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RESULTS AND INTERPRETATION (CONTINUED)

4.1. Factors Significantly Contributing to Achievement Motivation, Self-Esteem, Emotional Maturity, Parent-Child Relationship and Anxiety of Goan Adolescents

H$_{a_5}$: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to their achievement motivation, self-esteem, emotional maturity, parent-child relationship and anxiety.

Further, from the above hypothesis many specific hypotheses (H$_{a_{5,1}}$- H$_{a_{5,5}}$) for each of the variables such as achievement motivation, self-esteem, emotional maturity, parent-child relationship and anxiety of Goan adolescents are drawn and tested.

The technique of Stepwise Multiple Regression analysis was applied to know the significance of the contribution of various demographic factors collectively as well as individually to the overall scores of achievement motivation, self-esteem, emotional maturity, parent-child relationship and anxiety of Goan adolescents.

It is quite natural that human behaviour is influenced by most of the demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parents education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents, thus, any research becomes incomplete without studying the impact of demographic variables on the dependent variables undertaken in the studies. In view of this, similar attempt is also made in the present study to investigate the differential impact of these
demographic factors on the dependent variables viz, achievement motivation, self-esteem, emotional maturity, parent-child relationship and anxiety of Goan adolescents.

4.1.1 Factors Significantly Contributing to Achievement Motivation of Adolescents

Ha5.1: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to their achievement motivation.

Table 4.01: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression* Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to the Achievement Motivation of Adolescents (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta-coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parental education (Post graduate mothers)</td>
<td>-19.63</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>-2.86**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Faculty(Science)</td>
<td>-6.54</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-3.22***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Less sensitive to people)</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.18*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²=0.072
Overall F ratio = 7.535 ; p<0.001

*** p<0.001 very highly significant
** p<0.01 highly significant
* p<0.05 significant

The observation of Table 4.01 reveals that, out of many demographic factors, only three factors such as Parental education (post graduate mother), faculty (science), and sensitivity (less sensitive to people) of adolescents have emerged as significantly contributing factors to their achievement motivation.

*The obtained ‘R’ value in this analysis indicated the correlation between the criterion and predictor variables. The square of this correlation between the criterion and predictor variables. The square of this correlation gives the proportion of variance, which can be predicted. For example, R² 0.90 would imply that 90% of the variance in y scores can be predicted on the basis of x₁,x₂,…,xₙ scores. To test the significance of the overall prediction, F-ratio is computed. The F-ratio reveals whether the amount of overall variance (R²) predicted through regression equation is significant or not. Similarly, t-test is used to test the significance of individual regression (b) weights. That is to know whether the predictor variables can individually predict the criterion significantly or not.
More specifically, these three variables have collectively contributed to 7.2% of the variance for the overall achievement motivation of adolescents, which is very highly significant (F=7.535; p<0.001). In other words, 7.2% of the variance on the overall achievement motivation can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the three factors such as Parental education (post graduate mothers), Faculty (science), and Sensitivity (less sensitive to people).

Individually, Parental education (post graduate mother) has contributed to 2.9% the variance on achievement motivation, which is found to be significantly high but negative (t=-2.86; p<0.01). Faculty (science) has contributed to 2.8% of variance and is observed to be very highly significant and also negative (t=-3.21; p<0.001). Whereas Sensitivity factor has contributed to 1.5% of variance, and is also observed to be significant (t=2.18; p<0.05).

Thus, it can be learnt that achievement motivation is significantly influenced by Parental education (post graduate mothers), Faculty (science) and Sensitivity (less sensitive to people) collectively as well as individually. Further, it can be inferred that adolescents having post graduate mothers have shown significantly higher achievement motivation than those adolescents whose mothers are less educated than this level. Adolescents of science faculty have shown significantly higher achievement motivation than those coming from arts and commerce faculty. Adolescents who are less sensitive to people have shown significantly lower achievement motivation compared to adolescents who are sensitive to people.
4.1.2 Factors Significantly Contributing to the Self-Esteem of Adolescents

**H_{a5.2}:** Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to their Self-Esteem.

**Table 4.02: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to the Self-Esteem of Adolescents (N=300)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Decided)</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>-2.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parental Education (Graduate fathers)</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.09*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Academic (Satisfaction with academic performance)</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-2.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted $R^2 = 0.057$  
Overall F ratio=5.879; p<0.001  
**p<0.01 highly significant  
*p<0.05 significant**

Perusal of the above Table 4.02 reveals that again, only three factors such as Career (decided), Parental Education (graduate fathers) and Academic (satisfaction with academic performance) of adolescents have emerged as significantly contributing factors to their self-esteem.

More specifically, these three variables have collectively contributed to 5.7% of the variance for the overall self-esteem of adolescents, which is very highly significant (F=5.879; p<0.001). In other words, 5.7% of the variance of the overall self-esteem can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the three factors such as Career (decided), Parental education (graduate father) and Academic (satisfaction with academic performance) of adolescents.

Individually, the factor such as career (decided) has contributed to 2.8% of variance on self-esteem which is highly significant but negative (t=-2.70; p<0.01). Parental education (graduate father) has contributed to 1.5% of variance and is
observed to be significant ($t=2.09; p<0.05$). Whereas, Academic (satisfaction with academic performance) has contributed to 1.4% of variance and is observed to be significant ($t=-2.08; p<0.05$) and also negative.

Further it can be inferred that adolescents with decided careers have shown significantly higher self-esteem than those who have not decided with careers. Adolescents who are satisfied with their academic performance have shown significantly higher self-esteem than those who are not satisfied. Whereas adolescent children of graduate fathers have shown significantly lower self-esteem as compared to their counterparts.

### 4.1.3 Factors Significantly Contributing to Anxiety of Adolescents

**H$_{a5.3}$**: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health, academic performance, type of stay, parents' favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to their Anxiety.

**Table 4.03**: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly contributing to the Anxiety of Adolescents (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sl.No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Co-efficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contributed R$^2$</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-identity (Poor self-identity)</td>
<td>-5.72</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-3.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Favourite (Both parents)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>2.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family relations (Happy with) (the family relations)</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>2.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Income (Moderate income)</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Faculty (Science)</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>2.30*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted $R^2=0.127$

Overall F ratio= 8.452; $p<0.001$

***$p<0.001$ very highly significant  
**$p<0.01$ highly significant  
*p$<0.05 significant**
It can be noted from the above Table 4.03 that little more and different factors such as Self-identity (poor self identity), Favourite (both parents), Family relations (happy with the family relations), Income (moderate income) and Faculty (science) have emerged as significantly contributing factors to anxiety of adolescents.

That is their collective contribution amounts to 12.7% of the variance for the overall anxiety of adolescents, which is significantly very high, (F=8.452; p<0.001).

Individually, Self identity has contributed to 4.6% of the variance on anxiety of adolescents which is found to be significantly very high, but negative (t=-3.70; p<0.001). The factor that ‘whose favourite you are’(both parents) has contributed to 3.3% of variance which is significantly very high (t=2.89; p<0.01).Further happiness with the family, Income and Faculty have contributed to 1.8%, 1.6% and 1.4% respectively, which is further observed to be significant but in a negative way (p<0.05).

Thus, it can be inferred from the above presentation that adolescents having low self identity have higher anxiety as compared to adolescents with high self identity, adolescents who are favourite of both the parents have lower anxiety as compared to adolescents with only father’s or mother’s favourite. Adolescents who are happy with their family relations have lower anxiety as compared to adolescents with lower or moderate happiness with the family relations, Adolescents whose parents have shown moderate income have lower anxiety compared to low or high income group. Adolescents of science faculty have shown lower anxiety compared to adolescents of arts and commerce faculty.
4.1.4 Factors Significantly Contributing to Emotional Maturity of Adolescents.

Hα₄: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to their Emotional Maturity.

Table 4.04: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to the Emotional Maturity of Adolescents (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Faculty (Science)</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>3.18**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parental education (Less educated mothers)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>2.52*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Favorite (Both parents)</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>2.17*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Income (Fathers low income)</td>
<td>-3.77</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-2.08*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²= 0.079
Overall F ratio= 6.203; p<0.001

** p<0.001 very highly significant
*p<0.05 significant

An observation of Table 4.04 reveals that again almost same demographic factors such as Faculty (science), Parental education (less educated mothers), Favourite (both parents), and Income (low income fathers) have emerged as significantly contributing factors to their overall Emotional Maturity.

More specifically, these four variables have collectively contributed to 7.9% of the variance for Emotional Maturity, which is very highly significant (F=6.203; p<0.001). In other words, 7.9% of the variance on Emotional Maturity can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the above stated four factors.

Individually, the factor that is faculty has contributed to 3.3% of variance on Emotional Maturity which is significantly very high (t=3.18; p=<0.001). Parental education has contributed to 1.8% of the variance which is highly significant (t=2.52; p=<0.01). The factor of ‘whose favorite you are’ has also contributed to 1.4% and is observed to be highly significant (t=-2.17; p=<0.01). Lastly the level of income has
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contributed to 1.4% and is also observed to be significant and also negative (t=-2.081; p<0.05).

The above facts clearly shows that adolescents studying in science faculty, whose mothers are less educated and those who are favorite of both the parents have shown significantly higher emotional maturity, than those studying in arts and commerce faculties, those with mothers of higher education and those being favorite of either mother or father respectively. Further adolescents with low income fathers have shown significantly lower emotional maturity compared to those with moderate and high income fathers.

4.1.5 Factors Significantly Contributing to Protection Dimension of PCR- Father

Hₐ₅.₅.₁: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/ undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Protection by father.

Table 4.05: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Protection by Father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-Identity</td>
<td>-3.54</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>-3.87***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Poor self-identity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Favorite</td>
<td>-2.89</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-2.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Father’s favourite)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health(Healthy)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>2.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family Type(Nuclear)</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-2.09*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²= 0.138
Overall F ratio= 11.677; p<0.001

Perusal of Table 4.05 reveals that out of the many demographic factors, some factors such as Self identity (poor self identity), Favourite (fathers favourite), Health
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(healthy), and Family type (nuclear) have emerged as significantly contributing factors to Protecting dimension of PCR in Father form.

More specifically, these four factors have collectively contributed to 13.8% of the variance on protection by father, which is very highly significant (F= 11.677; p<0.001).

In other words, 13.8% of the variance on fathers protection can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the four factors such as Self identity (poor self identity), Favorite (Father favorite), Health (Healthy), and Type of Family (Nuclear).

Individually the factor that is self identity (poor self identity) has contributed to 7.0%, of variance on fathers protection which is significantly very high, but negative (t=-3.87; p=<0.001). Fathers favorite has contributed to 3.4% of the variance which is highly significant and also negative (t=-2.88; p=<0.01). The factor health (healthy) has also contributed to 2.1% and is observed to be significant (t=2.70; p=<0.01). Lastly family type (nuclear) has contributed to 1.3% of the variance and also observed to be significant (t=-2.09; p<0.05) but negative.

The above facts reveal that adolescents with poor self identity, who are father’s favourite and who are from nuclear families, have perceived that their fathers are highly protective, than adolescents with good self identity, who are mothers favourite or favourite of both the parents, and who are from joint families respectively. Further healthy adolescents have perceived that their fathers are less protective compared to those who are unhealthy.
4.1.6 Factors Significantly Contributing to Symbolic Punishment Dimension of PCR-Father

**Hₐ₅.₂:** Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Symbolic Punishment by the Father.

**Table 4.06:** Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Symbolic Punishment by Father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Not decided)</td>
<td>-2.29</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>-3.80***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type of Stay (With family)</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>2.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Sensitive to people)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>2.11*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²=0.074

**Overall F ratio= 7.778; p<0.001***

***p<0.001 very highly significant

* p<0.05 significant

An observation of Table 4.06 reveals that only three factors such as career (not decided), Type of stay (with family), and sensitivity (sensitive to people) have significantly contributed to symbolic Punishment dimension of PCR in father form.

More specifically, these three variables have collectively contributed to 7.4% of the variance on Symbolic Punishment by father, which is very highly significant (F= 7.778; p<0.001). In other words, 7.4% of the variance on Symbolic Punishment can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the three factors such as Career (not decided), Type of Stay (with family), and Sensitivity (sensitive to people).

Individually, the factor that is career (not decided) has contributed to 3.9% of variance on Symbolic Punishment, which is found to be significantly very high, but negative (t=-3.80; p=<0.001).
Further Type of Stay (with family) and Sensitive to people have contributed to 2.1%, 1.4% respectively, which is further observed to be significant but in a negative way (p<0.05).

Thus, it can be inferred from the above presentation, that adolescents with undecided careers have perceived their father as high on symbolic punishment compared to those with decided careers. Adolescents staying with their family and those who are sensitive to people have perceived their father low on symbolic punishment, compared to those who stay with relatives or hostel, and who are less sensitive respectively.

4.1.7 Factors Significantly Contributing to Rejection Dimension of PCR- Father

Ha5.5,13: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation, income health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Rejection by the Father.

Table 4.07: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Rejection by the Father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Relations (Healthy)</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>2.78**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early Background (Mixed)</td>
<td>-1.44</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>-2.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Favourite (Mother’s favourite)</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-2.37*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R2=0.068
Overall F ratio=7.778; p<0.001

**p<0.01 highly significant
*p<0.05 significant
The above Table 4.07 shows that again, only three factors such as Family relations (healthy), Early Background (mixed) and Favourite (mothers favourite) have significantly contributed to Rejection dimension of PCR in Father Form.

More specifically, these three variables have collectively contributed to 6.8% of the variance on Rejection by father, which is very highly significant (F= 7.778; p<0.001). In other words, 6.8% of the variance on Rejection by can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the three factors such as Family relations (favourable relations), Early Background (mixed) and Favourite (mother favourite).

Individually, the factor that is Family relations (healthy) has contributed to 2.7% of variance on rejection which is highly significant (t=2.78; p=<0.01). Early Background (mixed) has contributed to 2.3% of the variance and is observed to be highly significant but negative (t=-2.65; p=<0.01). The factor Favourite (mothers favourite) has contributed to 1.8% of the variance and is observed to be significant (t= -2.37; p=<0.05) and also negative.

Thus the findings reveal that adolescents who have good family relations have perceived their father less rejecting compared to those having poor family relations. Further adolescents coming from mixed early background and who are mothers favourite have perceived significantly higher rejection by their father compared to their counterparts.

4.1.8 Factors Significantly Contributing to Object Punishment Dimension of PCR- Father

Ha5.5.4: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to object punishment by father.
Table 4.08: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Object Punishment by Father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family Relations (Healthy family relations)</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R2= 0.015
Overall F ratio= 4.481; p<0.05

* p<0.05 significant

It can be noted from the above Table 4.08 that only Family relations (healthy) made significant contribution to Object Punishment dimension of PCR-Father Form. It solely contributed to 1.5% of the variance for object Punishment dimension of PCR of the father form, which is found to be significant (F= 4.481; p<0.05). That is to say, 1.5% of the variance on object Punishment by the father can be predicted with very high degree of confidence on the factor i.e Family relations (healthy) alone, which is significant(t=2.12;p=<0.05).

Thus, it can be stated that those adolescents who are having healthy family relations have perceived significantly lower object punishment from their father.

4.1.9 Factors Significantly Contributing to Demanding Dimension of PCR-Father

Hₐ₅.₅.₅: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career(decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to their Parent-child relationship on Demanding by the Father.
Table 4.09: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Demanding by the Father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Decided)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>4.38***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Academic (Satisfaction with academic performance)</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>2.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Type of Stay (With relatives)</td>
<td>-5.74</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-3.01**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type of Family (Nuclear)</td>
<td>-2.69</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>-2.90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Sensitive to people)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>2.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Favourite (Mother’s favourite)</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-2.00*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²=0.162
Overall F ratio= 9.333; p<0.001

The above Table 4.09 shows that almost same and some more factors such as Career (decided), Satisfaction with Academic performance, Type of stay (with relatives), Family type (nuclear), Sensitivity (sensitive to people), and Favourite (mother’s favourite) have significantly contributed to Demanding dimension of PCR in Father Form.

More specifically, the variable has collectively contributed to 16.2% of the variance for Demanding by father of adolescents which is significant (F= 9.333; p<0.001). In other words 16.2% of the variance on Demanding can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the factors such as Career (decided), Satisfaction with academic performance, Type of Stay (with relatives), Type of Family (nuclear), Sensitivity (sensitive to people), and Favourite (mother’s favorite). Individually, 16.2% of the variance on demanding of the father form.
Individually, the factor that is decided careers has contributed to 5.4% of variance on demanding which is significantly very high ($t=4.38; p<0.001$). Satisfaction with academic performance has contributed to 2.8% of the variance which is significant ($t=2.61; p<0.05$). The factor Staying with relatives has contributed to 2.4% and is observed to be highly significant, but negative ($t=-3.00; p<0.01$). The factor nuclear family has also contributed to 2.4% and is observed to be highly significant ($t=2.89; p<0.01$) but negative. Sensitive to people has also contributed to 2.1% and is observed to be highly significant ($t=2.63; p<0.01$). Lastly, Mothers favorite has contributed to 1.1% and also observed to be significant and negative ($t=-2.00; p<0.05$).

Thus the above facts clearly indicates that adolescents with decided careers, who are satisfied with their academic performance and those who are sensitive to people have perceived their father significantly less demanding, compared to those who have not decided with careers, not satisfied with their academic performance and those who are less sensitive to people respectively. Further adolescents staying with their relatives, who are from nuclear families and those who are mother’s favourite have perceived that their fathers are highly demanding, compared to those who stay with family or hostel, who are from joint family and those who are father’s favourite or favourite of both the parents respectively.

4.1.10 Factors Significantly Contributing to Indifference

Dimension of PCR-Father

Ha_{5,5,6} : Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early backgrounds, type of family, parental education, parental occupation and income, health, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career(decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of adolescents significantly contribute to Indifference by father.
Table 4.10: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Indifference by father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Not decided)</td>
<td>-2.35</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.064</td>
<td>-3.92***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family relations (Happy with family relations)</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>3.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family type (Joint)</td>
<td>-2.64</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>-3.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Self identity (Poor self-identity)</td>
<td>-1.71</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-2.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Type of Stay (With relatives)</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-2.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted $R^2=0.183$

Overall F ratio= 13.032; $p<0.001$

***$p<0.001$ very highly significant
**$p<0.01$ highly significant
*p$<0.05  significant

A perusal of Table 4.10 shows that some factors such as Career (not decided), Family relations (happy with Family relations), Family type (joint), Self Identity (poor self-identity) and Type of Stay (with relatives) has emerged as significantly contributing factors to Indifference dimension of PCR in Father Form.

More specifically these five variables have collectively contributed to 18.3% of the variance for Indifference by Father of adolescents which is very highly significant ($F=13.032; p<0.001$). In other words 18.3% of the variance on Indifference by the father can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the five factors that are Career (not decided), Family relations (happy with family relations), Family type (joint), Self-identity (poor self-identity) and Type of Stay (with relatives).

Individually the factor that is Career (not decided), has contributed to 6.4% of variance on indifference which is significantly very high, but negative ($t=-3.92$;
p=<0.001). Happy with family relations, contributed to 4.8% of the variance which is significant (t= 2.607; p=<0.05). Joint Family has contributed to 3.8% and is observed to be highly significant (t=-3.00; p=< 0.01) and negative. The factor Self-identity (poor self-identity) has contributed to 2.2% and is also observed to be significant, but negative (t=-2.60; p=<0.05). Lastly staying with relatives has contributed to 1.1% is observed to be significant (t=-2.04; p=<0.05) and also negative.

Thus, it is observed from the above stated facts, that adolescents who have not decided with careers, are from joint family, having poor self identity, and those who stay with relatives have perceived greater indifference from their father, compared to those with decided careers, are from nuclear families, having good self-identity and those who stay with family or hostel respectively. Further the Contribution of happy with family relations shows that, those adolescents who are highly satisfied with their family relations have perceived significantly lower indifference from their father compared to their counterparts.

4.1.11 Factors Significantly Contributing to Symbolic Reward Dimension of PCR-Father

Ha5.5.7: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career(decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Symbolic Reward by the Father.
Table 4.11: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Symbolic Reward by Father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed $R^2$</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-identity (Good Self-identity)</td>
<td>-1.99</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>-3.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Sensitive to People)</td>
<td>-1.65</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>-2.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parental Education (Post graduate mothers)</td>
<td>-5.05</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>-2.41*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health(Unhealthy)</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family relations (Unhappy with family relations)</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted $R^2$=0.11
Overall F ratio=7.151; p<0.001

**p<0.01 highly significant
*p<0.05 significant

An observation of the above Table 4.11 shows that out of the many demographic factors, some factors such as Self-identity (good identity), Sensitivity (sensitive to People), Parental education (post graduate mothers), Health (unhealthy) and Family relations (unhappy with family relations) have significantly contributed to Symbolic Reward dimension of PCR in Father Form.

More specifically these five variables have collectively contributed to 11% of the variance for Symbolic Reward by the father of adolescents which is very highly significant (F=7.151; p<0.001). In other words 11% of the variance on Symbolic Reward dimension of the father form can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the five factors that are Self-identity (good identity), Sensitivity (Sensitive to People), Parental education (post graduate mothers), Health (unhealthy) and Family relations (unhappy with family relations).

Individually the factor that is Self-identity (good self identity) has contributed to 4.4%, of variance on symbolic reward by the father which is significantly high but negative (t=-3.05; p=<0.01). The factor Sensitiveto people has contributed to 2.1%, of
the variance which is significant (t=-2.26; p=<0.05) but negative. Parental education (post graduate mothers) has contributed to 1.5% of the variance and is observed to be significant and also negative (t=-2.69; p=<0.01). Health (unhealthy) has also contributed to 1.5% of the variance and also observed to be significant (t=2.34; p<0.05). Lastly Family relations (unhappy with family relations) has also contributed to 1.5% of the variance and also observed to be significant (t=2.2; p<0.05).

Thus it can be clearly stated that those adolescents having good self-identity, are sensitive to people and whose parents are post graduate mothers have perceived significantly higher symbolic reward from their father, compared to those having a poor self-identity, not sensitive, and those whose parents are less educated respectively. Further the adolescents, who are unhealthy, and unhappy with family relations have perceived significantly lower symbolic reward from their father compared to those being healthy and having good family relations.

4.1.12 Factors Significantly Contributing to Loving Dimension of PCR-Father

H_a5.5.8: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to fathers' love.
Table 4.12: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Fathers Love (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self identity (Good identity)</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>-2.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parental Occupation (Mother housewife)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>2.82**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Faculty (Arts)</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health(Unhealthy)</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Career(Decided)</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-2.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted $R^2$=0.114  
Overall F ratio=7.326; p<0.001

* p<0.05 significant   
** p<0.01 highly significant

The above Table 4.12 shows that few demographic factors such as Self-identity (good self-identity), Parents Occupation (mother housewife), Faculty (arts), Health (unhealthy), Career (decided) have significantly contributed to the loving dimension of PCR in Father Form.

More specifically these five variables have collectively contributed to 11.4% of the variance, for loving dimension of father, which is very highly significant (F=7.326; p<0.001). In other words 11.4% of the variance on loving dimension of the father can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the five factors that are Self-identity (good self-identity), Parental Occupation (mother housewife), Faculty (arts), Health (unhealthy) and Career (decided).

Individually the factor that is Self-identity (good self identity) has contributed to 4.3%, of variance on loving dimension by the father which is significant, but negative (t=-2.45; p<0.05).The factor Parental Occupation (mother housewife) has contributed to 2.2%, of the variance which is significant (t=2.82; p<0.01). Faculty (Arts) has also contributed to 1.9% of the variance and is observed to be significant (t=2.27; p<0.05).The factor Unhealthy has also contributed to 1.5% of the variance.
and is observed to be significant (t=2.16; p<0.05). Lastly Career (decided) has contributed to 1.3% of the variance and also observed to be significant (t=-2.06; p<0.05) and negative.

Hence based on the above facts it can be stated that adolescents having good self identity and those with decided careers have perceived significantly that they are highly loved by their fathers. Further it shows that adolescents having mothers who are housewives, those from Arts Faculty and unhealthy have perceived significantly lesser love from their father compared to their counterparts.

### 4.1.13 Factors Significantly Contributing to Object Reward Dimension PCR-Father

H05.9: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parents education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career(decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Object Reward by Father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Parental Education (Less educated mother)</td>
<td>-15.98</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>-3.15**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Age(17-18years)</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²=0.047  ** p<0.01 highly significant
Overall F ratio=7.261; p<0.001  *p<0.05 significant

It is quite obvious from the above Table 4.13 only two factors such as Parental Education (less educated mother) and Age (17-18years) have significantly contributed to object Reward dimension of PCR in Father Form.

More specifically these two variables have collectively contributed to 4.7% of the variance for Object Reward by the father, which is very highly significant.
(F=7.261; p<0.001). In other words 4.7% of the variance on Object Reward dimension of the father form can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the two factors that are Parental Education (less educated mother) and Age (17-18 years).

Individually, the factor that is Parental Education (less educated mother) has contributed to 3.4%, of variance on object reward by the father which is highly significant but negative (t=-3.15; p=<0.01). The factor age (17-18 years) has contributed to 1.3% of the variance which is also significant (t=2.02; p=<0.05).

Thus it can be inferred that adolescents whose mothers are less educated have perceived significantly higher object reward from their fathers compared to those with highly educated mothers. Adolescents in the age group of 17-18 years have perceived significantly lesser object reward from their father, compared to those belonging to the age group of 19-20 years.

4.1.14 Factors Significantly Contributing to Neglecting Dimension of PCR Father

Hₐ₅.₅.₁₀: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Neglecting by the father.

Table 4.14: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Neglecting by the Father (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self identity (Poor self-identity)</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-2.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Career (Not decided)</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>-2.197*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Favourite (Mother’s favourite)</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Health(Healthy)</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>1.996*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²=0.070
Overall F ratio=5.477; p<0.001

*p<0.05 significant
It can be noted from the above Table 4.14 that demographic factors such as Self Identity (poor self-identity), Career (indecisive), Favorite (mother) and Healthy has emerged as significantly contributing to Neglecting dimension of PCR in Father Form.

More specifically these four variables have collectively contributed to 7% of the variance for Neglecting by father of adolescents which is very highly significant (F=5.477; p<0.001). In other words 7% of the variance on Neglecting by father can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the four factors that are Self Identity (poor self-identity), Career (not decided), Favourite (mother’s favourite ) and Health(healthy).

Individually the factor that is poor self-identity, indecisive career, and mothers favourite has contributed to 2.6%, 1.7%, 1.4% of variance on neglecting and is observed to be significant but negatively (p<=0.05). The contribution of good health is 1.3% and is also observed to be significant (t=2.607; p<=0.05).

Hence it can be stated that adolescents who have poor self-identity, those who are indecisive about their careers, and who are mother’s favourite have perceived significantly higher negligence from their father. Whereas adolescents who are healthy, have perceived significantly lesser Negligence from their father as compared to those who are unhealthy.

4.1.15 Factors Significantly Contributing to Protection Dimension of PCR-Mother

Ha5.5.11: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career(decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Protection by mother.
Table 4.15: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing Protection by mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>‘t’ value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Health (Unhealthy)</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-3.29**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family relations (Happy with family relations)</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>3.11**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Favorite (Both parents)</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>3.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type of family (Joint family)</td>
<td>-2.59</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-2.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Academic (Satisfaction with academic performance)</td>
<td>-1.54</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-2.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Faculty (Science)</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-2.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R² = .145

Overall F ratio = 9.366; p<0.001

**p<0.01 highly significant  
*p<0.05 significant

The above Table 4.15 shows that out of the many demographic factors, some factors such as Health (unhealthy), Family relations (happy with family relations), Favorite (both parents), Type of family (joint family), Academic (satisfaction with academic performance) and Faculty (Science) have significantly contributed to their relationship with mother on the dimension i.e on the dimension of Protection.

More specifically, these six factors have collectively contributed to 16.3% of the variance for Protection dimension of the mother, which is very highly significant (F= 9.366; p<0.001).

In other words 16.3% of the variance, on mothers Protection which can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the six factors that are Health (unhealthy) Family relations (happy with family relations), Favourite (both parents), Type of family (joint), Academic (satisfaction with academic performance) and Faculty (Science).

Individually, the factor that is unhealthy has contributed to 4.9%, of variance on mothers protection which is significantly high, but negative (t=-3.29; p<0.01). Family relations (happy with family relations), has contributed to 3.5%, of the
variance which is highly significant (t=3.11; p=<0.01). The factor Favourite (both parents), has also contributed to 2.6% and is observed to be significant (t=2.78; p=<0.01). Type of family (joint), has also contributed to 2.5% and is observed to be significant (t=-2.81; p=<0.01) but negative. Academic (satisfaction with academic performance) has also contributed to 1.6% and is observed to be significant, and negative (t=-2.24; p=<0.05). Lastly Faculty (science) has contributed to 1.2% of the variance and also observed to be significant (t=-2.02; p=<0.05) but negative.

The above facts reveal that adolescents who are unhealthy, those coming from joint families, those who are satisfied with their academic performance and those of science faculty have perceived significantly higher protection from their mother, compared to adolescents who are healthy, those who are not satisfied with their academic performance and who are from commerce and arts faculty respectively. Further, adolescents who are happy with family relations and those who are favourite of both the parents have perceived significantly lesser protectiveness from their mother.

### 4.1.16 Factors Significantly Contributing to Symbolic Punishment Dimension of PCR- Mother

**Ha5.5.12:** Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Symbolic Punishment by mother.
Table 4.16: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Symbolic Punishment by Mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R^2</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Not Decided)</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>-4.07***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Self-Identity(Poor self-identity)</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-3.25**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Type of Family (Nuclear)</td>
<td>-2.57</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>-2.94**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family Relations (Happy with family relations)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.27*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R^2= 0.160
Overall F ratio= 13.810; p <0.001

***p<0.001 very highly significant
**p<0.01 highly significant
*p<0.05 significant

An observation of Table 4.15 reveals that four factors, such as Career (not decided), Self-Identity (poor), Type of Family (nuclear), and Family Relations (happiness with family relations) have significantly contributed to Symbolic Punishment dimension of PCR in mother form.

More specifically, these four factors have collectively contributed to 16% of the variance on Symbolic Punishment by mother, which is very highly significant (F=13.810; p<0.001). In other words, 16 % of the variance on Symbolic Punishment by the mother can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the four factors that are Career (not decided), Self-Identity (poor), Type of Family (nuclear), Family Relations (happiness with family relations).

Individually, the factor that is Career (not decided) has contributed to7.3% of the variance on Symbolic Punishment which is very highly significant but negative (t=-4.07; p=<0.001). Self-Identity (poor) has contributed to 4.6%, of the variance and is observed to be highly significant (t=-3.25; p=<0.01) but negative. Type of Family (nuclear) has contributed to 2.6% of the variance and is observed to be highly
significant and also negative (t=−2.94; p<0.01). Lastly Family Relations (happiness with family relations) has contributed to 1.5% of the variance and is observed to be significant (t=2.27; p<0.05).

Thus the findings reveal that adolescents who have not decided with careers, have poor self-identity, and those coming from nuclear families have perceived significantly higher symbolic punishment from their mother, compared to those who have decided with careers, have good self-identity, and those coming from joint families respectively. Further adolescents who are happy with family relations have perceived significantly lower symbolic punishment from their mother.

4.1.17 Factors Significantly Contributing to Rejection Dimension of PCR-Mother

Ha_{5,5,12}: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescent significantly contribute to Rejection by the mother.

Table 4.17: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Rejection by the Mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Not decided)</td>
<td>-1.78</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-3.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Parents Education (Less educated mother)</td>
<td>-10.85</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>-2.56*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Age (17-18yrs)</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-2.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type of Family (Joint)</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-2.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Favorite (Mother’s favourite)</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-2.12*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R2=0.0111
Overall F ratio= 7.222; p<0.001

***p<0.001 very highly significant
**p<0.01  highly significant
*p<0.05  significant
A perusal of Table 4.1 reveals that five factors such as Career (not decided), Parents education (less educated mother), Age (17-18 years), Type of Family type (joint) and Favourite (mother’s favourite) have significantly contributed to Rejection on the dimension of PCR in father form.

More specifically, these five variables have collectively contributed to 11.1% of the variance on rejection by mother, which is very highly significant \((F=7.222; \ p<0.001)\). In other words, 11.1% of the variance on Rejection by the mother can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the five factors that are Career (not decided), Parents education (less educated mother), Age (17-18 years), Type of Family (joint) and Favorite (mother’s favourite).

Individually, the factor that is Career (not decided) has contributed to 3.7% of the variance on rejection which is very highly significant but negative \((t=-3.621; \ p<0.001)\). Parents education (less educated mother) has contributed to 2.5% of the variance and is observed to be significant \((t=-2.56; \ p<0.05)\) but negative. The factor Age (17-18 years) has contributed to 2.2% of the variance and is observed to be highly significant and negative \((t=-2.69; \ p<0.01)\). The factor Type of Family (joint) has contributed to 1.4% of the variance and is observed to be significant \((t=-2.08; \ p<0.05)\) and also negative. Lastly Favourite (mother’s favourite) has contributed to 1.3% of the variance and is observed to be significant \((t=-2.12; \ p<0.05)\) and negative.

Thus the findings reveal that adolescents who have not decided with careers, those who have less educated mothers, those who belong to the age group of 17-18 years, those who live in joint families, and who are mothers’ favorite, have perceived significant rejection by their mother, compared to those with decided careers, having highly educated mothers, those who belong to the age group of 19-20 years, those
who live in nuclear families, and who are father’s favourite or favourite of both the parents respectively.

4.1.18 Factors Significantly Contributing to Object Punishment Dimension of PCR-Mother

**Hₐ₅.₅.₁₄:** Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic, performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Object Punishment by mother.

Table 4.18: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Object Punishment by mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Not decided)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>3.12**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Sensitive to people)</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>3.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parental Education (Post graduate mothers)</td>
<td>-4.56</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-2.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family Relations (Unhappy with family relations)</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-2.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Type of Family (Nuclear)</td>
<td>-1.37</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-1.98*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²= .086
Overall F ratio= 6.568; p<0.001

An observation of Table 4.18 reveals that again five factors such as Career (decided), Sensitivity (sensitive), Parental education (post graduate mothers), Family relations (unhappy with family relations), Family type (nuclear) have significantly contributed Career (decided), on the dimension of PCR in father form.
More specifically, these five variables have collectively contributed to 10.2% of the variance for Object Punishment by mother of adolescents which is very highly significant (F=6.568; p<0.001). In other words, 10.2% of the variance on the Object Punishment can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the five factors such as Career (decided), Sensitivity (sensitive to people), Parental education (post graduate mothers), Family relations (Unhappy with family relations), Type of Family (nuclear).

Individually, the factor that is Career (decided) has contributed to 2.7% of the variance on Object Punishment which is insignificantly high (t=3.12; p=<0.01). Sensitivity (sensitive to people) has contributed to 2.5% of the variance and is observed to be highly significant (t=3.02; p=<0.01). The factor Parental education (post graduate mothers) has contributed to 2.0% of the variance and is observed to be significant but negative (t=-2.51; p=<0.05). Family relations (Unhappy with family relations) has contributed to 1.8% of the variance and is observed to be significant (t=-2.21; p=<0.05) but negative. Lastly Type of Family (nuclear) has contributed to 1.2% of the variance and is observed to be significant (t=-1.98; p=<0.05) and also negative.

Thus it can be concluded that adolescents with decided careers, and who are sensitive, have perceived significantly lesser object punishment from their mother compared to those who have not decided with careers and are not sensitive. Further adolescents whose mothers are post graduate, those who are unhappy with family relations, and those from nuclear family have perceived significantly high object punishment from their mother, compared to adolescents with less educated mothers, those who are happy with family relations, and those from joint family respectively.
4.1.19 Factors significantly contributing to Demanding Dimension of PCR-Mother

Hα₅.1.₈: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, parental occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Demanding by mother.

Table 4.19: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Demanding by Mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>‘t’value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Not decided)</td>
<td>-3.53</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>-4.62***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Type of family (Joint)</td>
<td>-3.94</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>-3.83***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Sensitive to people)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>2.65**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Age (18-19 years)</td>
<td>-1.93</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-2.43*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family Relations (Happy with family relations)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td>2.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²=0.171  ***p<0.001 very highly significant
Overall F ratio= 11.941; p<0.001  **p<0.01 highly significant
* p<0.05 significant

An observation of Table 4.19 shows that five factors such as Career (not decided), Type of family type (nuclear), Sensitivity sensitive to people), Age (18-19 years), and Family relation (happy with family relations) has emerged as significantly contributing to demanding dimension of PCR in Mother Form.

More specifically, these five factors have collectively contributed to 17.1% of the variance on demanding, by the mother which is very highly significant (F=11.941; p<0.001). In other words 17.1% of the variance on Indifference can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the five factors such as Career (not decided), Type of family (nuclear), Sensitivity (sensitive to people), Age (18-19 years), and Family relations (happy with family relations).

Individually, the factor that is career (not decided) has contributed to 6.5% of the variance on demanding which is significantly very high, but negative (t=-4.62;
Type of family (nuclear) has contributed to 4.9% of the variance which is very highly significant \( (t=-3.41; p<0.001) \) but negative. Sensitivity (sensitive to people) has contributed to 2.2% of the variance which is highly significant \( (t=2.65; p<0.01) \). The factor Age (18-19 years) has contributed to 2.0% of the variance, is observed to be significant and also negative \( (t=-2.06; p<0.05) \). Lastly, Family relations (happy with family relations) has contributed to 1.5% of the variance and is observed to be significant \( (t=2.28; p<0.05) \).

Thus, the above facts clearly indicates that adolescents who have not decided with careers, who are from nuclear families and those who are belonging to the age group of 18-19 years have perceived significantly high demanding from their mother, compared to adolescents with decided with careers, who are from joint families and those who belong to the age group of 17-18 and 19-20 years respectively. Further the contribution of, adolescents who are sensitive to people and those who are happy with family relations have perceived significantly less demanding from their mother compared those who are less sensitive to people and those who are unhappy with family relations.

4.20 Factors Significantly Contributing to Indifference Dimension of PCR-Mother

**Ha5.5.16:** Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parents’ education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Indifference by mother.
4.20: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Indifference by Mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta co-efficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>&quot;t&quot; value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-Identity (Poor self-Identity)</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>-3.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Career (Decided)</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td>3.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Family Relations (Unhappy with family relations)</td>
<td>-3.20</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-2.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parental education (Post graduate mothers)</td>
<td>-4.45</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-2.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²= 0.108

Overall F ratio= 8.840; p<0.001

A perusal of Table 4.20 shows that some factors such as Self Identity (poor self-identity), Career (decided), Family relations (unhappy with family relations) and Parental education (post graduate mothers) has emerged as significantly contributing factors to Indifference dimension of PCR in Mother Form.

More specifically these four variables have collectively contributed to 10.8% of the variance on Indifference dimension which is very highly significant (F=8.840; p<0.001). In other words 10.8% of the variance on Indifference can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the four factors that are Self-identity (poor self-identity), Career (not decided), Family relations (unhappy with family relations) and Parental education (post graduate mothers).

Individually, the factor that is Self-identity (poor self-identity) has contributed to 5.1% of the variance on Indifference which is significantly high, but negative (t=-3.41; p=<0.01). Career (not decided) has contributed to 2.6% of the variance which is highly significant (t=2.84; p=<0.01). The factor Family relations (unhappy with family relations) has contributed to 1.8% of the variance, is observed to be significant (t=-2.53; p=<0.05) but negative. Lastly Parental education (post graduate mothers) has
contributed to 1.3% of the variance and is observed to be significant \((t=-2.06;\ p<0.05)\) and also negative.

Thus it is observed from the above facts that adolescents, having poor self-identity, unhappy with family relations and post graduate mothers have perceived significantly higher indifference from their mother, compared to those having good self-identity, who are happy with family relations and those whose mothers are less educated respectively. Further the contribution of those with decided Careers have perceived significantly lesser indifference from their mother.

### 4.1.21 Factors significantly contributing to Symbolic Reward Dimension of PCR-Mother

**Ha5,5,17:** Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, parental occupation and income, health, academic performance, type of stay, parents favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of adolescents significantly contribute to Symbolic Reward by mother

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Contribute d R2</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self-identity (Good self-identity)</td>
<td>-1.95</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>-3.10**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Gender (Females)</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>3.299**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Health (Unhealthy)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>2.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Less sensitive to people)</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Type of Family (Joint)</td>
<td>-1.52</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-1.99*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted \(R^2= .127\)  
Overall \(F\) ratio= 8.416; \(p<0.001\)  **\(p<0.01\) highly significant  
*\(p<0.05\) significant

The above Table 4.21 shows that few factors such as Self-identity (good self-identity), Gender (females), Health (unhealthy), Sensitivity (insensitive to people) and Type of family (joint) have significantly contributed to Symbolic Reward dimension of PCR in Mother Form.
More specifically these five factors have collectively contributed to 12.7% of the variance on Symbolic Reward dimension by the mother, which is very highly significant (F=8.416; p<0.001). In other words 12.7% of the variance on Symbolic Reward by the mother can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the five factors such as Self-identity (good identity), Gender (females), Health (unhealthy), Sensitivity (less sensitive to people) and Type of family (nuclear).

Individually, the factor that is Self-identity (good identity) has contributed to 5.8% of the variance on Symbolic Reward which is highly significant but negative (t=-3.10; p=<0.01). Gender (females) has contributed to 3.1% of the variance which is significant (t=3.299; p=<0.01). The factor Health (unhealthy) has contributed to 1.4% of the variance and is also observed to be significant (t=2.18; p=<0.05). Sensitivity (not sensitive to people) has contributed to 1.2% of the variance and also observed to be significant (t=2.01; p=<0.05). Lastly Type of family (nuclear) has contributed to 1.2% of the variance and also observed to be significant (t=-2.01; p=<0.05) and negative.

Thus, it can be concluded from the above facts that adolescents having good self-identity, and those who are from nuclear families have perceived significantly higher symbolic reward from their mother compared to those who have poor self-identity and who are from joint families. Further adolescents who are female, those who are unhealthy, and who are less sensitive to people have perceived significantly lower symbolic reward from their mother, compared to those who are males, those who are healthy, and who are sensitive to people respectively.
4.1.22 Factors Significantly Contributing to Loving Dimension of PCR-Mother

Ha5.5.18: Demographic factors such as age, gender, class, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Mothers Love.

Table 4.22: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Mothers Love (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Self - identity (Good self- identity)</td>
<td>-1.94</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>0.053</td>
<td>-3.09**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sensitivity (Sensitive to people)</td>
<td>-1.797</td>
<td>0.698</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>-2.57*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Career (Decided)</td>
<td>-1.59</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-2.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type of Family (Nuclear)</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>-2.06*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted $R^2$=0.105 **p<0.01 highly significant
Overall F ratio= 8.496; p<0.001 *p<0.05 significant

The above table 4.22 shows that few factors such as Self-identity (good self identity), Sensitivity (sensitive), Career (decided) and Type of Family (nuclear) have significantly contributed to loving dimension of PCR in Mother Form.

More specifically these four variables have collectively contributed to 10.5% of the variance on mothers’ love which is very highly significant ($F=8.496; p<0.001$). In other words 10.5% of the variance on mothers’ love can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the four factors such as Self-identity (good self identity), Sensitivity (sensitive to people), Career (decided) and Type of Family (nuclear).

Individually, the factor that is Self-identity (good self identity) has contributed to 5.3% of the variance on loving dimension which is highly significant ($t=3.09; p<0.01$). The factor Sensitivity (sensitive to people) has contributed to 2.0% of the variance and is observed to be significant ($t=-2.57; p<0.05$). The factor Career (decided) has contributed to 1.8% of the variance and also observed to be significant ($t=$-
2.76; p<0.01). Lastly Type of Family (nuclear) has contributed to 1.4% of the variance and is also observed to be significant (t=-1.987; p<0.05). Hence based on the above facts it can be stated that adolescents who have good self-identity, who are sensitive to people, those with decided careers and who are from nuclear families have perceived that they have significantly more loving mothers as compared to their counterparts.

4.1.23 Factors Significantly Contributing to Object Reward Dimension of PCR-Mother

Ha5.5.19: Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parental education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self-identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to object reward by mother.

Table 4.23: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Object Reward by Mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr.N o</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta Coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R2</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Favourite (Both parents)</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>3.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Health (Unhealthy)</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>3.05**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Parental education (Post graduate mothers)</td>
<td>-3.96</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-2.11*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Type of Family (Nuclear)</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-2.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted R²= 0.088 ** p<0.01 highly significant
Overall F ratio= 7.001; p<0.001 * p<0.05  significant

It is quite obvious from the above table 4.23 that few factors such as Favourite (both parents), Health (unhealthy), Parental Education (post graduate mothers) and Type of Family (nuclear) have significantly contributed to Object Reward dimension of PCR in mother form.
More specifically these four factors have collectively contributed to 8.8% of the variance on object reward dimension by mother which is very highly significant ($t=7.001; p<0.001$). In other words 8.8% of the variance on object reward can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the four factors such as Favourite(both parents), Health (unhealthy), Parental Education (post graduate mothers) and Type of Family (nuclear).

Individually, the factor that is Favourite (both parents) has contributed to 3.2% of the variance on Object Reward which is highly significant ($t=3.19; p<0.01$). The factor Health (unhealthy), has contributed to 2.7% of the variance and is observed to be significant ($t=3.05; p<0.01$). The factor Parental education (post graduate mothers) has contributed to 1.4% of the variance and is also observed to be significant ($t=-2.11; p<0.05$) but negative. Lastly, Type of Family (nuclear) has contributed to 1.3% of the variance and is also observed to be significant and negative ($t=-2.04; p<0.05$).

Thus it can be inferred that adolescents who are favourite of both the parents, and who are unhealthy have perceived significantly lower object reward from their mother, compared to those who are either father’s or mother’s favourite, and who are healthy.

Further adolescents who have post graduate mothers and who are from nuclear families, have perceived significantly higher object reward from their mother compared to those whose mothers were less educated and who are from joint families.
4.1.24 Factors Significantly Contributing to Neglecting Dimension of PCR-Mother

**Hₐ₅.5.20:** Demographic factors such as age, gender, faculty, birth order, early background, type of family, parents education, occupation and income, health status, academic performance, type of stay, parents’ favourite, family relations, career (decided/undecided), sensitivity and self identity of Goan adolescents significantly contribute to Neglecting by mother.

Table 4.24: Results of Stepwise Multiple Regression Analysis of the Factors Significantly Contributing to Neglecting by mother (N=300)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sr. No</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Beta coefficient</th>
<th>Std.Error</th>
<th>Contributed R²</th>
<th>“t” value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Career (Decided)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>2.84**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family Relations (Unhappy with family relations)</td>
<td>-3.33</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>-2.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Self-Identity (Poor self-identity)</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>-2.04*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall adjusted adjusted R²=.075

Overall F ratio=7.899; p<0.001

**p<0.01** highly significant  
*p<0.05** significant

The above table 4.24 that only three factors such as Career(decided), Family relations (unhappy with family relations) and Self-Identity (poor self-identity) has emerged as significantly contributing to Neglecting dimension of PCR in Mother Form.

More specifically these three variables have collectively contributed to 7.5% of the variance on Neglecting by mother which is very highly significant (F=7.899; p<0.001). In other words, 7.5% of the variance on Neglecting can be predicted on the basis of the collective operation of the three factors such as Career (decided), Family relations (unhappy with family relations) and self-identity (poor self-identity).

Individually, the factor that is career (decided) has contributed to 3.5% of the variance on Neglecting which is highly significant (t=2.84; p=<0.01). Family relations (unfavourable relations) contributed to 2.7% of the variance, which is highly significant but negative (t=-2.74; p=<0.01). Lastly Self-Identity (poor self-identity)
has contributed to 1.3% of the variance and is also observed to be significant ($t=-2.04; p<0.05$) and negative.

Thus, the findings reveal that adolescents with decided careers have perceived significantly lower negligence from their mother, compared to those who have not decided with careers. Further, adolescents, who are unhappy with family relations and poor self-identity, have perceived significantly higher Negligence from their mother as compared to their counterparts.
4.2 INTERPRETATION OR RESULTS

Factors Significantly Contributing to Achievement Motivation, Self-Esteem, Emotional Maturity, Parent-child Relationship and Anxiety of Adolescents:

A growing body of literature suggests that, to understand Adolescents behaviour, researchers must study the distinct influences of personality, and social environment, because it continues to plague people’s interpersonal lives, their inter-group interactions, and society in general. It is incumbent on social scientists to develop a better understanding of the complex dynamics among personality variables, situational variables, and environmental variables. Doing so not only will enrich the field of theoretical understanding of adolescents behaviour, but will also refine therapeutic and policy interventions aimed at improving adolescents behaviour. Bronfenbrenner (1979) views the child as developing within a complex system of relationships affected by multiple levels of environment, from immediate setting of the family and school to broad cultural values and programs.

It can be observed that, almost all demographic factors have emerged as significantly contributing factors to all dependent variables such as Achievement Motivation, Self- Esteem, Emotional Maturity, Parent-child Relationship and Anxiety of adolescents, but in a various way.

The children of highly educated mothers are better nurtured psychologically because of their wider experiences, varied exposures and extended contacts etc. Such highly educated mothers encourage their children to think and act independently, and thereby try to shape their style of life from the beginning, with high motivation in the mind. Thus because of higher education mothers’ will be in a better position to provide healthy ground for the proper development, for their adolescent children. This finding supports the earlier finding of Julia Crede et al., (2015) whose study provides
an indication that highly educated mothers are a key resource in western Germany, impacting their children’s achievement motivation and life satisfaction. The results obtained in this study are in agreement with the findings of Rebekah et al., (2007) whose results indicate synergistic effects, whereby greater maternal education and literacy skills enhanced positive links between mothers’ new or sustained employment and improvements in adolescent cognitive and psychosocial functioning. This finding is somewhat similar to the earlier findings of Wang (2008) whose study indicated that parental education level influenced achievement motivation, higher the level of parental education, better was the achievement motivation among children.

Adolescents of Science faculty have significantly higher achievement motivation than those coming from Arts and Commerce faculty. It means that Science adolescents have higher aspiration, and are more hard working in order to pursue their goals. This finding supports the earlier findings of Eric Asante Adom and Barnie Josephine (2014) whose research results showed that, majority science adolescents were highly motivated, has high self-concept and performed well on the Mathematics Achievement test. They also found that there was a positive relationship between achievement motivation and academic achievement. Even the findings of Chow Shean Jen et al., (2013) revealed that there were significant positive associations between science adolescents’ motivational orientations and achievement.

Adolescents who are sensitive to people are sensitive to themselves as well, as they have a caring attitude, and higher aspirations, that makes them more focused, which in turn leads them to achieve higher goals. Whereas those who are insensitive to people are insensitive to themselves as well, as they don’t care about their own needs. This leads them to close their minds to many good things that happen around themselves and in turn hampers them from exploring the world, which leads them to
have lower achievement motivation. This finding supports the earlier findings of Therese J. Borchard (2009) whose study revealed that sensitive people can learn to express more pride, joy, hope and finally are able to walk tall in the world like anyone else.

The adolescents who have decided with their career feel confident of themselves and this in turn boost up their self-esteem, on the other hand those who have not decided about their careers feel shaky and weak, as well as lose focus towards their future, this makes them to have low self-esteem. This finding is somewhat similar to the earlier findings of Loeb, Horst and Horney (1950) who found that high self-esteem was associated with parents who offered suggestions but left the child some freedom of choices, rather than with directive style. Adolescents who are satisfied with their academic performance have shown significantly higher self-esteem. This may be attributed to the fact of utilizing their abilities to the best of their knowledge, and coming out successfully. This finding supports the earlier finding of Spinath et al., (2006) who established that, in western and European cultures, self-esteem has a significant influence on adolescents academic performance. The results obtained in this study are in agreement with the findings of Herbert W. Marsh (2006) who found that advanced grades high school adolescents in Kenya of had higher self-esteem.

The adolescent children of graduate fathers is interesting to discuss, and this result is to be understood taking Goan adolescents as special case. It is special because in the state of Goa, most of the graduate fathers go away from the family for months and years together for employment, compared to less educated and highly educated fathers. The absence of father for a long duration may be the reason for the lower self-esteem in their children. In other words the very presence and association
of the father with children constantly will have boosting impact on their self-esteem. This finding supports the earlier findings of Rex et al., (1991) who found that high father involvement was associated with increased children’s feelings of paternal acceptance, a factor that plays a role in the development of self-esteem and self-concept. Similarly Cabrera et al., (2007) also found that fathers education was positively associated with children’s language and self-esteem.

The finding that adolescents with poor self identity showing higher anxiety may be attributed to the fact that, adolescents with poor self identity do not possess self clarity and experience confusion, and in turn they are left with higher anxiety. On the other hand the people with good self identity have clarity in their thoughts and vision, and are able to maintain normal anxiety. This finding supports the earlier findings of Andrew (2007) who maintains that low self-esteem either causes or contributes to neurosis and anxiety. Similarly Yellowlees et al., (1996) found that low self-esteem operates as a predisposing and a contributory factor in the development of anxiety. They also found that raising the level of self-esteem significantly reduced the level of anxiety and the human response, both emotionally and physiologically.

Another finding that adolescents who are favorite of both father and mother showing less anxiety, may be due to the fact of getting proper attention and affection from both the parents. Specially getting cared for by both the parents, make the child to develop more integrated personality. This finding is matching with earlier finding of Carl.E.Pickhardt (2011) who found that favourite child feels more highly valued, specially deserving and develops a sense of entitlement from being favored.

In the same way the findings of Pillemer (2011) revealed that higher rates of anxiety and behavioural problems are noticed in children and adolescents who
perceive favoritism, and the impact of those mental health consequences can continue into adulthood.

Further similarly the adolescents having favourable relationship with family members showing significantly lower anxiety may be attributed to the fact of having and enjoying comfort zone at family level. This finding supports the finding of Gardner et al., (2007) stating that positive parenting that is high in warmth, responsivity, and anticipating a child's needs and reactions to daily routines, is one of several parenting dimensions that has been linked to lower levels of anxiety. Corey M. Clark (2010) also reported that the presence of social support from family significantly predicts the individual's ability to cope with stress. Knowing that they are valued by others is an important psychological factor in helping them to forget the negative aspects of their lives, and thinking more positively about their environment which prevents them from developing anxiety. This finding supports the finding of Bowl by (1973) that securely attached children will experience less anxiety than insecurely attached children. Brumariu et al., (2010) suggested, that secure attachment is indeed linked to lower levels of anxiety symptoms in adolescence.

Adolescents of moderate income families showing lower anxiety may be attributed to the fact of getting more care and attention by the parents. In other words children of low income families are unable to get more attention by their parents as they have to struggle hard for the daily living itself as opposed to this the parents of high income level get committed to many outward and social activities. Thus they may not be able to spend more time with the children. This finding supports the finding of Santhosh Kumar et al., (2014) who suggest that the children from families
with moderate or high income, parental education and family economy had better quality of life.

Another finding that science adolescents showing lower anxiety may be due to the fact that usually science adolescents show higher clarity in their thinking and dealing with the situations, this in turn makes them to manage their anxiety. This study supports the earlier finding of George and Kaplan (1998) who found that, the more the parents showed a positive attitude to science, the better the pupils achieved in science, and thereby reduced anxiety.

EMS Science adolescents showing higher emotional maturity compared to their counterparts, endorse the above finding that they have lower anxiety. Once again this result also can be understood in the background of their higher rational approach to deal with varying situations. Thakur (2002) also stated that ‘there exists a positive relationship between home environment and emotional maturity’.

Less educated mothers are usually homemakers so that they are able to spend more time with their children. These intimate relationships with mothers make them to develop confidence and courage, and in turn manage their emotions effectively.

The present study finding endorses the result of the earlier finding of Mittal (1998) who indicated that daughters of non-working mothers were relatively higher on achievement and emotional maturity. This finding is some what similar to the earlier finding of Lois Wladis Hoffman (2000) found that sons of employed mothers in the middle class showed lower school performance and lower I.Q. scores during the grade school years than full-time homemakers. They also found that quality education, a good job, mental and emotional stability, a safe home can make the challenge easier to tackle and overcome adolescent’s emotional problems.
Adolescents those who are favourite of both the parents feel highly satisfied and enjoy being close to both of them and this nurturing and protective behaviour of their parents make them to balance their emotions. This finding is somewhat similar to the earlier findings of Peterson (2005) whose study revealed that Latino adolescents in immigrant families experience a solid emotional base from which to explore their world when they perceive mothers’ and fathers’ support.

Adolescent children of low income fathers showing lower emotional maturity indicates that the very struggle of getting satisfied for their lower order needs might hamper the growth of their emotional maturity. On the contrary children of moderate and high income fathers with their better satisfied lower order needs can focus on developing themselves in a better manner. This finding supports the earlier finding of Gavin et al., (2002) who found that father’s income and education may provide material and social resources to young children and may contribute to the children’s competency in acquiring communication and language skills. Father’s education may also influence the quality and quantity of father-child interactions.

The finding that low self identity, being fathers favourite, and those of nuclear family have perceived that their fathers are highly protective, are interrelated. High protection by father hampers their children’s self identity. The results obtained in this study are in agreement with the finding of Berkowitz (1993) who found that paternal over protection would correlate positively with adolescents delinquent behaviours. This finding is somewhat similar to the findings of Herz and Gullone(1999) who revealed that parenting characterized by high levels of overprotection related negatively with self-esteem for adolescent samples.
Those who perceived that their fathers are highly protective, naturally develops the feeling of being fathers favourite. Further compared to joint family the close contact between father and child is possible in nuclear family, this in turn makes the child perceive that their fathers are highly protective.

A study by Yeung, et al., (2000) stated that children who have a protective father are more likely to be emotionally secure, confident to explore their surroundings, and, as they grow older, have better social connections with peers, which shows further that moderate level of protection from father is essential.

Another finding of healthy adolescents perceiving that they are less protected by father is mainly due to the fact of not requiring more care and attention when these adolescents are able to manage by themselves. Similarly a study finding of Elkin and Handel, (1978) revealed that when the parents enable that the children’s needs are met, children generally be healthy.

As far as symbolic punishment by father is concerned the results are according to expectation. The very fact of having undecided careers have perceived their father as high on symbolic punishment, is due to the child’s, inability to meet the expectations of the father. This finding supports the earlier finding of West (1981) who found that parents whose verbal interactions consists mainly of guilt inducement, harsh criticism or intrusive commands foster poor self identity, negative attitude and poor decision making, in their children. Another finding of Goldsmith (2000) states that, parental abusive behaviour results from "poor problem solving, decision making, impulse control, social skills, and poor stress coping."
The other two factors such as staying with family and being sensitive to people have perceived their father low on symbolic punishment, because of developing socially desirable attributes in them.

Adolescents with healthy family relations experience less rejection by father, because they get accepted by their father due to developing desirable behaviour in them, besides this also leads to less object punishment by their father. This finding supports the earlier finding of McNeely et al., (2002) which states that teenagers who have a good and respectful relationship with their parents are more likely to imitate their parents’ attitudes, which may make them avoid undesirable behaviours. This finding is somewhat similar to the earlier findings of Gershoff (2002) study found a significant negative association between paternal discipline and childhood competence suggesting that behavioural participation that is inconsistent, and rejecting undermines the development of social competence.

The adolescents with decided careers, satisfied with academic achievement as well as being sensitive to people experience less demand by father. This fact is basically due to incorporating healthy behavioural pattern and growing in the right direction makes the father to become less demanding.

This finding is similar to the finding of Goldstine, H. S. (1982) which states that an active, nurturing and less demanding style of fathering is associated with better verbal skills, intellectual functioning, and academic achievement among adolescents.

On the contrary to this, adolescents staying with relatives and being in nuclear families, as well as favourite of mothers, have perceived that their fathers are highly demanding. This is quite natural as their children are being away from them, makes them to become more anxious regarding their growth. The father feels that if the child
is favourite of mother he becomes more anxious, thinking that mother is having too soft corner for their children. Thus to balance this he starts acting as a demanding father.

Adolescents who are indecisive as far as their career is concerned, belonging to joint family and having poor self identity have perceived greater indifference from their father, due to the fact that their children are incapable of shaping their future and somebody else may be there to take care of them in the family and not having self clarity respectively.

Another fact of having healthy family relations have perceived significantly lower indifference from their father may be basically attributed to the fact of getting more affection and care by the father that leads to keep the family relations healthy.

Adolescents with good self identity, being sensitive to people, having highly educated mothers, perceiving high symbolic reward, from father is mainly due to the fact of possessing all desirable qualities which in turn lead to further meaningful development. The results obtained in this study are in agreement with the previous studies of Hornand Sylvester (2002) whose study revealed that children who witness affectionate, respectful, and sacrificial father are more likely to be happy, have good self-esteem and are well-adjusted. Further this finding somewhat endorses the finding of Parke et al., (2002) which revealed that fathers who respond calmly when their children misbehave, have children who are more popular, boys who are less aggressive, and girls who are less negative and sensitive with their friends. This finding is also somewhat similar to the finding of Vasanthalaxmi (2015) which revealed that there were highly significant differences between the rural and urban
adolescents of home environment and self concept. It was also found that self concept has positive relationship with home environment.

The adolescents being unhealthy and having unhealthy relations in the family, experience less reward by father. This results may be understood in the background of parental expectations from the children’s side. This finding is similar to the finding of Hornn and Sylvester (2002) study found that children who live with their fathers are more likely to have good physical and emotional health, achieve academically, and avoid delinquent behaviour.

The finding that adolescents having good self identity, having decided about their career, perceive that they are more loved by their fathers. This result is mainly due to the fact of, father feeling happy and satisfied with the proper growth and maturity in the children. This finding endorses the results of earlier finding of Pruett, K. (2000) suggest that children who have fathers who are involved, nurturing, loving and playful with them, have higher IQs, better linguistic and cognitive capacities, intellectual functioning, academic achievement, self-esteem more patient and can handle the stresses and frustrations associated with schooling more readily. This finding is somewhat similar to the finding of Kerr and Stattin, (2000) whose study revealed that a trusting climate of parent-child relationships facilitated by warmth, affection and communication, has been conceptualized as a fundamental pillar in high-quality parent-child relationships.

Adolescents whose mothers are homemakers, those who are unhealthy, and studying in arts faculty feel that they are less loved by their fathers. This is because the child has same expectations from the father, as they get constant care and attention
from their mother, when it is lacking leads them to perceive that they are less loved by their fathers.

Adolescents with less educated mothers, have perceived significantly higher object reward from their fathers, may be the responsibility of providing or solely lying on fathers shoulders, as mother is a non earning member. The present finding is matching with the finding of Lamb, M. E. (2002) who found that, a father who has a good relationship with the mother who is homemaker, is more likely to be involved and to spend time with their children, who are psychologically and emotionally healthier. Similarly, a mother who feels affirmed by her children’s father and who enjoys the benefits of a happy relationship is more likely to be a better confidant mother, who is very supportive of her teenagers seeking advice and emotional support.

Early adolescents have perceived significantly lesser object reward from their father, as they show unstable mentality and behaviour at this stage, compared to their counterparts. This finding supports the earlier findings of EmanatuchoDano (2011) whose study revealed that early adolescent age group show higher emotional problems than middle and late adolescents age groups.

Adolescents with poor self identity, undecided career and being favorite of mother have perceived significantly higher negligence from their father. This may be explained in the background of the adolescents with these three factors, naturally induce the feeling that they are being neglected by their fathers. The present study finding endorses the result of the earlier finding of Hertherington and Parke (1986) finding stated that children from neglectful parents are on the whole impulsive,
aggressive, indecisive, non-compliant, and have low self-esteem, besides they are also more prone to involve themselves in behavioural problems.

In the same way Figueredo et al. (1993) research revealed that fathers may neglect and abuse their children as a way of extracting revenge on a spouse or partner by whom they feel humiliated.

Healthy adolescents are in a better position to think realistically and thereby feel less neglected by father. This finding is somewhat similar to the earlier finding of Pope (2006) whose results show that children with physical problems were more likely to suffer emotional neglect by their father. Similarly Sullivan (2000) found that child’s cognitive impairment is associated with all neglect subtypes which might imply that parents from one-child families consider the child as their “only hope”, thereby putting greater expectations to make them culturally desirable.

The findings of unhealthy children have perceived significantly higher protection from their mother is quite natural as they require constant assistance and care to carry out the activities.

Another finding of adolescents perceiving significantly higher protection from their mother, in joint families may be due to mothers’ instinct to safe guard her own children when they live in joint family. In other words, when number of family members are more, to share the limited resources naturally mother’s first preference will be to her own children. Another finding that adolescents who are very highly satisfied with academic performance have perceived significantly higher protection from their mother, can also be understood in another round. It means that those who are protected well by mothers will be able to perform better because of naturally induced comfort feeling in them.
This finding is somewhat similar to the earlier finding of Eya (2002) that daughters of working mothers had higher career aspirations than daughters of non-working mothers. Researchers found that higher levels of parental warmth were positively associated with the parent-adolescent relationship and found that parental warmth was associated with decreases in externalizing behaviours, increases in self-esteem and academic performance.

The adolescents who have favourable family relations have perceived significantly lesser protectiveness from their mother as they exhibit healthy and expected behaviour. Hence no extra protection by mother is required. Similarly being favourite of both the parents may not expect mothers to be more protective. The present study also confirms earlier research of Wen-Jui Han (2011) whose studies show that mother–father relationship quality may significantly affect children’s well-being through childhood.

The finding that adolescents who have not decided about their career, having poor self identity, and stay in nuclear families experience high symbolic punishment by mother is according to social expectation. The mother is very much pleased to see her child growing with healthy self identity and proper objective in life. In case if this is not found in the child, she wants to discipline the child with punishment. In nuclear family mother observes the growth of the child. Any slight variation in the child’s behaviour will make the mother to bring discipline by punishing them. This finding is somewhat similar to the finding of Sylvester (2002) who found that harsh parenting, such as threatening, yelling, or screaming in response to misbehaviour, is thought to contribute to more frequent externalizing behaviours that normalize violence or aggression. Harsh discipline is also linked to behaviour problems ranging from conduct disorder to depression low self-esteem and poor decision making.
This finding is somewhat similar to the findings of Conger et al., (1996) who found that hostile interactions are associated with destructive adolescent problem solving behaviours.

Mother is observed to be less punishing the children when they show favourable relationship with others. This fact is also understood in the light of mothers expectations with regard to child’s healthy development.

The finding that adolescents who have not decided about their careers and having less educated mothers as well as those who are in early adolescents period feel rejected more by their mother. This may be due to the fact of not meeting the expectation of mothers, and the mothers inability to understand the child completely as well as fluctuations in behaviour respectively. The present finding are in agreement with the earlier finding of Verma et al.,(1989) who revealed that parental rejection makes children fearful, insecure, attention seeking, jealous, aggressive, hostile and lonely, with distorted and devaluated self-image,emotionally unstable, indecisive and poor educational adjustment. Similarly Kohl et al, (2000) found that poor or limited parental education might leave the parent lacking in vision, confidence or competence in supporting their own child. The finding of Bharathi et al., (2005) also agree with the finding stating that early adolescent boys, scored high in areas of rejection, object punishment and demanding areas of parenting.

The observation that adolescents with decided careers and who are sensitive are less punished by mothers as they possess the socially desirable behaviour in them.

On the other hand children of highly educated mothers, and those who are not happy with the family relations are more punished by their mothers, is due to high
expectations and stress induced by the overwork as well as the undesirable responses from the children respectively.

The study also found that maternal psychological distress was correlated with adolescents’ psychological distress levels, poorer emotional well-being, and behavioural problems, compared with mothers who remained in cohabiting relationships.

Again adolescents with undecided careers have perceived that their mothers are more demanding may be due to the mother’s expectations from her adolescent child to be more concerned about his or her future. Adolescents staying in nuclear family feel they are more demanded by their mother because of the constant proximity between them as compared to joint family. This finding is somewhat similar to the finding of Haapsalo et al., (1998) whose research indicated that parenting styles including punishment, demanding, power assertion, rejection, physical abuse and neglect by parents were prime predictors of future criminal and antisocial offspring behaviour.

On the other hand those who are sensitive and happy with the favourable relations feel less demanded by mothers as their behaviour is as per the expectation in the family. The present finding is somewhat similar to the finding of Heather Bachman (2012) whose research revealed that mothers who regularly engaged in family-strengthening activities, however, were linked to lower levels of adolescent delinquency and behavioural problems. Family structure and stability were associated with mothers’ parenting qualities that correlate with adolescents’ behaviour outcomes.

Adolescents with poor self identity, having unhappy relations, having mothers with higher education, feel that their mothers are highly indifferent to them. This may
be due to the reason of not developing the qualities as expected by the family. Moody (1988) found that children of educated working mothers were careless emotionally unstable and achieved low intelligence score.

On the contrary to this adolescents who have decided with their career showing less indifference by mother is once again due to the fact of developing desirable qualities to succeed in life. The present finding is similar to the earlier finding of Deleire et al., (2002). Parents with a higher education level were able to communicate more effectively with their children, and often had healthier parenting styles.

Adolescents with good self identity, staying in nuclear family feel highly rewarded by their mother, because of their healthy development and being close to mother respectively. This finding is somewhat similar to the finding of López et al., (2006) who found that parental affection has been underlined as one of the most important dimensions within the family context. Similarly, Perrin et al., (2002), found that children are more likely to have successful relationships throughout life if they are exposed to low levels of parental conflict and perceive a strong, loving, relationship between their parents.

On the contrary female adolescents perceive that they are less rewarded by their mother, this fact may be understood in the light of gender discrimination at the family level while upbringing the children. As opposed to this less sensitive adolescents felt that they are less rewarded by mother because of not meeting the expectations of their mother.

Adolescents with good self identity, who are sensitive, with decided careers and staying in nuclear families feel more loved by mothers as they possess all positive
qualities in turn pleases their mother. This finding supports the earlier finding of Bayley et al., (1960) who reported that the early warmth and affection of mother is associated with calm, happy, cooperative behaviour and good performance from children throughout adolescence.

In the same way the finding of Rueter et al., (1995) study among American youth revealed that, warm parental interactions are associated with high self-esteem and effective problem solving ability in both the adolescent and the family as a whole. Highly educated mothers have been perceived by their adolescent children showing high object reward, as these mothers are able to understand their children properly and motivate them with object reward. This study is somewhat similar to the study of A.N.Bhadane et al.,(2005) which revealed that educated working mothers are having high positiveness for their child rearing and Parent-child relation.

Children of nuclear family feel more rewarded by mothers because of their close association which is possible in nuclear family as opposed to joint family.

Again adolescents who have decided of their careers feel less neglected by their mother, may be again due to the fact of adolescent children developing age related expected healthy behaviour. Further, adolescents who have unfavourable relations and have poor self identity have shown less negligence by mothers as they are unable to meet the expectations of the mother.

The present study, finding endorses the results of earlier finding Goldman et al.,(2003) which states that neglect of school-aged children is associated with depression, low self-esteem, antisocial behaviour, juvenile delinquency, intellectual development, attachment disorders, and adult criminal behaviour.
4.3. **Highlights**

1. Adolescents having post graduate mothers and those studying in science faculty have shown significantly higher achievement motivation, than adolescents whose mothers are less educated and those coming from Arts and Commerce faculty respectively.

2. Adolescents who are not sensitive to people have shown significantly lower achievement motivation, compared to adolescents who are sensitive to people.

3. Adolescents with decided careers and those who are satisfied with their academic performance have shown significantly higher self-esteem than those who have not decided with careers and those who are not satisfied with their academic performance respectively.

4. Adolescents of graduate fathers have shown significantly lower self-esteem as compared to their counterparts.

5. Adolescents having low self-identity have shown significantly higher anxiety as compared to adolescents with high self-identity.

6. Adolescents who are favourite of both the parents, happy with their family relations, whose parents have moderate income and those of Science faculty, have shown significantly lower anxiety as compared to their counterparts.

7. Adolescents studying in science faculty, whose mothers are less educated and who are favourite of both the parents, have shown significantly higher emotional maturity, than those studying in arts and commerce faculties, those with mothers of higher education, and those being favourite of either mother or father respectively.
8. Adolescents with low income fathers have shown significantly lower emotional maturity compared to those with moderate and high income fathers.

9. Adolescents with poor self-identity, who are father’s favourite and those from nuclear families have perceived that their fathers are highly protective, than those with good self-identity, who are mother’s favourite or favourite of both the parents, and those who are from joint families respectively.

10. Healthy adolescents have perceived that their fathers are less protective, compared to those who are unhealthy.

11. Adolescents who have not decided with careers have perceived their father as high on symbolic punishment, compared to those with decided careers.

12. Adolescents staying with their family, who are sensitive to people have perceived their father low on symbolic punishment, as compared to those who stay with relatives or hostel and those who are not sensitive to people.

13. Adolescents with good family relations have perceived their father less rejecting, than those having poor family relations respectively.

14. Adolescents coming from mixed early background and who are mother’s favourite have perceived significantly higher rejection by their father compared to their counterparts.

15. Adolescents with healthy family relations have perceived significantly lower object punishment from their father, compared to those having unhealthy family relations.
16. Adolescents with decided careers, who are satisfied with their academic performance and those who are sensitive to people have perceived their father significantly less demanding, compared to those who have not decided with careers, not satisfied with their academic performance and those who are not sensitive to people.

17. Adolescents staying with their relatives, who are from nuclear families and those who are mother’s favourite have perceived that their fathers are highly demanding, compared to those who stay with family or hostel, who are from joint family and those who are fathers’ favourite or favourite of both the parents.

18. Adolescents who have not decided about their careers, are from joint family, having poor self-identity, and those who stay with relatives have perceived greater indifference from their father, compared to their counterparts.

19. Adolescents with satisfied family relations have perceived significantly lower indifference from their father compared to those with poor family relations.

20. Adolescents who are sensitive to people, having good self-identity, and those having post graduate mothers have perceived significantly higher symbolic reward from their father compared to their counterparts.

21. Adolescents who are unhealthy and who are unhappy with family relations have perceived significantly lower symbolic reward from their father compared to their counterparts.

22. Adolescents having good self-identity and those with decided careers have perceived significantly that they are highly loved by their fathers.
23. Adolescents having mothers who are housewives, those from Arts faculty and unhealthy have perceived significantly lesser love from their fathers, compared to their counterparts.

24. Adolescents with less educated mothers have perceived significantly higher object reward from their fathers, compared to those with highly educated mothers.

25. Adolescents in the age group of 17-18 years have perceived significantly lesser object reward from their father, compared to those belonging to the age group of 19-20 years.

26. Adolescents who have poor self-identity, those who have not decided with careers, and who are mother’s favourite have perceived significantly higher negligence from their father.

27. Adolescents who are healthy have perceived significantly lesser negligence from their father, as compared to those who are unhealthy.

28. Adolescents who are unhealthy, coming from joint families, those who are satisfied with their academic performance and those of science faculty have perceived significantly higher protection from their mother, compared to adolescents who are healthy, those who are not satisfied with their academic performance and who are from commerce and arts faculty respectively.

29. Adolescents who are happy with family relations and those who are favourite of both the parents have perceived significantly lesser protectiveness from their mother.
30. Adolescents who have not decided with careers, have poor self-identity, and those coming from nuclear families have perceived significantly higher symbolic punishment from their mother, compared to those who have decided with careers, have good self-identity, and those coming from joint families respectively.

31. Adolescents who are happy with family relations have perceived significantly lower symbolic punishment from their mother.

32. Adolescents who have not decided with careers, who have less educated mothers, those who belong to the age group of 17-18 years, those who live in joint families, and who are mother’s favourite, have perceived significant rejection by their mother, compared to those with decided careers, having highly educated mothers’, those who belong to the age group of 19-20 years, those who live in nuclear families, and who are fathers favourite or favourite of both the parents respectively.

33. Adolescents with decided careers, and who are sensitive, have perceived significantly lesser object punishment from their mother compared to those who have not decided with careers and are insensitive.

34. Adolescents whose mothers are post graduate, those unhappy with family relations, and those from nuclear family have perceived significantly high object punishment from their mother, compared to adolescents with less educated mothers, those happy with family relations, and those from joint family respectively.
35. Adolescents who have not decided with careers, who are from nuclear families and those who are belonging to the age group of 18-19 years have perceived significantly high demanding from their mother, compared to adolescents with decided careers, who are from joint families and those who belong to the age group of 17-18 and 19-20 years.

36. Adolescents who are sensitive and those who are happy with family relations have perceived significantly less demanding from their mother, compared those who are not sensitive and those who are not happy with family relations.

37. Adolescents having poor self-identity, unhappy with family relations and those having post graduate mothers have perceived significantly higher indifference from their mother, compared to those having good self-identity, who are happy with family relations and those whose mothers are less educated respectively.

38. Adolescents with decided careers have perceived significantly lesser indifference from their mother.

39. Adolescents having good self-identity and those who are from nuclear families have perceived significantly higher symbolic reward from their mother, compared to those who have poor self-identity and who are from joint families.

40. Female adolescents, those who are unhealthy, and who are not sensitive to people have perceived significantly lower symbolic reward from their mother, compared to those who are males, those who are healthy, and who are sensitive to people respectively.