be defined in terms of promotion of independence or in terms of promotion of volitional functioning among children.

The degree of psychological autonomy granting or democratic participation allows children to express themselves. It is found to be an optimal factor in advancing children’s competence and character (Baumrind, 2005; Baumrind & Thompson, 2002).

2. Demandingness refers to the claims parents make on children to become integrated into the family and society by their behavior regulation, disciplinary efforts, and willingness to confront a disruptive child, maturity demands (behavioral control) and supervision of children’s activities (monitoring). Demanding parents supervise and monitor their children’s activities by directly confronting rather than subtly manipulating them, and, thus, may engage in open conflict with their children at points of disagreement.

Demandingness is also referred to as “parental control” as it includes direct confrontations; monitoring; and consistent, contingent discipline (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).
Confronting parents are involved and firm but not necessarily coercive, although they may be. A confronting parent takes a stand even when to do so provokes conflict. Confrontational social control techniques deter internalization of prosocial attitudes, whereas covert influence techniques do not. Power assertive confrontational parenting does not undermine prosocial behavior, among children, when parents are (a) supportive; (b) nonpunitive; (c) authentic {i.e. when parents do not attempt to disguise inconsiderate and demeaning remarks to children as friendly conversation}; and (d) sensitive {i.e. parents take into account the extent to which a particular child can profit from their confrontation without becoming anxious or overwhelmed} (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Coercive parents, on the other hand, consistently issue superfluous commands accompanied by threats and promises, but not by reasons. They focus the child’s attention on the powerful status of the parent rather than on the harmful consequences of the act that the parent wishes to correct. Such coercive cycles tend to escalate into ineffectual and mutually hostile disciplinary encounters that provoke defiance and undermine internalization (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Monitoring imposes restrictions on children, but these restrictions need not be intrusive or overly directive. To be successful, monitoring and close supervision require considerable investment of time and energy, as well as the provision of an orderly consistent regimen. Though monitoring and overly directive intrusion are highly correlated, monitoring is positively associated with children’s self-assertiveness, while intrusiveness is negatively associated (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).
Parental control, through the use of consistent, contingent discipline is intended to orient the child towards goals selected by the parents; modify expression of immature, dependent, hostile behaviour; and promote compliance with parental standards. The crucial factor in behavioural management is contingent use of positive or negative reinforces immediately following desired or prohibited child behaviour, respectively. A non contingent caregiver produces a defiant child who induces the caregiver to punish harshly and who coercively controls other family members by temper tantrums and physical attacks (Baumrind 1983; 1991; 1996).

A high level of parental demandingness is best accepted by children when accompanied by an equally high level of responsiveness. Baumrind (1967; 1971; 1981) used these dimensions to derive a classification of parenting behaviour that describe how parents reconcile the joint needs of children for nurturance and limit setting. The three parenting configurations – authoritative, authoritarian and permissive - emerged from the pilot study as empirical descriptions of how parents of children differ from each other on responsiveness and demandingness variables.

1. Authoritative parenting style is described by high levels of control, nurturance, clarity of communication, and maturity demands. Authoritative parents are both demanding and responsive. They exert firm control over their children’s behaviour and set clear stands of conduct for the child. At the same time they openly acknowledge and incorporate the child perspective in disciplinary matters, within limits that are acceptable to the parents. Their disciplinary method is very supportive and involves combined use of reason and
power, rather than harsh physical punitive discipline or severe restriction of the child’s autonomy. They attempt to direct the child's activities but in a rational, issue-oriented manner with reference to established standards of conduct (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Authoritative parents encourage verbal give and take, share with the child the reasoning behind their policy, and solicit his/her objections when s/he refuses to conform. Both autonomous self-will and disciplined conformity are valued. They value both expressive and instrumental tributes, and exert firm control at points of parent-child divergence, but do not hem the child in with restrictions. They enforce their own perspective as an adult, but recognize the child's individual interests and special ways and also set standards for future conduct. They use reason, power, and shaping by regime and reinforcement to achieve their objectives, and do not base their decisions on group consensus or the individual child’s desires (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

2. *Authoritarian parenting style* is identified by high levels of control and maturity demands, and lower levels of nurturance and clarity of communication. *Authoritarian parents* are highly demanding and directive, but are not responsive and warm. They are obedience oriented expect their orders to be obeyed without explanation. They attempts to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct, usually an absolute standard, theologically motivated and formulated by a higher authority. They favor punitive, forceful measures to curb self-will at points where the child's actions or beliefs conflict with what they think is right conduct and regard the preservation of order and traditional structure as a highly valued end in itself. They believe in keeping the child in his place, in restricting his
autonomy, in assigning household responsibilities in order to inculcate respect for work; and they do not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept her word for what is right (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

3. **Permissive parenting style** is characterized by high levels of nurturance and clarity of communication, and low levels of control and maturity demands. *Permissive parents* are more responsive than demanding. They allow the child great freedom in choosing activities, are openly accepting and supportive of the child’s behaviour, and make little effort to exert control over it or set standards of conduct. Discipline involves the use of reason and manipulation, but not overt power to accomplish their ends. They are lenient, lax, do not demand mature behaviour, allow considerable self-regulation and avoid confrontation. They attempt to behave in a nonpunitive, acceptant and affirmative manner towards the child's impulses, desires, and actions. They allow the child to regulate his/her own activities as much as possible, avoid the exercise of control, and do not encourage him/her to obey externally defined standards (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

*Permissive parents* actively seek out the child for input regarding household rules and regulations, policy decisions and give explanations for family rules. They make few demands for household responsibility and orderly behavior. They present themselves to the child as a resource for him/her [the child] to use as he wishes, not as an ideal for him/her to emulate, or as an active agent responsible for shaping or altering his/her [the child] ongoing or future behavior. Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Each of the three parenting style patterns exemplify the distinctive features of the group, as well as explicit description of parenting behaviors that characterize each group.
member, categorizing a particular parent-child relationship at a specific time. However, moderate pattern stability is a likely consequence of continuity in the child’s qualities and the parents’ values, personality, and expectations. Flexible application of disciplinary practices across domains and infractions varies by pattern, with authoritative and democratic parents likely to be more flexible than authoritarian or disengaged parents in how they regulate a child’s behavior (Baumrind, 2005).

Further, Baumrind (1996; 2005) posits that parenting style has proven power to predict children’s competence and to qualify effects of (observed) parenting practices other than abuse. Thus, variables representing the demandingness factor have a more beneficial effect when embedded in an authoritative configuration than when embedded in an authoritarian configuration. Similarly, high responsiveness affects children positively when conjoined with high demandingness in an authoritative configuration, but not when conjoined with low demandingness in a permissive pattern (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005).

Authoritative parenting style conjoins firm behavioral control and monitoring with warmth and autonomy control and has shown to assist young children and adolescents develop instrumental competence which is characterized by psychosocial maturity, cooperation with peers and adults, responsible independence, and academic success. By contrast, despite the appearance of being diametrically opposite rearing styles, authoritarian and permissive parenting hold in common the propensity to minimize opportunities for children to learn to cope with stress. Authoritarian parents do this by curtailing children’s pursuits of their own initiatives (Baumrind, 1991; 1996; 2005). Permissive parents do this by giving their children free rein and failing to establish and
enforce standards of conduct. The result is a reduction in the capacity to cope with frustration and disappointment and to deal adaptively with everyday life challenges (Baumrind, 1971, 1989, 1991, 2005; Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

The cumulative results of Baumrind’s work are well known (Baumrind, 1967; 1973; 1989; 1996; 2005). Her authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive typologies are currently widely employed models of parenting style and has yielded a consistent picture of the types of parenting thought to enhance or mitigate the successful socialization of middle-class children. Research testing her typology during the past four decades has been remarkably consistent. The benefits of authoritative parenting and the detrimental impact of authoritarian and permissive parenting to children’s social and academic competence from early childhood through adolescence, both in the United States and abroad, are well documented (Robinson et al., 2002; Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

b) Maccoby and Martin’s Model

In a review published in the *Handbook of Child Psychology*, Maccoby and Martin (1983) attempted to modify Baumrind's configurational approach by attempting to capture parenting style as a function of two dimensions, which they labeled responsiveness and demandingness. They defined parenting style as reflecting two specific underlying processes: (a) *the number and type of demands made by the parents* and (b) *the contingency of parental reinforcement*.

Analogous to Baumrind, they posited that *authoritative* parents are high in both demandingness and responsiveness; and *authoritarian* parents are high in demandingness but low in responsiveness. But where empirically, Baumrind had found the “*permissive*”
type, Maccoby and Martin (1983) distinguished two distinct patterns of *permissive* parenting.

*Permissive–indulgent* parents are high on responsiveness and low on demandingness and are highly involved with their children. *Permissive-neglectful* parenting is characterized by low demandingness and low responsiveness. These parents are emotionally and physically disengaged from their children, showing little monitoring, supervision, and support of their children’s behavior. This fourth dimensions is also referred to as “*uninvolved*” on “*neglecting*”.

They posited that, compared to children of authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive-indulgent parents, children of permissive-neglectful parents appeared to be at highest risk for instrumental incompetence, a finding that was later replicated by Baumrind and others (Baumrind, 1991; Radziszewska et al., 1996).

Thus, abject abdication of parental responsibilities, as reflected in permissive-neglectful homes, appears to have even worse consequences for children than in homes in which parents lack warmth, discourage dialogue, and are harsh and restrictive, as reflected in authoritarian homes. These data suggest that, generally speaking, some kind of parental involvement with children, even if it is of poor quality, is better than none at all (Teti & Candelaria, 2002).

This move by Maccoby and Martin (1983) away from the configurational approach toward one that defined configurations on the basis of orthogonal dimensions marked an attempt—reminiscent of earlier attempts to differentiate underlying dimensions of parenting style—to tease apart the processes that underlie the influence of style (Darling & Steinberg, 1993).
c) Robinson, Mandleco, Hart and Olsen’s Model

Robinson et al. (1995; 2001) in their study attempted to develop an empirical means of assessing global typologies consistent with Baumrind’s main conceptualizations for parents of preadolescent children and also attempted to identify specific parenting practices that occur within the context of the typologies. According to them conceptualization of parenting styles is primarily framed in reference to parental control or demandingness as well as parental warmth.

They posited that authoritative parenting, as it is commonly defined, is a mix of appropriate behavioural control (demandingness) and parental warmth. Dimensions of authoritative parenting typically consist of such parenting strengths as connection, reasoning-oriented regulation, and autonomy granting (Nelson et al., 2006). Connection exists when parents are warm and responsive to the needs and feelings of the children, comfort them when they are upset and encourage them to share their troubles and problems and gives praise when the child is good. Regulation occurs when parents impose rules and regulations and monitor the behaviour of their children with emphasis on reason making the child understand his/her behaviour by explaining its consequence.

Autonomy transpires when parents allow children to manage and plan their own time, activities and encourage them to express their opinions and ideas, taking into account child’s preferences in making plans for the family or before asking the child to do something (Robinson et al., 1995; 2001). This parenting style is commonly associated with competent child and adolescent outcomes (Nelson et al., 2006).

Authoritarian parenting, in contrast, is defined by high levels of excessive behavioral control and lower levels of acceptance (Robinson et al., 1995; 2001).
style is epitomized by frequent engagement in physical and verbal coercion, punitiveness, and restriction of autonomy (Nelson et al., 2006).

Physical coercion involves use of physical force by parents, in form of spanking, slapping, grabbing etc, in order to correct the child’s behaviour. Verbal hostility entails parent’s yelling, shouting, criticizing a child in anger so as to control or discipline a child. Punitive parenting implies parent’s use of punishment, threats without any justification to discipline and control the child.

Such parents may also take away privileges from child or may even put child off somewhere alone with little if any explanations (Robinson et al., 1995; 2001). These elements may communicate parental rejection of the child and, accordingly, is more often associated with child behavioural difficulties (Nelson et al., 2006).

Permissive parenting is associated with indulgence on part of the parents. These parents give into child when s/he causes a commotion about something; threaten/state punishments to child but do not actually carry it out. They spoil the child and find it difficult to discipline him/her (Robinson et al, 1995; 2001).

In addition, they also paid a lot of attention to the construct of psychological control (Hart et al., 1998, 2003; Nelson et al., 2006; Olsen et al., 2002). Psychological control is deemed to be composed of stylistic dimensions reflecting a parental attack on the child’s developing need for psychological autonomy. It is a form of control that potentially inhibits or intrudes upon psychological development through manipulation and exploitation of the parent child bond {e.g., love withdrawal and guilt induction}, negative, affect laden expressions and criticisms {e.g., possessiveness, protectiveness} and is considered harmful to the child’s individuation (Nelson et al., 2006).
Furthermore, they identified an oversolicitous approach to parenting that is both excessively warm and excessively controlling. These parents are overly protective and controlling to the point of being intrusive. Although these parents may often have their children’s best interest in mind (i.e., safety, learning, social interaction), the constraints that oversolicitous parents place on their children may actually limit children’s opportunities to practice social skills, learn how to regulate their own emotions, and build their own cognitive constructions (Nelson et al., 2006).

They also found cross-cultural similarities in the dimensions of parenting styles. Factor structures of authoritative and authoritarian parenting dimensions have been found to be similar in United States, Australia, China and Russia (Hart et al., 2000; Porter et al., 2006; Russell et al., 2003).

According to them parenting styles might be closely associated with child maladjustment in cultures the world over. Moreover, parenting practices, though they may be differentially emphasized across cultures, likely communicate parental acceptance or rejection and thus contribute to overall style, or pervasive interaction climate, which is the essence of parenting style (Nelson et al., 2006).

4.5 Factors affecting Parenting Style

There are considerable variations in parenting styles among individuals. Theorists posit that this results from various psychosocial and environmental determinants. It is opined that parenting is influenced by the unique characteristics of the parents, such as their personality, childrearing beliefs, educational background, and psychological
wellbeing. These factors affect parents’ day-to-day interactions with their children and how the relationships with their children evolve (Bronfenbrenner 1979, 2000).

In addition, the context in which the relationship is occurring also incurs an impact. It includes aspects of the immediate setting such as other relationships in the household, including the parent’s relationship with a spouse or partner, relatives and friends etc. Network members provide informational, instrumental (e.g., child care), and emotional support for parents; they can also be sources of stress and take time away from child care activities. Also, other contexts such as the parents’ work place and the neighbourhood context may influence parents’ values and childrearing beliefs, their concerns for their children, and their perceptions of the opportunities available to their children.

The transactions that occur in the home environment and other important setting are also influenced by socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and culture. In addition, parenting behavior is influenced by parent education and family support programs designed to enhance the quality of care that parents provide. Clearly, many factors play a role in the way parents care for their children (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 2000; Luster & Okagaki, 2005).

Drawing on Bronfenbrenner’s work, Belsky (1984) identified three main determinants of parenting: (a) characteristics of the parent {e.g., personality, psychological functioning, attachment history}; (b) characteristics of the child {e.g., temperament}; and (c) contextual sources of stress and support {e.g., financial strain, divorce, social network}. 
Goodness of fit occurs when parents’ approach to their child is sensitive and responsive to the child’s presentation while poorness of fit occurs when there is dissonance between a child’s temperamental individuality (i.e. his or her presentation and behavior) and parents’ way of handling the child (i.e. their response to the child’s presentation and behavior) (Thomas & Chess, 1991). If a child’s characteristics of individuality provide a good fit (or match) with the demands of a particular setting, adaptive outcomes will accrue in that setting. In turn, of course, poorly fit, or mismatched, children—those whose characteristics are incongruent with one or most settings—should show alternative developmental outcomes. Such characteristics of individuality involve what the children do, why the children show a given behavior, and/or how the children do whatever they do (Thomas & Chess, 1991; Lerner et al., 2002).

The goodness of fit model was originally proposed to describe how parents, can adapt their parenting styles to suit the different temperaments of children, in order to promote healthy emotional development (Berk, 2007). Recent researches have shown that a child’s physical distinctiveness and psychological individuality, his or her temperament will prompt varying reactions in parents based on the parents’ attitudes, values, stereotypes, and behavioral style, and on the physical characteristics of the setting (Lerner et al., 2002). For instance, it has been found that children with more adaptable, sociable, and easy-to-soothe temperaments are likely to elicit warm and responsive parenting (Putnam et al., 2002). Findings with children in early middle childhood indicated that maternal reports of children’s high irritable distress and low effortful control were associated with children’s reports of maternal hostility (Morris et al., 2002).
These findings suggest that the challenges inherent in parenting a temperamentally difficult child may cause many parents to invest minimal energy in parenting and emotionally withdraw from the relationship which in turns hampers optimal child development and behaviour, leading to a “circular function” in individual development (Lerner et al., 2002; Schneirla, 1957).

The parent shapes the child, but part of what determines the way in which parents do this is children themselves. Children shape their parents—as adults, as spouses, and of course as parents per se—and in so doing children help organize feedback to themselves, feedback that contributes further to their individuality and thus starts the circular function all over again {that is, returns the child effects process to its first component} (Karraker & Coleman, 2005; Lerner et al., 2002).

With regard to parenting style, the goodness of fit model can be of further use when discussing, raising and supporting children regarding to their other qualities, not just in relation to temperament. Parents can use this model to adapt their parenting styles to suit the individual needs and interests of their children. Thus, parents need to understand their children so as to enhance their contributions to their children’s well-being and development (Karraker & Coleman, 2005).

**Significance of the Study**

If today we look at the family system we will know that it is becoming weak. The interpersonal relations are seen sunder lot of stress. There are lot of conflicts in the interpersonal relations. Many persons are avoiding close relations. They do not want to get involved in the close relation like marriage. On this background of the society it is necessary to study the people’s adjustment in the society and also within the family. Do
really there are so much problems or it has been focused in a negative way. Today the families are becoming smaller and smaller. There is no one in the family who will tell the younger generation how to solve the problems or face them effectively.

The parenting style of the parents and their adjustment are important component for a healthy family. These factors are affected by number of other factors. Such as the personality of parents, marital adjustment, and gender. Adjustment is one of the indicators of mental health according to WHO. The overall adjustment affects the different sub fields of adjustment such as family, health, social, occupation, marriage. This study will investigate the effect of specific adjustment field affects the specific adjustment field or not. The marital adjustment is very important aspect in the life of a married couple. A person who is happy and mentally healthy at home is also healthy and happy outside the home. There are not water tight compartment between family and job. So there will be percolation of healthy from one part of life to the other. Therefore it is necessary to check this assumption in the light of scientific methods.

A good parent has a good interpersonal relationship. No doubt that a effective parents will raise a mentally and physical healthy children. But this parenting is a outcome of number of things. The parents themselves are a major attribute to the parenting. This study focuses on the personality, marital adjustment and gender of the parent and the parenting style of the parents. This is very necessary to understand their effects and interactions.