Chapter- II

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM
It has often been said that a society’s character can be determined by how a child is reared in that society and it is no wonder that parents, guardians, teachers, institutions, and society at large are concerned about how best to enhance a child’s psychological development. Indeed, parenting has been identified as one of the most important factors in the development of any child, with far-reaching consequences on the society as a whole. A host of studies have provided theoretical and methodological foundations pertaining to child rearing practices (Baumrind, 1971, 1973, 1991a & b; Collins, Maccoby, Steinberg, Hetherington & Bornstein, 2000; Perris, Jacobsson, Lindstrom, von Knorring & Perris, 1980; Rohner & Khaleque, 2005) and its attendant effects on the social development (Grusec & Lytton, 1988; Lytton & Romney, 1991; Vandell, 2000), personality (McCrae & Costa, 1994; McCrae et al., 2000; Bornstein, 1992; Maccoby, 2000), academic achievement (Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, & Fraleigh, 1987; Kim & Rohner, 2002) and a variety of behavioural problems (Amato & Fowler, 2002; Bandura & Walters, 1959; Forehand & Nousiainen, 1993; Steinberg, 2001; Whitbeck, Hoyt & Ackley, 1997) of children, adolescents and adults.

The Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory is a theory of socialization and lifespan development that attempts to predict and explain major causes, consequences, and other correlates of interpersonal (especially parental) acceptance and rejection (Rohner, Khaleque, & Cournoyer, 2009). The empirical study of parental acceptance-rejection has a history going back to the 1890s (Stodgill, 1937) and it was only in the 1930s that a more-or-less continuous body of empirical research began to appear dealing with the effects of parental acceptance-rejection (Rohner, 2004a). An especially productive early collection of acceptance-rejection research papers came from the Fels Research Institute in the 1930s and 1940s (Baldwin, Kalhorn, & Breese, 1945, 1949). Noteworthy in the 1950s to 1980s were the seminal work of Schaefer and associates (Schaefer, 1959, 1961; Schludermann & Schludermann, 1970, 1971,
1983), and the work of Siegelman and colleagues (Roe & Siegelman, 1963). Rohner’s program of research, which ultimately led to the construction of parental acceptance-rejection theory (PARTheory) and associated measures, grew directly out of these psychological traditions in the United States as well as from a twenty-year anthropological and psychological program of cross-cultural comparative research beginning in 1960 (Rohner, 1960, 1975; Rohner & Nielsen, 1978; Rohner & Rohner, 1980, 1981).

Since that time, especially in the 1980s and 1990s, other independent programs of research on issues of acceptance-rejection have also evolved - the sociological tradition of research by Rollins & Thomas (1979), Baumrind’s widely recognized conceptual model dealing with parenting prototypes, including the concepts of authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and rejecting/neglecting styles of parenting (Baumrind, 1966, 1968, 1989, 1991), followed by Steinberg and colleagues (Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991; Steinberg, Elman, & Mounts, 1989); and the work of Downey, Feldman, and colleagues (Downey & Feldman, 1996; Downey, Khouri, & Feldman, 1997; Feldman & Downey, 1994).

Programs of international acceptance-rejection research also exist, such as the work of Perris and colleagues originating in Europe (Perris et al., 1980, 1985, 1994; Arrindell, Gerlsma, Vandereycken, Hageman, & Daeseleire, 1998; Emmelkamp & Heeres, 1988), Parker and associates, working primarily in Australia and England (Parker, 1983a, 1983b, 1984, 1986; Parker, & Barnett, 1988; Parker, Tupling, & Brown, 1979; Torgersen, & Alnaes, 1992), and Chen and colleagues' cross-sectional studies primarily in China and Canada on issues surrounding both maternal and paternal acceptance and rejection (Chen et al., 1997, 2000, 2001).

According to Rohner's Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory, parental acceptance is defined in terms of “warmth, affection, care, comfort, concern, nurturance, support, or
simply love’’ that children receive from their parents. In contrast, parental rejection and hostility are defined as the ‘‘absence or significant withdrawal of these feelings and behaviors and by the presence of a variety of physically and psychologically hurtful behaviors and affects’’ (Rohner et al., 2005, p. 5). More specifically, children and adults universally appear to organize their perceptions of acceptance-rejection around the same four classes of behavior: warmth/affection (or its opposite, coldness/lack of affection), hostility/aggression, in difference/neglect, and undifferentiated rejection (Rohner et al., 2005). Undifferentiated rejection is a form of rejection which refers to individuals’ beliefs that their parents do not love them or care for them, although there might not be clear behavioral indicators that parents are unaffectionate, neglecting or aggressive toward them (Rohner et al., 2005).

One of the central assumptions of Parental Acceptance-Rejection Theory is that rejection by a significant other generates the same negative effects on psychological adjustment, behavioral functioning, and cognitive processes of children and adults, regardless of differences in culture, language, race, or gender. A meta-analysis of 43 studies including 7,500 children and adults, conducted in different ethnic groups in the USA, as well as on numerous samples from Africa, Asia, and Europe, strongly supported this assumption (Khaleque & Rohner, 2002). As reported by Rohner et al. (2005), approximately 21 percent of the variance of adults’ psychological adjustment is explained by parental acceptance-rejection in childhood.

Children and adults who perceive their significant others as rejecting tend to feel growing anger, unrest, and other destructive emotions that can become extremely painful. They are also anxious and insecure. Behavioral problems are more common within this group, as well as disorders like depression, drug, and alcohol abuse. Findings from different studies suggest that children who experienced rejection tend to develop one of seven
personality or behavioral dispositions (Hughes, Blom, Rohner, & Britner, 2005): hostility (aggression, passive aggression, or psychological problems with the management of hostility and aggression), emotional unresponsiveness, immature dependence or defensive independence, impaired self-esteem, impaired self-adequacy, emotional instability, and negative worldview (Rohner et al., 2005; Khaleque, Rohner, Riaz, Laukkala, & Sadeque, 2007).

The ability to handle life’s issues and demands is based upon psychological foundations of early family experiences. Within the society, parents identify certain values that are important for the development of their children (Goldsmith, 2000). Family factors and experiences have been found to be important predictors of children’s achievement progress too (Bradley & Corwyn, 2002). The term motivation refers to any organismic state that mobilizes activity which is in some sense selective or directive. According to Newcomb (1964) achievement motivation is the acquired tendency and one of the most important social needs. It has been defined by McClelland et al., (1953) as a disposition to strive for success in competition with others with some standard of excellence, set by the individual. Motive to achieve requires an act of some norm of excellence, long-term involvement and unique accomplishment. This has been recognized as one of the most important manifest and social needs and personality variable enlisted by Murray (1964), and in fact measured in this study by the Achievement Motivation Scale (Deo-mohan, 1986). It has been opined that achievement motivation is an acquired tendency and one of the most important social needs that drives the individual to strive for success (Manjuvani & Anuradha, 2011); and that it is opined that achievement motivation is an inner drive that directs students' behaviour towards the fulfillment of their goal (Chowdhury et al., 2007). Both extrinsic and intrinsic motivation are found to have positive relationship with academic achievement.
Zellman and Waterman (1998) confirmed that it is not parental encouragement on the whole but parenting styles that are the better predictors of academic achievement. Parental involvement, authoritarian and permissive parenting styles especially have been associated with academic grades, college adjustment and self-esteem of adolescents (Pate et al., 2006; McNeal, 1999; Yan, 2000; Murphy, 2009). Lamborn et al., (1991). Hickman et al. (2000) found that high-achievers often described their parents as understanding, approving, trusting, affectionate, encouraging and not overly strict in discipline. Conversely, under-achievers described their parents as very strict and demanding, lax or punitive in disciplinary technique.

Achievement motivation has been deduced as an integration of affect aroused by cues in situations involving standards of excellence (Acharya, 2009). Such standards of excellence are typically learnt from parents who urge the child to compete against the standards. Children coming from different home environments are affected differently by such variations. Muola (2010) reported positive relationship between academic achievement motivation and home environment. Kazmi (2011) conducted the study to evaluate the impact of fathers' style of dealing with their children at home and their academic achievements at school. The results of this study revealed fathers' involvement had positive significant relationship with academic achievement.

As presented in the forgoing literature, parents play a central role throughout a child’s life, even through adulthood, and the maintenance of strong familial relationships is the key to understanding the educational and success and maintaining a high quality of life (Kim & Park, 2004; Park & Kim, 2004b). The quality of parent–child relationships during infancy and early childhood has been considered to constitute a significant factor in later personality (Dozier, Stovall, & Albus, 1999; Green & Goldwyn, 2002; Greenberg, 1999;
Weinfield, Whaley, & Egeland, 2004). Early warm, positive parent-child tie, sustained over time, promote many aspects of children’s development like higher motivation to achieve in school (Thompson, Easterbrooks, & Padilla-Walker, 2003).

Indeed, parenting styles have been found to play a causal role in psychosocial development, social competence and academic performance, as well as in the emergence of depression, anxiety and problem behavior. (Baumrind, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Cassidy & Shaver, 1999; Collins et al., 2000). Of particular concern, the degree or level of interactions between parents and children in terms of acceptance-rejection become very important for the healthy psychological development of offspring, especially in relation to levels of dependent behaviour and personality. Most psychologists are in agreement with the belief that humans have a fundamental “need to relate” to others and that some degree of interpersonal dependency, expressed in flexible, socially appropriate ways, can enhance adaptation in a broad range of contexts. Several labels have been used to describe this situation-appropriate, adaptive dependency including interdependence (Cross & Madson, 1997), mature dependency (Baumeister & Leary, 1995), connectedness (Rude & Burnham, 1995), relatedness (Blatt, Zohar, Quinlan, Luthar, & Hart, 1996), and healthy dependency (Bornstein & Languirand, 2003). Research on the developmental antecedents of healthy dependency is scanty, but studies have suggested that this personality style is rooted in a history of exposure to authoritative parenting that instills in the child a sense of self-confidence coupled with trust in others along with an ability to ask for help and support without feeling guilty, weak, or ashamed (Bornstein, 2005; Kobayashi, 1989; Lee & Robins, 1995; Tait, 1997).

As conceptualized by Bornstein (Bornstein et al., 2002), the converse of dependency is dysfunctional detachment (DD) which refers to an inability to cultivate social ties and
engage in adaptive affiliative behaviors. Moreover, researchers have found it useful, both conceptually and empirically, to distinguish destructive overdependence (DO) which is characterized by rigid, inflexible dependency, from healthy dependency (HD) which is characterized by flexible, situation-appropriate help and support seeking (Bornstein, 1998; Kantor, 1993; Millon, 1996; Pincus & Wilson, 2001). Although understanding the intrapersonal and interpersonal dynamics of overdependence, detachment, and healthy dependency has important implications for personality development, social adjustment, and risk for psychopathology, no psychometrically sound measures have been available until recently to assess these three constructs simultaneously. To facilitate research on these personality styles, Bornstein and Languirand (2003) developed the Relationship Profile Test (RPT), a 30-item self-report measure of Destructive Overdependence (DO), Dysfunctional Detachment (DD), and Healthy Dependency (HD).

Although problematic detachment has received less attention than problematic dependency from clinicians and researchers, studies confirm that an inability or unwillingness to cultivate social ties and accept help and support from others can also be maladaptive (Birtchnell, 1987, 1996). High levels of detachment are associated with deficits in social and occupational functioning (Colgan, 1987; Kantor, 1993) and studies have suggested that detachment results from an array of underlying factors including early learning experiences that emphasize self-reliance at the expense of social connectedness, intrapsychic conflicts regarding closeness and intimacy, and infantile temperament differences that elicit detachment-promoting responses from parents and peers (Clark & Ladd, 2000; Coolidge, Thede, & Jang, 2001).

The recent upsurge in the study of dependent personality can be traced to the work of Rohner (1986), Bornstein et al. (2002) and Rohner, Khaleque and Cournoyer (2005).
Bornstein (2002) postulates three types of dependent personality: Destructive overdependency, Healthy dependency, and Dysfunctional detachment; whereas Rohner et al., (2005) postulates a continuum of Immature Dependency, Mature Dependency and Defensive Independency. Examination of theoretical literature of both postulates have been well hypothesized to implicate parenting styles as the main predictors but have not been empirically tested enough to come up with a definite conclusion. Studies on parenting as related to the development of dependent behaviour in the offspring have never been attempted in the Mizo context, a problem that begins to be the concern of the Mizo society, especially economically among males. It remains the responsibility of social scientists to attempt to get a better understanding of the Mizo parenting styles in relation to dependency and to find out the effects of such dependent behaviour on achievement motivation and well-being so as to provide the much needed information on parenting and its consequences in the society.

Historical writings and anecdotal reports have revealed that in the olden Mizo society, child-rearing was primarily in the hands of the community as a whole and not much on the family as a unit, especially for boys with their transition from childhood to adulthood, and character building and societal norms inculcated in ‘Zawlbuk’ – the bachelor’s dormitory (Chatterjee, 1975; Kipgen, 1979). Girls’ upbringing was significantly different from boys’. She was reared in and around the house, to do the domestic works under the supervision of her mother. Boys were reared mostly outside the home, to take part in the activities of the society and to ensure the society’s security under the male senior leadership.

The concept of “parenting” as referring to the aspects of raising a child aside from the biological relationship, as the process of promoting and supporting the physical, emotional, social, and intellectual development of a child from infancy to adulthood within the context of the family (Davies & Martin, 2000) seems indistinct in the Mizo society. Anecdotal
accounts would indicate that no individual parenting in the family as such was recognized among the Mizo from the olden days, with the collective being given the charge of caring for the young. The role of 'parenting' usually fell in the hands of the older generation in the community who could not go out in the fields for work, and on the older siblings not old enough to till the lands. The fathers’ role was to provide food and security for the family members and hardly in parenting, except for the intermittent pep talk and chiding of the family members during meals by the head of the family, the father, as apparent from the use of the term *hmelchhiat lai* (the moment when the appearance is not at its most appealing/attractive state) to refer to meal times. The mother's role was subservient, to support the father at his every beck and call. The psychological development of the child was not much reckoned but rather the biological development understandably was the main concern in a society where food was not in abundance. Even today the concept of “parenting” doesn’t seem very clear among the Mizo parents, but its importance is beginning to be recognized, most notably among the church communities as is evident from the few seminars conducted among them.

The Mizo society was and still is a male-dominated society, especially in the political, religious and social arenas. Most of the activities of the Mizo society revolved around the male members. Properties naturally fall in the hands of the male members and females neither tried to achieve nor were they expected to achieve much outside the home (Lianthanga, 2000). However with the coming of age of the Mizo society with much economic and political development of the people, the achievements of the Mizo female counterpart is notably remarkable. It is noteworthy that the modern Mizo woman with her history of the home and hearth as being her main domain have come a long way to attain great success outside the domestic world, especially in the economic sphere.
However, different socialization patterns for male and female children continue to be evident even today in the Mizo families. Mizo parents are noted to be permissive and yet overprotective with their young boys, and more restrictive with their little girls. But, as the growing child approach adolescence, there arise confusion at both ends and parents become either more restrictive or succumbed to denial in their child rearing behaviour of the adolescents. The transition from a very permissive to a more restrictive parenting style seems to confuse the boys whereas the girls are usually not subjected to drastic transitions as their earlier rearing experience entailed restrictions. As in other societies, males are observed to be slower in becoming independent than the female counterparts, and whatever achievement motivation that may simmer underneath is not apparent in the level of actual achievements among the males, especially among young adults. And, whatever achievement motivation lies within the minds of the female counterpart finds expression in the form of more employment and academic achievements among the Mizo female.

In the wake of rapid societal changes due to development in various areas of living and growth in population, the Mizo family is bogged with new responsibilities to care for their own, with the consequences of new parenting responsibilities as the community could not remain the same to take care of its offspring. Confusion and chaos seems to rule the family unit as far as parenting is concerned. As such different parenting patterns would emerge with greater consequences on the social life of its population. Thus, a transition from more primitive life to a modern society that is still rooted in community dominance is apparent in the lives of the members of the Mizo society. A sense of conflict can be felt in the members of the community that appears to have an effect in the rearing of children too and eventually among young adults.

As may be inferred from contemporary psychological theories of development (Grusec & Lytton, 1988), early adulthood is normally the period of independence and
formation of intimate relationships, the quality of which would depend on the experiences the young adults have had during the growing years, irrespective of cultural differences. Young adulthood, the period which span from 18 to 40 years of age (Santrock, 2006) is the time for establishing long term, intimate relationships with other people, choosing a lifestyle and adjusting to it, deciding on an occupation, and managing a home and family. This is the stage where individuals grapple with the tasks of developing adult identities, making decisions about work and career, managing educational and peer-related stresses, and forming intimate partnership. This is a sensitive time wherein persons must navigate a normative yet uniquely challenging life transition.

In the context of the Mizo family, the youngest son is the heir and hence expected to remain in the parents home even into adulthood and married life, and continue to maintain the house for his own parents, his unmarried sisters, widows other family dependents. However, many young Mizo males, married or single, are observed to be dependent on the family especially financially/economically, and remain un-customarily in the parent's home even after marriage while it is traditional for only the youngest son and unmarried daughters to remain in the parents home. In this respect, the female member appears to be doing considerably better than her male counterpart in many fields. She is usually economically independent and still is dependable at the home front as she ventures outside the house for work and thereby changing her sole role from a home-maker and taking up an additional role of financial contributor to the family, far from the restrictive role of her forebears. On the other hand, with the change in the means of living especially in the more urban areas where it is no longer agrarian, men are generally seen to have lost their post as the main provider of the family but yet still hold the post of head of the family and society in all spheres of Mizo life, be it religion, politics, social issues or the economy.
Though there are many fields where females are outnumbering males there are more fields, especially in the higher posts where males are outnumbering females. Incidents where females are outperforming males can be clearly seen in the academic field and low level commercial/economic field. If we look back, at least five years, at the results of the High School Leaving Certificate Examination (MBSE, 2012) we cannot miss seeing the gender differences in particular at the top position which are occupied by females. Data collected from the last five years of the Higher Secondary School Leaving Certificate Examination also tells the same story, that is to say girls are outperforming the males academically. In the commercial sector of the society too, more and more females are getting engaged and less and less males are to be seen working in the market places. In effect, females appear to have made great strides in becoming more independent whereas males appear to have regressed. However, the trend where females outperform the males does not continue in the graduate and post graduate levels and even in the civil services examinations. In the political arena there are hardly any females and the scenario is similar in the top administrative position among the Mizos in the state of Mizoram where only a handful of females are seen to be occupying the top most positions (Statistical Handbook, 2012). Similarly, in the highest academic institution, Mizoram University, male professors are outnumbering females.

The fact that achievement motivation is directly affected by parenting has been known (Baumrind, 1991; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Cassidy & Shaver, 1999; Collins et al., 2000) and Literature is abounding with studies on the relationship between dependency and achievement motivation (Bornstein & Masling, 1985; Ojha, 1978). The present concern, therefore, is to understand the mechanisms by which parenting affect achievement motivation. It is hypothesised that one of the important mediating factor that explains the relationship between parenting and achievement motivation would be dependency behaviour as developed from the consequences of parenting that in turn affect the motivation to achieve.
This is the main problem that has been identified to be tackled in this research - the mediating role of dependency in the relationship between parenting and achievement motivation with the fallout in psychological well-being from such interactions.

A recent shift in psychological research literature from an emphasis on disorder and dysfunction to a focus on well-being and positive mental health (e.g. Argyle, 1987; Diener, 1984; Kahneman, 1999; Seligman, 1991, 2002) have been witnessed (Cooper, Goswami, & Sahakian, 2010), which also captured the attention of epidemiologists, social scientists, economists, and policy makers (e.g. Huppert, 2005; Layard, 2005; Marks & Shah, 2005; Mulgan, 2006). An impressive body of cross-sectional survey data shows that happy people: tend to function better in life than less happy people; are typically more productive and more socially engaged; and tend to have higher incomes (Diener, 2000; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001).

Well-being, and not just the absence of undesirable states such as depression or anxiety, may have consequences for physical health, cognition, relationships and even survival (Danner et al. 2001; Huppert & Whittington, 2003; Keyes, 2005). However, evidence remains sparse (Ostir et al. 2000; Strandberg et al. 2006). There are two broad (and complementary) traditions in conceptualizing well-being: the ‘hedonic’ and ‘eudaimonic’ approaches. The hedonic approach emphasizes happiness (pleasant affect, life satisfaction) whereas the eudaimonic approach (with origins in Platonic philosophy) emphasizes optimal psychological and social functioning (or ‘flourishing’). The GHQ-12 has been found to be a good measure for assessing the overall psychological well-being (Zulkefly & Baharudin, 2010) of students. The General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) is a subjective measure of psychological well-being, developed by Goldberg (1992) who described the measure as a psychological well-being measure.
In view of the literature presented, the present study shall attempt to highlight the impact of parenting on healthy and unhealthy dependency and its concomitant relation to achievement motivation and well-being of young Mizo adults. Such findings may throw light or contribute to a better understanding of the Mizo parenting styles and its effects with far-reaching consequences on the economy and mental well-being of its population. Moreover, such findings may also help in removing many of the negative consequences that arise due to parental rejection, dependency, low achievement motivation and ill-being of the young Mizo adults and thus open the path that leads to better psychological health. This study is, therefore, evolved with the following specific objectives:

1. To study achievement motivation in relation to paternal acceptance-rejection and maternal acceptance-rejection separately with four subscales: Warmth-affection (WA), hostility-aggression (HA), indifference-neglect (IN), and undifferentiated rejection (UR) among Mizo male and female young adults.

2. To study dependency 3 factors: Destructive Overdependence (DO), Dysfunctional Detachment (DD), Healthy Dependency (HD) in relation to paternal and maternal acceptance-rejection (with four subscales: WA, HA, IN, and UR ) among Mizo male and female young adults.

3. To study psychological well-being in relation to paternal acceptance-rejection and maternal acceptance-rejection separately (with four subscales: WA, HA, IN, and UR) among Mizo male and female young adults.

4. To determine the predictability of dependency (3 types), achievement motivation and psychological well-being from the parenting variables (Total Acceptance-Rejection, WA, HA, IN, UR from mothers and from fathers) among Mizo male and female young adults.
5. To examine the mediating role of dependency (3 types) on the relationship between parenting (Total Rejection, WA, HA, IN, UR from mothers and from fathers) and achievement motivation among Mizo male and female young adults.

6. To examine the mediating role of dependency (3 types) on the relationship between parenting (Total Acceptance-Rejection, WA, HA, IN, UR from mothers and from fathers) and psychological well-being among Mizo male and female young adults.

7. To determine gender differences in the predictors, potential mediators and criterion variables of the study.

The following hypotheses were drawn given the nature of the observable behaviours of men and women in the population under study, and in line with the literature given in the foregoing:

1. Achievement motivation is expected to be higher in females than in males, psychological well-being is expected to be lower in females than in males, parental acceptance-rejection is expected to be higher in females than in males, and dependency is expected to be higher in males than in females among Mizo young adults.

2. Dependency, achievement motivation and psychological well-being each will be substantially predicted from parental acceptance-rejection.

3. Parental Acceptance Rejection will be positively correlated with Destructive Overdependence and Dysfunctional Detachment, and negatively with Healthy Dependency.

4. Parental Acceptance-Rejection and its sub-scales will show negative correlation with Achievement Motivation.

5. Parental Acceptance-Rejection and its sub-scales will show negative correlation with Psychological Well-being.

6. Dependency will play a mediating role in the relationship between Parental Acceptance-Rejection and Achievement Motivation.

7. Dependency will play a mediating role in the relationship between Parental Acceptance-Rejection and psychological well-being.