CHAPTER - II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

In this chapter the researcher has presented review of the previous researches in the concerned area. The researcher has presented it with reference to the points mentioned below, to make the review meaningful and relevant to the present study:

1. History of researches on parental behaviour.
2. Research on measurement of parental behaviour.
3. Personality correlates of parental behaviour.
4. Research in India.

HISTORY OF RESEARCHES ON PARENTAL BEHAVIOUR

Initially in 1870 and 1930 research in the field of parental behaviour appeared. Galton first of all stressed on the role of family structure in environmental context on development of human being.¹

Further in 1925 while noting the environmental impact in the development of 1000 gifted children, Termon² employed a variety of systematic measures of family background—father’s occupational status, mother’s report of family income, ethnic background of family, schooling of parents, teachers’ evaluation of child’s home

environment, the relationship between parents, extent of family supervision etc. This presents the model of parental role.

**RESEARCHES FROM 1930 TO 1950**

After 1930, a kind of scientific revolution aroused, focusing on the parent child relationships and their effects on the child’s behaviour. Its initiator was David Levy\(^1\) who studied parent child relationship in detail from rejection to over protection.

Levy’s Relationship between patterns of parental care and the corresponding behaviour and personality characteristics of children\(^2\).

Based on Levy’s work Symonds\(^3\) undertook research later open and published results in 1939 in volume entitled - The Psychology of Parent Child Relationship. Later on Baldwin \(^4\) conducted more elaborate studies of child rearing.

Another major form of investigation on parent child relationship was the study of child’s socialization; in it stress was on parents living at different places. Anderson\(^5\) in 1932 conducted some surveys, in which data related to social class differences in parent practices were reported. These parental practices include breast feeding, toilet training, permissiveness and mode of punishment and training for independence.

---


2 A Handbook of Child Psychology, P.367, Col. 4.


RESEARCHES AFTER 1950 AND MODELS PARENTAL BEHAVIOUR

After 1950, researches on child development assumed more complex form. New parental domains were added and new complex structures were formulated. Some models¹ are as under:

A. Person Process Context Model

The design of this model includes all the traits of each of the elements and interaction among them. Parent child relationship and parent child interaction has been studied in this model. Child rearing attitudes and beliefs are exposed as chief mediators of child rearing behaviour. This model clarifies that not only parental behaviour and attitude affects child's behaviour and personality but the child influences parental behaviour and attitudes²,³.

B. Micro System Model

This model provides a child specific setting in face to face interaction with the parents. Their patterns of activity, roles, interpersonal relationships, time and material traits have been studied by many researchers⁴,⁵ to recognize the effect of such setting on child because it provides to the child environment.


C. Meso - System Model

Developed during 1960, this model stresses that parental behaviour, environment created by them and some other factors affects child’s behaviour. More than one setting has been provided in some researches\(^1\),\(^2\) to assess the impact on child’s personality. Multisetting influences on child development are provided first of all by Hartshorne and May’s\(^3\) experiment on Deceit” in which the author revealed the relative impact of parents’ and peers’ values on child’s development of sense of right or wrong. In 1987, Sowaid\(^4\) and his associates also have conducted studies in this direction.

D. Exo- System Model

External factor of parental behaviour have been studied in this model. Studies of this kind were conducted by Hoffman\(^5\),\(^6\). In these studies impact of mother’s employment on child’s behaviour was studied by him. Studies on influence of father’s occupation continued to be in fashion in 1950, 1960 and 1980s. Miller and Swanson\(^7\), Miller and Kohn\(^1\) all found in their studies that parents’


\(^7\) Miller and Swanson,“The Changing American Parents”; N. Y. Willy, 1958.
employment, nature of employment and sex of parents has significant influence on the development of the child’s attitude, values and academic achievement.

Thus said models from 1870 to present day have been influencing research efforts in this field. Three major sets of forces owe to the evolution of these models. The first includes the theoretical paradigm developed by the scientists. The second model is based on the social changes emerging in their society. The third set of forces emerged from the individual efforts of the researchers on latent structures underlying the research design employed by the early investigators in this field.

**RESEARCH ON MEASUREMENT OF PARENTAL BEHAVIOUR**

Parents are the major socializing agent for their children. They may not be conscious of their style but they important a great influence on every day’s life of a child continuously. Parent react differently to comparable situation, attaching different meaning to them and consequently contrasting with one another in their response to children.

A number of researches have developed tolls to measure parental behaviour. These have been reviewed in this section. Some of these researches have tried to measure parental attitudes towards their children, some of these have concentrated upon measuring various aspects of Parental Child relationship where as other studies have tried to develop tool to measure different dimensions of Parental behaviour. Schaefer and Bell\(^2\) designed a


research instrument measuring Parental attitudes titled as Parent Attitudes Research Instrument (PARI) in 1958. This instrument assesses various aspects of parent attitudes with the help of twenty three scales. A factor analysis of this rest by Zukerman, Ribback, Manashkin and Norton\(^1\) using a sample of mothers of normal and disturbed children, yielded three factors scores of which two seemed especially meaningful. These two major factors have been ‘Authoritarian – Control’ and Hostility – Rejection out of twenty three scales, sixteen scales measure H.R. factor. This instrument is made of 115 items. Each item is of four point scale, ranging from strong agreement (four points) to strong disagreement (one point). Separate forms for mother and father have been constructed. This instrument was found sufficiently reliable and valid and has been in several researches on child development\(^2,3,4\). Duncan evolved a Stanford Parents Questionnaire\(^5\) in 1971 measured attitudes and interactions of parents. The tool was revised and refined several times and is considered a good tool of research in the field of child development.


Different dimensions of parent child relationship have been measured by different tools constructed by many researchers. Out of these tools, Roe-Siegelman Parent Child Relationship Questionnaire\(^1\) has been established as an important measure of parent child relationship. This questionnaire has been designed to achieve a measure of the characteristic behaviour of parents towards their children, as experienced by the child. Ten sub-sets constitute the body of this instrument. Out of which six sub-sets contain fifteen items each (Loving, demanding, protecting, rejecting, neglecting and casual) whereas, remaining four sub-sets (symbolic love-reward, direct object reward, symbolic love punishment and direct object punishment) have ten items each. A factor analysis produced three major factors namely Loving-Rejecting, Casual demanding and over attention. Reliability and Validities of all sub-sets have been found very high. Two forms separate for each parent are generally completed in about twenty minutes if administered collectively. This instrument is available for adults as well as for children and has been used by many investigators\(^2\),\(^3\) in their studies because of its vast applicability and comprehensiveness. In 1971 another scale for measuring Parent Child relationship has been developed by Herman, Stapf and Krohne\(^4\) at Marburg University titled as The Marburg Scales of

---


\(^3\) Joel Robert Gavriele-Gold, “Relationship among perception of Parenting Baheviour Motivation for Learning and actual Academic Achievement in College Sophomores”, Diss Abst, Int. P. 1057 (Sep) 1981.

Parent Child Relations. Separate forms with small variations were developed for each Parent Child Relationships that is Parental Support and Parental severity. In this way the complete scale contains four scales namely - severity of mothers, severity of fathers, Support of mothers and Support of fathers. Each scale is made up of fifteen items. Five point scale is used for gathering data. The reliabilities and validities of the instrument have been found very high. This scale was cross validated by Lukesch and Tischles in a study conducted by them. In this study they tried to replicate results gathered by K. H. and Stapf et. al.(1972) in studying Marburg Scales. In another study, Hower developed a parent Child relationship questionnaire, in order to measure Parent Child relationship for six factors. There are forty items in this questionnaire. Another Parent Child relations questionnaire was developed by Fred in two forms for each parents, having six subscales namely-loving, demanding, casual, rejecting, and neglecting. Morton has also developed and used Whitesel Situations Questionnaire for Parent Child relationship in order to gather rather rejection and mother acceptance scores. Swanson Child-Parents-Relationship Scale was also brought in to light by Serot and Teevan when they conducted a study to relate Parent Child

2 J. T. Hower, Rosemea Graduate School of Psychology, 1977.
relationship and Child adjustment. This instrument was developed by Swanson\textsuperscript{1} in 1950. In order to devise Parental Behaviour measuring instrument Schaefer and his associates contributed a lot in this field. His major Contribution\textsuperscript{2} in this area in his Children's Report of Parental Behaviour Inventory (1963, 65) which has been revised and refined many times by his team as well as by other researchers at different times and in different languages. This inventory measures twenty six hypothesized concepts such as ignoring, possessiveness and lax discipline to sample all samples of a conceptual model for parental behaviour\textsuperscript{3}. A ten items scale was developed for each concept from items that describe specific, observable behaviours. All the twenty six conceptualised behaviours were categorised in to eight molar dimensions Viz., Autonomy and Love, Love, Love and Control, Control and Hostility, Control, Hostility, and Hostility and Autonomy. Internal consistency reliabilities of the scales are reported for normal boys, normal girls, and delinquent boys which are sufficiently high. The discriminative power of the scale is demonstrated by an analysis of differences between normal and delinquent boys, which is also found quite high. Nuttal and Nuttal adapted this instrument in to Spanish language for their study in 1970\textsuperscript{4} and 1976\textsuperscript{1}. In Japanese language


it was adapted by Tsujioka and Yamamoto in 1978\(^2\). A revised from of this instrument has been used by many investigators time to time\(^3, 4, 5\). Some of the researchers have used this instrument in its original form for measuring Parental behaviour\(^6, 7, 8\). Special feature of its instrument lies in the fact that children's perceived parental behaviour is being measured by this tool. Reference and description of many other Parental behaviour measuring instruments are available in the related literature. Perceived Parental Communication Scale\(^9\), Parental Behaviour Form\(^10\), The

---

Porter Parental Acceptance Scale\textsuperscript{1} and How I see myself\textsuperscript{2} and like have been administered in various studies. At Cornell University many research instruments have been devised to assess Parental behaviour. Some of them have been titled as Cornell Parent Behaviour Inventory \textsuperscript{3} Bronfenbreener Parental Behaviour Questionnaire\textsuperscript{4} and Cornell Parent Behaviour Description\textsuperscript{5}.

In India also, some Parental behaviour measuring instruments have been either adapted or developed by many investigators. Misra\textsuperscript{6} has reported his findings on the basis of a questionnaire titled as “Misra’s Parent Child Rearing Behaviour Questionnaire”; which has been developed by himself to assess acceptance and permissiveness of mothers and fathers separately. Prakash\textsuperscript{7} and Kulshreshtha\textsuperscript{8} have used Parivaric Sambandh Suchi, developed by Sherry and Sinha, successfully in their studies. This scale measures mother’s and father’s acceptance, concentration


and avoidance separately. Singh\(^1\) has cross-validated Cooper’s Parent Evaluation Scale. On an Indian sample after preparing a hindi version of this scale. Final adapted version of this scale contains twenty items for mother and twenty four items for father. Test-Retest and split half reliabilities of the scale have been found rendering from 81 to 92. A Parent-Child Questionnaire has been developed by Chaudhary\(^2\) in 1967. To assess the extent of active interaction between parent and children this may help cognitive development and scholastic achievement of children. Kale\(^3\) has devised an instrument named as, Parent-Child Interaction Scale. This is administered on parents and takes 20-40 minutes for completion. Optimum Level of reliabilities and validities has been established by the author of the scale. For the parents of Children Ravichandra and Parmeshwaran\(^4\) have also constructed a Parental Orientation Inventory in which twenty pairs of items are present dealing with achievement orientation and development orientation. Test-Retest reliability and criterion-related validity have been also established as very high.

Most of these instruments are based on children’s or parent’s introspection and descriptive reports. Although in some cases, researchers have used other measuring techniques also such as


observations. Parent Diary Report (PDR) a check list based on telephone interviews asking about child’s behaviour occurring in the home during specified hours was developed by Patterson in 1982 which has been used by several other researchers also. A critical incident interview method has been developed and recommended for use by Hoffman. Multi-method approaches involving a combined use of various data sources such as questionnaire, observations, rating scales etc. for collecting information about parental behaviour were used by Black, Baumrind, Patterson etc.

This comprehensive review of the efforts of the specific researches on measuring the parental behaviour brings out that various types of measures such as observation schedules, questionnaire, inventories tests, interview schedules, situation observation schedule and profiles have been developed and used for this purpose. The researcher for the purpose of her study has thought of developing an inventory to measure and compare parental involvement in their male and female children’s academic activities. Moreover, the instrument has been decided to measure the children’s perception of their parental involvement in academic activities. Thus the title has been decided for the tool is “Children’s Report on parents’ Participation in Academic Activities.”


6 G. P. Patterson, op.cit.
PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF PARENTAL BEHAVIOUR

In this part an effort is made to clarify specific aspects of child's personality as found associated with particular type of parental behaviour by various researches made in this field.

RISK-TAKING BEHAVIOUR

Researchers suggest that parents are one of the most important influences on the risk behaviours that their children decide to engage in. Previously it was thought that the more vigilantly parents monitored their children's behaviours, the safer their children would be. However, it has recently been determined that parental knowledge is actually key to increase influence and there are several key variables within parental control that can contribute to the amount of knowledge that they have about their children. Specifically, parents have the power to create positive familiar environments where their children feel comfortable disclosing information about the risky decisions they are facing in their daily lives. In such environments, children are more apt to listen to their parents about the ways that they should best handle these decisions. In addition to interactions with their children, parents also influence their teens' behaviours through their own behaviours. Researchers have found that adolescents will mimic the safety behaviours that their parents demonstrate and that parental safety behaviours (or lack thereof) translate into the behaviours that children will demonstrate. This is true both for their behaviours as teens and for how they feel adults are supposed to behave. Parents need to be vigilant about "practicing what they
"preach" to their children and programming pieces directed at parents need to emphasize this component.

Adolescence is a developmental period marked by increased health risk-taking and novelty seeking behaviours (Kelley, Schochet and Landry\textsuperscript{1}, 2004). This marked increase in risk-taking usually does not occur at any other point in the lifespan (Kelley, et al.\textsuperscript{2}, 2004).

Increased risk-taking has been called one of the greatest behavioural changes that occur within adolescence (Kelley, et al., 2004); it is a time marked by increased novelty seeking, risk-taking and in turn injury and mortality. In fact, statistics on motor vehicle crashes, risky sexual behaviours, binge drinking and crime demonstrate that adolescents engage in more risk behaviours than any other age group, including children (Dahl\textsuperscript{3}, 2004; Steinberg\textsuperscript{4}, 2004). Accordingly, researchers have devoted much attention to this period of heightened risk-taking during adolescence (Dahl, 2004) and efforts to understand how other variables may influence adolescent risk engagement have been extensively examined.

Research in the past two decades has highlighted the central role of genetics as a major factor contributing to the most troubling and costly outcomes of adolescent risk-taking, including violence,


criminal activity and substance use disorders (Jaffee et al\textsuperscript{1}; Taylor, Iacono and McGue\textsuperscript{2}). However, there is mounting evidence that genetic influences on a variety of problem outcomes reflect a complex interplay between inherited and environmental risk with genetic risk leading to pathological behaviour for some youth only when the primary socializing environment also is adverse (Cadoret, Winokur, Langbehn and Troughton\textsuperscript{3}).

Three broad categories of family influence have been studied in the literature on adolescent risk-taking: the quality of family interactions, parenting styles and practices and family modeling and socialization of risky behaviours. One of the most robust predictors of alcoholism risk is a positive family history with the biological offspring of alcoholics being approximately three to five times more likely to develop alcoholism during their lifetime and more likely to begin using alcohol and drugs in adolescence than the biological offspring of non-alcoholics (Chassin, Rogosch and Barrera\textsuperscript{4}, 1991; Hawkins, Catalano and Miller\textsuperscript{5}, 1992). High rates of mental health disorders, such as depression, also are found in parents and


siblings of substance abusers (Mayes and Suchman\textsuperscript{1}, 2006). Antisocial behaviour tends to run in families as well, with concordance between siblings growing up in the same family (Rowe, Rodgers and Meseck-Bushey\textsuperscript{2} 1992) as well as between parents and children (Herndon and Iacono\textsuperscript{3} 2005). However, evidence suggests the effects of parent psychopathology are largely transmitted through genetics and through the family relationship and socialization processes featured in the following sections (Chassin, Ritter, Trim and King\textsuperscript{4} 2003; Jacob et al.\textsuperscript{5}, 2003; Laub and Sampson\textsuperscript{6} 1988).

Conditions ranging from living with irritable and quarreling parents (Davies and Cummings\textsuperscript{7} 1998; O'Brien, Margolin, John, and Krueger\textsuperscript{8} 1991) or siblings (East and Shi\textsuperscript{1} 1997; Hall, 2006).

---


Henggeler, Ferreira and East\textsuperscript{2}, 1992), to being exposed to violence and abuse at home (Dodge, Petit and Bates,\textsuperscript{3} 1994; Malinosky-Rummell and Hansen\textsuperscript{4} 1993; Small and Luster\textsuperscript{5}, 1994) have been associated with adolescent risk-taking behaviours.

Abundant evidence also indicates that hostile, coercive and punitive parenting is associated with increased risk taking in adolescence, particularly antisocial behaviour and substance use problems (see Rothbaum and Weisz\textsuperscript{6} 1994 for review).

Several studies have shown that adolescents who are raised in homes characterized by authoritative parenting (that is- parenting that is warm but firm) are more mature and less likely to engage in risk-taking behaviour (Baumrin\textsuperscript{7}, 1985; Maccoby and Martin\textsuperscript{8}, 1983; Steinberg, Lamborn, Darling, Mounts and Dornbusch\textsuperscript{9}, 1994).


\textsuperscript{9} L. Steinberg, S.D. Lamborn, N. Darling, N.S. Mounts and S.M. Dornbusch, (1994). Over-time changes in adjustment and competence among adolescents from
Research studies that assess these aspects of effective parenting report reliable negative associations between them and a broad array of high risk behaviours, including aggressive, hostile, oppositional and delinquent behaviour; use and abuse of alcohol and illicit substances; initiation of sex, failure to practice safe sex and involvement in a pregnancy at an earlier age (Ary, Duncan, Duncan and Hops\(^1\), 1999; Baumrind,\(^2\) 1991; Fleming, Kim, Harachi and Catalano,\(^3\) 2002; Galambose, Barker, and Almeida \(^4\) 2003; Jackson, Bee-Gates, and Henriksen\(^5\), 1994; Rothbaum and Weisz,\(^6\) 1994; Shedler and Block,\(^7\) 1990; Steinberg et al.,\(^8\) 1994). While most studies have focused on maternal parenting to the exclusion of authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. Child Development, 65(3), 754-70.


of fathers, emerging evidence suggests maternal and paternal influences are both important (Lamb\(^1\), 2003).

Theoretically, disengaged parenting raises a risk for adolescent problem behaviour because the combination of (1) a lack of emotional bonding or attachment to parents and (2) a lack of supervision and consistent behavioural control fails to provide a clear communication of parents’ values and also undermines motivation for adolescents to attend and comply, thus weakening adolescents’ internalization of parental values and socialization (Baumrind\(^2\), 1991; Grusec and Goodnow\(^3\), 1994). Highly supportive and responsive caregiving, particularly when combined with clear and consistent discipline, also facilitates the gradual increase in children’s self-regulatory capacities and decision-making abilities (Martin, Maccoby and Jacklin\(^4\), 1981; Shaw, Keenan and Vondra\(^5\), 1994).

Evidence suggests that the parenting context begins to shape pathways to adolescent risk-taking very early in development. Keenan and Shaw\(^6\) (2003) explain development of

---


antisocial behaviour as the result of both individual deficits in the capacity to regulate emotions and behaviours (stemming from genetically-linked vulnerabilities previously described) and a caregiving environment that exacerbates these deficits by not providing the appropriate level of developmental guidance in important socialization processes. Contingent and sensitive responding in infancy and early childhood provides a foundation for caregivers to facilitate development of self-regulatory skills (Martin, Maccoby and Jacklin,1 1981; Shaw, Keenan and Vondra,2 1994) and internalization of moral standards (Kochanska,3 1995) and also sets the stage for parents to have greater impact in middle childhood and adolescence.

During elementary and middle school, parents can directly manage peers to a certain extent by actively steering their children toward desired peers and activities (Parke and Ladd,4 1992). How much parents attend to their younger children’s activities, their friends and specifically their opportunities for substance use has a strong impact on preadolescents’ beginning drug use (Chilcoat and Anthony,5 1996). Adolescents whose parents are authoritative (that is- when parents are involved, make demands, and supervise while

demonstrating acceptance and warmth) are less swayed by peer pressure to misbehaviour than are adolescents whose parents are overly permissive or authoritarian (Fuligni and Eccles,\(^1\) 1993; Mounts and Steinberg,\(^2\) 1995). Research also shows that teens are more willing to tell their parents about their whereabouts and activities if they have a strong parent-child bond (Kerr and Stattin,\(^3\) 2000) and the presence of strong bonds with parents and other family members moderates the negative influence of peer drug use and delinquency (Farrell and White,\(^4\) 1998; Germán, Gonzales and Dumka,\(^5\) 2009; Mason, Cauce, Gonzales and Hiraga,\(^6\) 1995; Wills and Cleary,\(^7\) 1996).

The family context also provides socialization specific to risk-taking behaviours through modeling (for example parent or sibling involvement with drugs and alcohol), transmission of family values and attitudes that are favorable or prohibitive of risk-taking.


(Johnson and Pandina, 1991) and communication about topics such as adolescent sexuality, drinking and drug use (Chassin et al., 2005; Webster, Hunter and Keats, 1994; Kotchik, Shaffer, Forehand and Miller, 2001).

However, an equal number of studies find no effects or even contradictory effects (Chassin et al., 1995; Fisher, 1989; Miller, Benson and Gailbraith, 2001). One possible explanation is that findings may vary depending on when communication is initiated (for example; before or after parents discover their children are sexually active or using drugs), the quality of the parent-child relationship, or the family values and models available in the household. For example, two studies found that parent attitudes and parent specific socialization strategies to reduce smoking (rules, punishment and prohibitions against smoking) prospectively predicted adolescent smoking behaviour, but not in homes in which

---


parents smoked (Andersen et al.,\textsuperscript{1} 2002; Chassin et al.\textsuperscript{2}, 1995); when family members are actively using, these socialization strategies have had paradoxical effects to increase adolescent smoking (Chassin, et al., 1995; Ennett, Bauman, Foshee, Pemberton and Hicks,\textsuperscript{3} 2001).

Researches summarized herein have identified the family influences in complex ways. Family influences operate sequentially, competitively or in a compensatory fashion at different stages of development. Dodge et al.\textsuperscript{4} (2009) describe a cascading pattern in which early parental factors (low warmth, high harsh discipline) influence which subsequently influence parental reactions (withdrawal of supervision and monitoring due to conflict), which influence substance-use behaviour Dodge et al.\textsuperscript{5} (2008) describe a similar dynamic cascade in the development of adolescent violence. A risky family context leads young children to lag in their social, cognitive and emotional development, so they are ill-prepared to develop positive, pre social relationships and are lacking in regulatory skills and coping abilities to make good

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
decisions when faced with risky choices. Social incompetence leads to social rejection by peers and aggressive conflicts with peers. In turn, parents respond to a conflict-ridden child by withdrawing supervision and monitoring, even though these children may be the ones who need the high structure of supervision more than other children. Lack of parental supervision of a dysregulated adolescent increases risk for affective disturbance and the use of risk-taking, particularly alcohol and drugs, as a form of self medication, seeking of peer approval or enjoyment. In this model, the family plays a central role early in development, with a shift to greater influence of peers in adolescence. However, even during adolescence, the family remains important because it provides a source of supervision, guidance and protection. Hawkins et al.¹ (1992) have proposed that strong bonds between an adolescent and his or her parents reduce the likelihood of problem behaviours and substance use because of its effect on reducing the salience and value of peer influences and vice-versa. Efforts of parents to monitor structure and limit peer activities are also important to delay or reduce exposure to risky peer contexts, which may be especially important during early adolescence when youth are most vulnerable to heightened reward processing coupled with a still immature self-regulatory system.

DECISION MAKING ABILITY

While most authors do not discount the socializing effects of individuals such as parents during adolescence, there have been claims made that peer groups are the primary environmental

influence on children’s psychological functioning (Harris, 1995). Harris\(^1\) (1995) even goes so far as to contend that parents do not have any long-term effects on the development of their child’s personality.

Contrary to Harris’\(^2\) (1995) assertions and despite the pronounced emphasis that many developmental theorists place on the influence of peers in an adolescent’s life, parents contribute substantially to their child’s development. The effects of family values begin in childhood, affect the values and skills that children will develop. These values also contribute to the peers and affiliates that children will choose as they become more autonomous in adolescence (Garnier and Stein,\(^3\) 2002). A family environment that promotes values of care and kindness in their children produces adolescents with more Risky Decision Making generative life narratives (French et al.,\(^4\) 2007). Additionally, a parental commitment to values that focus on traditional achievement and authority, as well as humanism or egalitarianism, predict fewer delinquent behaviours in adolescence (Garnier and Stein,\(^5\) 2002). Despite growing reliance on peers for social support, most adolescents still look to their parents for important and positive

---


influence in their lives (Laible et al.,\textsuperscript{1} 2000). Overall, the conclusion made by early researchers on socialization that parents have little influence on adolescent behaviour or personality were often overstated, and were based on correlational findings or relied excessively on singular factors of parental influence (Collins et al.,\textsuperscript{2} 2000).

Current research recognizes the important connection between family and peer effects in adolescent decision making; it points to the collective influence of peer norms and parent values during adolescence development as opposed to the earlier view, which assumed their opposition (Laible et al.,\textsuperscript{3} 2000; Collins et al.,\textsuperscript{4} 2000). According to Laible et al. (2000), parent and peer relationships serve similar, though not equal, functions for adolescent adjustment. Moreover, while adolescents begin to look more toward their peers for support during the transition from childhood to adulthood, most still also rely heavily on their parents for emotional support and advice.

Previous research commonly conflated peer influence with peer similarity, ignoring the considerable force of selection effects (Collins et al.\textsuperscript{2} 2000). In reality, adolescents choose their peers and they generally choose like-minded ones, based on the values and


beliefs that they have had instilled in them by their parents. Parents also have substantial opportunity to steer their young children toward specific social interactions, and can later actively block certain peers from aspects of their child’s environment Risky Decision Making (Collins et al.,\textsuperscript{1} 2000). While this doesn’t eliminate all the effects of deviant or unfavorable peers, this type of parental monitoring can affect the attitudes, values and motivations that children are exposed to during their development. Furthermore, adolescents differ substantially on their susceptibility to peer influence and this is most strongly predicted by parenting type, with more authoritative parents having less susceptible children (Collins et al.,\textsuperscript{2} 2000). All things considered, the major flaw in the arguments of Harris\textsuperscript{3} (1995) and others is the failure to recognize that relationships do not occur in a vacuum and that most relationships, parent and peer included, can offer support, protection and compensation when others fail or fall short (Vandell,\textsuperscript{4} 2000).

**ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT**

Academic achievement is the most researched area in the field of child development. The studies reveal that child’s academic achievement is largely influenced by parental behaviour.

---


\textsuperscript{4} D.L. Vandell, (2000), Parents, peer groups and other socializing influences, Developmental Psychology, 36(6), 699-710.
These studies do not reveal any solid foundation on the basis of which prediction may be made about academic achievement of children in relation to parental behaviour. Nevertheless some researches concerned to this area are presented here.

Wilson,\(^1\) Edward\(^2\) and Nuttal\(^3\) and his co. have revealed that academic achievement of children is closely associated with parental involvement. They conducted study on various types of children as normal and special. Moreover some other studies conducted by Hrabal\(^4\), Juneja\(^5\) etc. have also displayed same results. But in one research undertaken by Marjoribank\(^6\) non significant relationship was found between the two.

Although in another study conducted by him he found positive relation between the two. Field\(^7\) also found better academic

---

\(^1\) F. H. Wilson, “Parental Involvement with their Children’ Education on the Junior High School Levels in Urban Schools and its relationship to Students Achievement to Parental Status, to Distance of Home from School and to Parent Sex”, Dis. Abs. Int. 37:5, 3542-3543, 1976.


achievement and interest in academic activities in case of parental involvement in the academic activities.

Edward¹ showing very high correlation between parental involvement and children’s academic achievement has revealed that parental academic interest helps in predicting grade level.

Su,² Karnes³ and his associates found the parents of high achievers in the habit of giving love, affection and respect to their children as compared to the parents of low achievers. High control, dominance and possessiveness associated with love, acceptance and high nurturance are found positively related to high achievement by Tiwari⁴, Heilburn and Walters⁵; but on the other hand when high control accompanied with low nurturance and rejection are found foreteller of low achievement, by Heilburn and Walters in the same study.

Morrow and Wilson⁶, Su⁷ and Tiwari⁸ in some other studies explored that rejection, ignorance, punishment, restrictive behaviour

⁷ C. W. Su, op cit
⁸ G. P. Tiwari, op cit.
and severe attitude of parent result in low achievement of their children. While Juneja in his study divulged that negative reinforcement of behaviour, more immediate punishment, high maternal control certainty in influencing child behaviour and logically approved authority along with warmth always leads to high achievement.

Fine, Cutts and Mosley in their studies found that high aspiration and high expectation on the part of parental behaviour leads to high academic achievement of their children but it was found in case of indirect parental involvement in children’s academic activities, personal freedom and encouragement to the children and direct involvement in children’s activities is found to be associated with low academic achievement. In another study by Karnes and his associates parental pressure to achievement has been found as a reason of low achievement.

Parents’ estimation of I. Q. of their children is also found associated with achievement. Boeger also witnessed that under estimation of I.Q. of children by parents is related to high achievement while over estimation of the same is found closely related to low achievement.

---


In some other studies some more factors are also found related to achievement and grade level of children, as in a research Kulshreshtha\(^1\) brought into light that parents’ care concerning collecting fees and other facilities for their children has been found responsible for low achievement level.

According to Osuala\(^2\)’s findings, mild family dysfunction and deficit in attention, motivation, memory and self esteem are highly correlated to under achievement. Various studies have been undertaken to reveal the impact of parental behaviour on children’s achievement, adjustment and other personality factors like anxiety, depression, instability, dependency etc. Still all these researches treat children’s adjustment in relation to parental behaviour in very general way, as these studies do not reveal clearly and specifically which parental behaviour is associated with children’s achievement and their personality traits in what manner and to what extent.

So this lacuna motivates the researcher to present some more review as follows:

In the context of parental behaviour, children’s adequacies of behaviour have been subjected to research\(^3,4\). Parental traits in treating their children are found closely related to children’s adjustment to ten environments. Further it is found in some studies

---


that maladjusted fathers tend to make their offspring shy, withdrawn and maladjusted\textsuperscript{1,2}.

Parental faulty attitudes and unhealthy parent child relationship are found to be highly related to maladjustment of children as has been explored by Marfatia.\textsuperscript{3} In Studies made by Mink and Kazuo\textsuperscript{4} and his associates found that behaviour problems developed in children as a result of alcoholic habits and lack of control on the part of parents.

Mack\textsuperscript{5} revealed that high anxiety in the children is caused by the rigidity and severe attitude of parents. Gill\textsuperscript{6} explored that children abused by their parents develop such personality traits as hyperactivity, high annoyance, aggression etc. High correlation between parental acceptance and adjustment capability of children is reported by Koudelkova\textsuperscript{7} on the basis of his research findings.

Again these studies are concentrated on the two factors mainly. In absence of these two factors these studies hardly help in making prediction about child’s level of adjustment. In fact there are


some more factors which are closely related to children’s adjustment as Gupta \(^1\) in his study has revealed that parental preference in social field is a good measure of children’s adjustment. Mink and Kazuo \(^2\) and his associates have proved that in achievement oriented families where children are pressurized to high achievement, they face problem in adjusting with school demands.

**EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATION**

A very few studies have been conducted in the field of relationship of parental behaviour with their children’s educational aspiration\(^3\), \(^4\), \(^5\). Available Studies reveal an adequate base to formulate clear cut guidelines to parents and educators so that appropriate environment may be evolved to raise the level of educational aspiration of the students to the maximum level.

However some studies provide in their findings in the form of positive correlation between the said factors. Muller Wolf \(^6\) has

---


shown that parental behaviour influences achievement motivation and motivation for the lifelong learning.

Gavriele\(^1\) has also shown significant relation between parental behaviour and motivation for learning. Naik\(^2\) and Fleming have explored that parental motivation and encouragement are significantly related to parental behaviour influences achievement motivation of the students and are good predictors of level of parental behaviour influences achievement motivation and academic motivation. Difference between understood and misunderstood children have been found related to high and low level of educational aspiration in a research conducted by Bladsoe and Wiggins\(^3\). Bisht\(^4\) has revealed in his study that educational and recreational facilities provided by the parents affect the level of children’s educational aspiration.

Nagalakshmi\(^5\), Nuttall and Nuttall\(^6\) and Prakash\(^1\) in their studies have brought out that the parents of high academic achievement acceptants.

---


Herman\textsuperscript{2} and his associates have shown that parental expectations are also related with educational aspiration of the children. They have revealed that parents of high achievers use more non-specific help as well as their expectation related to their children’s performance is found very high.

Some studies focus on the mode of disciplining as a determinant of level of academic motivation. Tervino\textsuperscript{3} has revealed that mother’s punishment in case of girls and support in favour of boys lead to high educational aspiration. Democratic attitude of parents is shown in close relation in this connection by Nuttall and Nuttall\textsuperscript{4} and Nagalakshmi\textsuperscript{5}. But Nuttal has stressed on firm discipline in case of boys as determinant of high educational aspiration.

Naik\textsuperscript{6} in his research has demonstrated positive relation in parental supportive behaviour to child’s independence and his academic activities and high educational aspiration of their children. While Nagalakshmi\textsuperscript{7} has shown that these two variables are independent to each other.


\textsuperscript{7} Nagalakshmi, 1983, op cit.
COGNATIVE DEVELOPMENT

Parental behaviour is also found closely related to development of children’s intellectual functioning and mental abilities. Walberg\(^1\) and Bradley\(^2\) have proved that modes of parental behaviour determine the cognitive development of their children. Hammond\(^3\) along with his associates has shown that cognitive development of children is associated with home environment and parental behaviour. Piper\(^4\), Wilson\(^5\) and Dason\(^6\) found that early parental behaviour related experiences influence the verbal I.Q. and verbal creativity. Thompson and his associates\(^7\) are similar. Reena Rastogi\(^8\) in her studies pertaining to intelligence reveals that none out of twenty six dimensions of parents’ academic participation is found to be significant with children’s level of Intelligence.

---


CREATIVITY

Some researchers focus on effect of parental behaviour on the creativity, originality and imaginative capabilities of children. Nuttal\(^1\), Shekhar\(^2\) and Agarwal\(^3\) have found that creativity and parental acceptance are highly associated to each other. Shekhar\(^4\) has shown that parental encouragement, motivation, democratic discipline lead to the development of creativity in the students. Agarwal\(^5\) and Juffer\(^6\) have revealed that parental rejection, firm control on the part of mother, directive behaviour of parents are negative correlates of child’s creativity.

OTHER PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

In order to study the impact of parental behaviour on the personality traits of children various researches have been conducted by the researchers, in this part of the study the researcher is giving the review of such studies. Obstinate, delinquent behaviour of the children is accredited to the family environment and faulty parental behaviour by the researchers. Ralph\(^7\) has reported in his study that there is positive correlation

---


5. S. Agarwal, op.cit.


between father's punishment and level of delinquent aggression, particularly in males. Tamnex has also demonstrated crucial impact of parental mode of punishment, discipline and communication the character and personality characteristics of their children.

Su has shown that moral behaviour of children is positively influenced by the love and accepting behaviour of the parents, while rejecting behaviour is associated with the immoral conduct and tendencies.

On the other hand Edward and Hower have revealed that accepting, lax autonomous attitude, inductive and power assertive parental behaviour had negative effect on the same.

Sehgal and his company have also revealed that parental behaviour has significant effect on the child's locus of control. Chandler and Wolf found that parent's positive statements exert positive influence on the children's personality traits.

Self concept of children is also significantly affected by the parental behaviour as Saxena has approved that children's self

---


identity and self evaluation are shaped greatly by the parental behaviour.

Self concept of children is found influenced by the parental acceptance and positive attitude by V.V. Jogawar. Positive correlation between the two variables is shown by Stadter.

Self Esteem of children is also greatly influenced by the parental behaviour and attitude as shown by Growe who has explored that level of self esteem is significantly affected by the three dimensions of parental behaviour like rejection, autonomy and indulgence. At the same time he reported that boys’ self esteem was more significantly influenced by the parental behaviour than that of girls. Loeb has also shown that parent child relationship is the determinant factor of self esteem of children.

Some other personality characteristics are also studied by various scholars. Some of the general traits are attitudes, Career awareness, Self disclosure and independence training.

RESEARCHES IN INDIA

Survey of educational and psychological research published during 1974 and 1972 unveil insufficient researches in the field of parental behaviour by Indian scholars.

---


As reported by II educational survey of education\(^1\) and psychology\(^2\) a number of researches have been conducted concerning parental behaviour and child’s personality development. Studies conducted during this period have shown deep interest in the developmental changes in the personality of child including the factors involved in this change.

Anandlakshmy\(^3\) has exposed that child development is influenced by the child’s behaviour in the family and his experiences with the elders. Child’s social behaviour is shown significantly determined by the type of family whether joint or nuclear as well as the interaction patterns. Except it various personality traits like dependence, creativity, adjustment, achievement and aspiration level moral behaviour are also dealt in various researches in this context.

However studies chiefly focus on the pre-schoolers and adolescents\(^4, 5, 6, 7\) in this regard. Impact of father’s child rearing practices and behaviour on child’s personality development is found

---

significant by Muthayya.¹ According to Sood², discipline patterns of parents are also found significantly related to the children’s locus of control and internalization of rules. Maladjusted behaviour of the children and parental behaviour are found highly correlated by Majumdar³ and Reddy⁴. In the same way parental behaviour and level of achievement of the children are found significantly related by various scholars.⁵,⁶,⁷,⁸

In a study by Kapoor⁹ and his associates parental acceptance and affectionate attitude are found related to the internalization of moral values by the children. Jain¹⁰ and Kakkar¹¹ in their study have divulged that parent child interaction and


behaviour pattern of parents affect children's personality traits as cooperation, altruism, social, sharing behaviour etc. Agarwal¹, Shekhar² and Jogawar³ have revealed in their studies that other traits of children's personality – creativity, vocational interest, and job preference and value orientation are related to favorable home environment and healthy parent-child relationship.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of review of researches conducted in India concerning the parental involvement and their children's personality traits, the researcher have come to the following conclusions:

1. The researches conducted in this area are insufficient to yield any general result.
2. Academic involvement of parents in their children's activities and its impact on their adolescents', risk-taking behaviour, decision making ability and other specific personality traits is hardly touched area in the researches in India.
3. Various tool and techniques are employed in these researches; hence it seems very difficult to come to any solid conclusion.
4. To the best knowledge of the researcher, in India no study has been undertaken to predict the adolescents', risk-taking behaviour, decision making ability on the basis of their parent's involvement in their academic activities.

This elaborate review of the previous researches in the concerned area the researcher attains guidelines and background for conducting the present research which is different from other studies on the following grounds:

1. This study concentrates on the parents’ involvement in the academic activities of adolescents.

2. Main objective of this study has been to quantify parents’ involvement in adolescents’ academic activities on the basis of specific dimensions of parental behaviour.

3. In this way the sole purpose of this study is to show the effect of parental involvement on the adolescents’, risk-taking behaviour and decision making ability.

Thus, on the basis of some specific features which distinguish this research from the previous researches, the researcher allege that here a novel endeavor is made to explore some embedded areas concerning parental behaviour and children’s personality development.