Chapter 3
Review of Literature
There is a growing body of evidence about the child, family, and contextual factors that contribute to social competence (Eisenberg et al., 2003) and subjective well being (Wilson, 1967). This review endeavours to cite the researches exploring the association of temperament, parenting style, parenting stress with social competence and subjective well being.

**Temperament with Social Competence**

Amongst a number of influential factors, temperament has been found to significantly contribute in the development of social competence. Studies reveal that temperament patterns account for the frequency of familial and peer interactions, children's tendency to withdraw from peers, to exhibit shyness or sociability in their company, their relations, and also status within the peer group.

On reviewing numerous studies assessing the association between social competence and temperament, Ma (2006) concluded that researchers have studied temperament either as a whole concept (Szewczyk-Sokolowski, et al., 2005), or constellation groups (Walker et al., 2001), or as specific dimensions of individual temperamental traits (Gleason et al., 2005).

Studies assessing temperament as a general behavioral style or as a whole concept (Houck, 1999; Korner et al., 1985; Maccoby, et al., 1984) have found correlations between temperament and social competence; and, have affirmed the role of temperament in regulating the social exchanges between young children and adults.

However, several other studies, have found no interactional effect between temperament, and children's social relationships (Feiring & Lewis, 1980; Pearson-Blennow & McNeil, 1981). An explanation for the relative lack of congruence between temperament style and social competence is that general behavioral styles are much more ambiguous than are specific dimensions of temperament. Hence, it is likely that particular dispositions of temperament – much more than general styles of behavior – contribute to the organismic impetus behind the development of social competence (Carson, et al., 1986).
This urged researchers to assess specific temperament dimensions in relation to social competence.

Researchers have widely assessed the dimensions of temperament proposed by Thomas and Chess’ as well as Rothbart’s in their respective models.

Children’s temperament dimensions and characteristics have repeatedly been shown as being related to social competence, skilled social behavior, prosocial behavior and cognitions (Sanson et al., 2002). In their study, Carson, et al. (1986) found that temperament dimensions associated with social competence were approach/withdrawal, adaptability to change and general quality of mood. To corroborate their findings they cited several notable researches linking temperament dimensions to the acquisition of verbal and motor skills, initiations of social interactions, sociability and extroversion, wariness and shyness, psychosocial adaptation and academic achievement, parent-child relations, and developmental psychopathology (Buss & Plomin, 1984; Carey, 1972; Chess & Thomas, 1984; Crockenberg, 1986; Lerner, 1983).

In a recent review, Sanson, Hemphill and Smart (2002) observed that most research in this area has focused on the role of temperament dimension of approach/withdrawal also referred to as sociability and temperamental uninhibition - inhibition.

Sociable children are reported to be socially competent. In their study, Skarpness and Carson (1986) found that 5-6-year-old children who showed less inhibition (by mother report) had more positive peer relations (by teacher report). Parker-Cohen and Bell (1988) found that children low on inhibition and high in activity showed, concurrently, higher levels of teacher-reported peer responsiveness. Similarly, Stocker and Dunn (1990) reported that temperamentally sociable 5- to 10-year-olds were more popular with peers and had more positive relations with friends than less sociable children. According to Corapci (2008) less inhibited child temperament has positive effects on teacher and observer ratings of social competence outcomes.
On the other hand, social withdrawal in childhood is related to lower levels of social competence. Several researches (Eisenberg et al., 1998; Kagan, 1988) indicate that being inhibited as a toddler or preschooler has been associated with withdrawal from peers at 8-11 years. Kochanska and Radke-Yarrow (1992) reported that "social inhibition" (inhibition to an unfamiliar adult) in toddlerhood predicted shy, socially withdrawn behavior with a peer at 5 years, while "nonsocial inhibition" (to an unfamiliar environment) was associated with less engagement in group play at 5 years, suggesting that different types of inhibition are associated with somewhat different peer relationship outcomes.

While comparing groups of extremely inhibited or uninhibited toddlers other researchers have also found inhibition among children clearly correlated with observed social withdrawal at 5-7 years, lesser peer interaction, more time spent alone and lower social competence than uninhibited toddlers (Howes & Phillipsen, 1998; Kagan, 1988; Gersten, 1988; Reznick et al., 1986). Similarly, various cross-sectional studies and longitudinal studies (Hinde et al., 1993; Kagan et al., 1984; Sanson, 2000), from infancy to preschool age, have also highlighted the links between child inhibition and social withdrawal or lack of peer interaction in preschool children.

Children with temperamental inhibition, who typically display fear and withdrawal when confronted with a range of novel stimuli including people, objects, and situations, have been observed to show a reticent style of interaction (i.e., onlooking, unoccupied behavior with signs of anxiety) and are generally considered to be at risk for later peer rejection (Kagan, 1998; Sanson et al., 2004).

Although in a contradictory study, Chen et al. (1995) conducted longitudinal work showing that Chinese children with high shyness levels were nevertheless accepted by their peers. Contradictory to the general beliefs possessed by Western researchers that shyness may lead to negative peer relationships, this important finding suggests that cultural issues moderate the association between temperamental patterns and peer relationships.
In addition to sociability, *emotionality*, also, has been seen as an essential factor in social competence and peer interactions (Fabes et al., 1999). Using hierarchical regression analysis, Stocker and Dunn (1990) examined the effect of temperament on friendships and peer relationships, respectively and linked emotionality and sociability to the quality of children’s relationships with friends and peers. The results also showed that temperament explained 7 to 35 percent of the variance in predicting friendships and peer relationships.

In their research, Rothbart, Ahadi, and Hershey (1994) suggest complex and distinct relationships between components of negative emotionality and aspects of social behavior. Temperamental fear (unease, worry), sadness (lowered mood or energy), and effortful control were related to empathy, guilt, and shame. Aspects of negative affectivity reflecting irritability, such as anger or discomfort, were related to antisocial, but not prosocial, behaviors. Liew et al. (2004) found that children who were rated by parents and teachers as low on negative emotionality expressed fewer immediate verbal/gestural indicators of disappointment in the presence of an unfamiliar adult and were perceived by their parents, teachers, and peers as socially competent and well adjusted.

Similarly, another temperament dimension *self-regulation* (attentional and emotional processes including persistence, non-distractibility and emotional control; as proposed by Rothbart) too has been associated with social competence. Eisenberg et al. (1993) found that highly self-regulated children were more likely to have positive peer interactions. Girls were found to be more able to self-regulate, be more expressive, and be more socially competent than boys.

Self-regulation has also been studied in tandem with emotionality to explicate the link between temperament and social competence. Concurrent to this, several investigators (Diener & Kim 2004; Eisenberg et al., 1997; 1999) have pointed to the importance of children’s emotionality and self regulation for social competence and prosocial behavior. Children with high negative affect but also high self-regulation have been found to show higher levels of prosocial behavior and better social skills (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1992; Eisenberg et al.,
1993). While, children who were both highly emotional and poorly regulated tended to overreact in the course of intense peer interactions, had lower social skills and sociometric status (Eisenberg et al., 1993; Fabes et al., 1999). However in a relaxed situation, regardless of their temperamental characteristics, most children exhibit socially competent behavior (Fabes et al., 1999).

Furthermore, Eisenberg et al. (2001) found that children high on externalizing behavior were low on self-regulation and high on anger. It is, thus, likely that there is an interaction of self-regulation and emotionality wherein self-regulation is critical for children high on negative affect.

For some researchers (Dunn & Cutting, 1999; Gleason et al., 2005), activity level was frequently found to be a significant factor for the connection between temperament and peer relationships. Findings of the longitudinal study by Parker-Cohen and Bell (1988) suggested that children with high activity and high approach, but a low sensitivity level are more socially responsive toward their peers, when caught in a new situation. For later social behaviors, only activity and approach/withdrawal were found to be associated with preschoolers' social behavior. Youngblade and Mulvihill (1998) using naturalistic observations of preschoolers from homeless families viewed that children who were active, soothable, or persistent more frequently displayed positive behaviors than emotional or shy children.

Although in a contradictory research, Dunn and Cutting (1999) reported that highly active children engaged less frequently in joint pretend play with their friends. The less frequent interactions between highly active children and their friends were factors that prevent the highly active children from developing close relationships with others.

Research has, also, documented that impulsive children, who show intense affective reactions, particularly irritability, and poor self-regulation, receive lower peer popularity ratings, engage more often in antagonistic peer interactions like peer conflicts, and are perceived as less socially competent by teachers (Arsenio et al., 2000). Low impulsivity among children has been found
to be positively related to teacher and observer ratings of positive social competence outcomes (Corapci, 2008). However, in an opposing study, Gleason et al. (2005) examined the influence of temperament on children’s choice of friends and found that children prefer to choose those high on impulsivity and soothability as friends. The researchers also found that girls tended to choose friends with low activity levels, whereas boys preferred to choose children with high activity levels.

In addition to the above mentioned dimensions, other temperamental dimensions (proposed by Thomas and Chess as well as Rothbart) have also been investigated.

Assessing the contribution of concurrent and earlier temperament to social skills at 11-12 years, Prior et al. (2000) found attentional self-regulation, sociability, reactivity, task orientation and flexibility as the causative factors of social skills (combined parent, teacher, and child report).

Similarly, other investigations have found that high task orientation, attention, persistence and flexibility (positive mood, adaptability, and approach) have been associated with parent- and teacher-rated social skills, peer acceptance and more socially interactive behaviour with peers (Arsenio et al., 2000; Goldsmith, et al., 2001; Keogh & Burstein, 1988; Paterson & Sanson, 1999). Conversely, high reactivity, low persistence, poorer attention, lower rhythmicity and activity have been linked with negative interactions with others as well as peer rejection (Guralnick & Groom, 1990; Kurdek & Lillie, 1985).

In addition to assessing specific temperament dimensions researchers have also focused on different temperament profiles and their relation to social competence. Research highlights significant relationships between the clusters of temperament and social behavior. Observational studies (DiLalla, 1998; Farver & Bransletter 1994), reveal that children rated as temperamentally “easy” by their parents displayed more prosocial behavior with an unfamiliar peer as well as demonstrated prosocial responses to peer distress than the children rated as either “slow to warm up” or “difficult” by their parents.
The review, thus, highlights and explicates the association between various temperament dimensions and social competence

**Temperament with Subjective Well Being**

Unlike the researches on link between temperament and social competence, the studies investigating the association between temperament and subjective well being are by far very few, especially those assessing links between various temperament dimensions and subjective well being amongst children.

Despite the scarcity of investigations, Diener (1996) observes that temperament concepts have been considered useful in understanding people’s subjective well being. The evidence for impact of temperament on subjective well being, according to him, starts with *heritability studies* of subjective well being.

Longitudinal study of twins (Baker et al., 1992; Tellegen et al., 1988; Tellegen & Lykken, 1996) suggest that approximately half of the variability in positive and negative affect is due to genetic variance, showing that some portion of subjective well being is due to one’s genetic make-up. Goldsmith and Campos (1986) report that biologically based emotional reactions develop early in life, are somewhat stable over time, and offer the building blocks for adult personality dimensions.

Kagan et al. (1992) in their study of inhibited and uninhibited children, proposed that these different emotional styles are thought to be biologically based resulting from different excitability of the amygdale and its projections to the motor system, the cingulate and frontal cortex, the hypothalamus, and the sympathetic nervous system. These studies allude that one’s inborn biology might predispose the individual to greater or lesser subjective well being.

In addition to this view, researches also purport that temperament predispositions are seen in people’s consistent emotional reactions and life satisfaction which are fairly stable over time (Diener, 1996; Magnus & Diener,
1991). In their study, Diener and Larson (1984) found that people’s average affective reactions were quite consistent. They found that individuals’ pleasant affect in work situations correlated .70 with their average pleasant affect in recreation situations.

Suh, Diener, and Fujita (1996) reported that people usually react briefly to life events and later return to baseline level according to their personality. They added that individuals adapt to life events rather quickly whether negative or positive. In their dynamic equilibrium model, Headey and Wearing (1989) proposed that temperament determines individuals’ basic level of happiness—what has come to be known as the hedonic set-points. Life events can temporarily increase or decrease the level of happiness, as proposed by Headey and Wearing (1989) but individuals usually return to their basic levels of happiness and this stability is prevalent across 8 years in both positive and negative affect. These findings suggest that temperament has a biological basis that predisposes a person to experience certain types of emotions.

Temperament and personality theorists propose that there are stable individual differences in the frequency and intensity with which negative emotions such as anger and fearfulness, and positive emotions such as happiness and interest, are expressed and experienced (Bridges et al., 2001). Such tendencies, originating in infancy and early childhood, have been hypothesized to continue to affect emotional well-being throughout life. Thus, temperament is believed to exert a causal role in predisposing some individuals to experience high subjective well being and others low subjective well being.

Concurrent to this view, Kagan (1994) hypothesized that a biologically based emotional style—inhibited or uninhibited—channels positive and negative affects. Laboratory studies also demonstrate that happy and unhappy people react differently to the same stimuli. Compas et al. (2004) pointed out that temperament can directly influence the experience of children with stronger dispositions to negative affect mapping onto dysphoric symptoms and positive affectivity mapping onto anhedonic symptoms. Children prone to negative affect
will experience stronger stress reactions than less highly-distress prone children given the same environmental stressor (Rothbart, 2004).

Studying correlations between temperament and subjective well being in an earlier study, Costa and McCrae (1980) investigated the relationships between adult temperament and positive affect, negative affect and life satisfaction. They assessed six temperament scales, viz., general emotionality, fear, anger, poor inhibition of impulse, sociability, tempo, and vigour. Results revealed that the six temperament scales were correlated with the positive affect, negative affect and life satisfaction. In another study, Elliot and Thrash (2002) found that approach temperament underlies the positive affective orientation assessed by measures of positive emotionality (Tellegen, 1985), whereas avoidance temperament underlies the negative affective orientation assessed by measures of negative emotionality (Watson, 2000).

Emmons and Diener (1991) using Buss and Plomin’s (1984) EASI temperament survey assessed possible association with subjective well-being. They found that the four temperament dimensions (viz., emotionality, activity, sociability and impulsivity) correlated with subjective well-being in predictable ways. Results revealed that Sociability showed consistent strong relationships to both positive affect and life satisfaction, but moderate to non-significant relationships with negative affect. While both Emotionality and Impulsivity showed consistent significant relationships with negative affect, but showed moderate to non-significant relationships with positive affect and life satisfaction.

Some of the researches assessing the link between temperament and subjective well being among individuals have also utilized Eysenck’s extraversion, neuroticism model and Grey’s (1982) BAS (Behaviour activation system; sociability, facilitative behaviour) and BIS (Behaviour inhibition system; shyness, inhibited behaviour) temperament model. Extraversion tendencies have frequently been identified as and correlated with temperament dimensions of approach/sociability, positive affect, liveliness, activity and assertiveness. While, Neuroticism tendencies have been frequently correlated with
temperament dimensions of negative affectivity and identified as fear/irritability (Fogle et al., 2002; Rothbart & Jones, 1998).

Many studies have endeavoured to explore links between temperament and emotionality. In an earliest study, Carver and White (1994) found positive relationships through correlational and factor analytic research between positive emotionality and BAS as well as negative emotionality with BIS.

Similarly, Argyle and Lu (1990), Brebner et al. (1995) and Costa et al. (1980) have also consistently depicted that extraversion is strongly related to happiness and well-being; while, neuroticism is consistently and negatively related to adult, adolescent and child happiness and well-being. Rusting and Larson (1997) demonstrated that extraverted individuals (those who appear to react more strongly to rewards) responded more intensely to positive rather than negative pictures in a laboratory setting, whereas neurotic individuals reacted more strongly to negative photos. Larsen and Ketelaar (1989, 1991), Zelenski and Larsen (1999), too, documented that individuals high on neuroticism dimension report a stronger negative affective response to an unpleasant mood induction compared individuals lower on neuroticism. In addition to these, Watson and Clark (1993), Clark and Watson (1999) and Gable, Reis and Elliot (2002) too, depicted significant positive correlations among extraversion and positive emotionality and neuroticism with negative emotionality in their respective investigations.

In a study of 423 adolescents (aged 11–15), Barrio et al. (1997) revealed a significant positive relationship among Neuroticism, anxiety and depression while, a negative correlation existed between Extraversion and depression.

Using Buss and Plomin’s EAS temperament model as well as Eysenck’s model, Greenspoon and Saklofske (2000) attempted to explore the association of subjective well being and psychopathology with temperament, in a study comprising 407 children in grades 3–6. They found significant links between temperament dimensions of sociability and emotionality with both subjective well being. Results revealed that teachers found children high on subjective well
being to be very sociable as compared to children low on subjective well being. Emotionality too correlated positively with high subjective well being.

Holder and Coleman (2007) examined the contribution of temperament, popularity, and physical appearance to children’s happiness. They included the neurotic variable as a temperament predictor of happiness in children and results showed that it significantly negatively correlated with happiness. An analysis of variance revealed that children who were reported as “very outgoing” by their parents were rated by their parents as happier than children viewed by their parents as “shy”. Ortiz and Gandara (2007) in their research of children and adolescents between 8 -15 years of age, revealed that difficult temperaments showed more depressive symptomatology.

Psychologists have also assessed the links between temperament and life satisfaction. Heaven (1989) in his study on Australian adolescents found a significant negative correlation between neuroticism and satisfaction with life, while, extraversion was positively related to satisfaction with life. Huebner (1991) in a study assessing correlates of life satisfaction among children found that children who displayed characteristics more closely related to extraversion like sociability and positive affect reported high degrees of life satisfaction. Evans (1994) too reported that temperament of the individual has an impact on his/her perceived life satisfaction.

In their study of 160 children (aged 10 - 15), Fogle et al. (2002) endeavoured to find the relationship between temperament and life satisfaction. They found that life satisfaction was correlated positively with extraversion; and negatively with neuroticism. The regression analysis revealed that extraversion and neuroticism both accounted for the variance in the children’s life satisfaction.

McKnight et al. (2002) investigated relationships among stressful life events, temperament, externalizing and internalizing behaviors, and global life satisfaction in a sample of 1,201 adolescents, from grades 6 to 12. They found a modest correlation between life satisfaction and extraversion, whereas moderate correlations were found between life satisfaction and neuroticism and
life satisfaction and stressful life events. Based upon hierarchical regression analyses, temperament variables accounted for approximately 16% of the variance in predictions of life satisfaction ratings. Rigby and Huebner (2005) too found similar links between extraversion and life satisfaction.

In another study, Garcia and Siddiqui (2008) categorized 135 high school students into one of four different affective temperaments (self-actualizing, high affective, low affective, and self-destructive); in an endeavour to explore how the number of recalled life events (positive and negative) predicts psychological well-being and in turn how psychological well-being predicts life satisfaction on 135 high school students. Results indicated that temperament combinations may allow the individual to achieve psychological well-being and life satisfaction. Even more importantly, self-acceptance may foster life satisfaction regardless of temperament and may have more impact on life satisfaction than life events.

Thus, overall the review shows association between temperament and subjective well being.

However, contrary to these researches Kagan and Moss (1962), observed that not all children remained as such through childhood, suggesting that environment also influences social and emotional development beyond early temperament. Among the various environmental factors, parenting style has been widely studied in relation to children’s socio-emotional development.

**Parenting Style with Social Competence**

Parenting plays a direct as well as a mediational role in the social competence (Engels et al., 2002). Parenting styles, viz., authoritative, authoritarian and permissive, have been identified as critical in determining children’s social development in diverse ethnic and cultural groups (Aunola & Nurmi, 2005; Chao, 2001; Lansford et al., 2005; Steinberg, et al., 1992), a view endorsed by both psycho-analytical and behavioural theorists alike. This has propelled the interest of investigators to establish the association of parenting style with social competence in children. The following review cites several
studies that explore the association between parenting style and social competence.

Although on a sample of African-American children, Baumrind (1972) found a positive relationship between authoritarian parenting style and independence/assertiveness, most researches generally demonstrate that rejecting, restrictive, and authoritarian parenting style is negatively related with children's social competence, peer-rejection and aggressive behaviour (Baldwin, 1955; Baumrind, 1967). In a sample of 304 second-grade children from Beijing, Chen et al. (1997), found that authoritarian parenting was associated positively with aggression and negatively with peer acceptance, social competence and school academic achievement.

Dishion (1990) studying the link between coercive parental disciplinary behaviors and children’s antisocial behavior and social rejection found that poor parental discipline led to antisocial child behavior, which in turn led boys to be rejected by their peers. He suggested that as these rejected boys came from families characterized by coercive interaction patterns, this may predispose children to hostile attributional biases and reactive aggressive dispositions that place them at risk for peer rejection.

Giving credence to this view, several other studies, too, illustrate that children who are exposed to harsh coercive (i.e., slapping, hitting, and yelling); aversive, restrictive, power-assertive disciplinary tactics (characterized by punishment, threats, lack of reasoning) commonly exhibit disruptive playground behaviors, hostility, aggression, low social competence, conduct problems, antisocial behavior and social rejection (Gottman & Fainsilber-Katz, 1989; Hart et al., 1992; Webster-Stratton & Hammond, 1998). Research also reveals that children who are exposed to directive parental behavior (direct commands, often accompanied by lack of explanation and negative affect during parent–child play interactions) are more likely to display negative peer behaviors, hostility, and aggression, and are likely to be less popular with their peers (Attili, 1989; Putallaz, 1987; Rose-Krasnor et al., 1996)
Similarly, parental insensitivity, harshness, hostility, negative control, too, have been associated with negative peer interactions, child aggression, peer rejection, greater externalizing behavior and poor psychosocial adjustment (Baumrind, 1971; Bates et al., 1998; Booth et al., 1994; Diener & Kim, 2004; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2001; Rubin & Burgess, 2002).

In another study, Rubin et al. (1998) found that 2-year-old boys with dysregulated temperament and mothers with high levels of dominance were higher in externalizing problems and observed aggression. Lindahl (1998) revealed that parental commands and coercion discriminated boys with disruptive behavior problems from those with no behavioral problems.

In a sample of seventy-four 6 year old children and their parents, Laible et al. (2004) examined the links between parenting, children's perceptions of family relationships, and children's social behavior. Children completed relationship-oriented doll stories that were coded for coherence, prosocial and aggressive themes. Parents completed a report of their child's social behavior, a parenting scale, and a number of demographic items. Teachers also completed measures of children's social competence and externalizing behavior. Harsh parenting predicted both a child's use of aggressive themes in the doll stories and a child's externalizing behavior. These findings support the idea that children are constructing models of relationships out of the early interactions with caregivers, and that they use these representations to guide their social behavior.

In a study of 843 Spanish adolescents ranging in age from 11 to 16 years old, López et al. (2006) revealed that aggressive rejected students informed of lower levels of family self-esteem, less parental support, higher levels of aggression between their parents at home, and a more offensive parent–child communication in comparison with nonaggressive rejected adolescents.

In contrast, the authoritative parenting style has been identified to benefit social development in diverse cultures (Baumrind, 1996; Chen et al., 1997; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Hill, 2001; Steinberg et al., 1992). Various positive parenting behaviors such as sensitivity, warmth, acceptance, appropriate
control, responsivity and involvement have often been shown to predict positive peer play, socially competitive and acceptable behaviour, better peer relationships and behavioral and cognitive competence in children’s social competence (Baldwin, 1955; Baumrind, 1996; Chen & Rubin, 1994; Clarke-Stewart et al., 1994; Darling & Steinberg, 1993; Hill, 2001; McGrath et al., 1995; NICHD Early Child Care Research Network, 2001; Rubin et al., 1998; Youngblade & Belsky, 1992).

In his research, Putallaz (1987) revealed that mothers who were less demanding and praised their children, had children who behaved more positively with their mothers and with their peers, were better able to solve social problems, and had higher social status in the peer group. Webster-Stratton and Hammond (1998), too, found maternal praise and physical warmth to be positively related to social competence.

Similarly, parental use of reasoning behaviors and explanations (Roopnarine, 1987; Roopnarine & Adams, 1987) has been associated with peer popularity. A positive relationship has also been found between parental support and children’s competence, self-reliance, and compliance (Baumrind, 1971; Jackson et al., 2000).

Further, parent’s interaction with their children also impacts their children’s future social competencies. An authoritative/democratic interaction style, the ability to verbally engage and participate actively with their child in play interactions, and the ability to involve their child in reciprocal, positive, and mutually focused interactions has been related with positive peer outcomes, such as peer popularity and acceptance, harmonious peer interactions, and prosocial behavior (Dekovic & Janssens, 1992; MacDonald & Parke, 1984; Mize & Pettit, 1997). The amount of mother’s positive interactions with her child at home inversely predicted the child’s negative peer behaviors at preschool (Stevenson-Hinde et al., 1986). Children who have engaging and positive parents tend to have positive relations with their family members, peers and others as well (Parke, 1990; Parke et al., 1988, 1989; Pettit et al. 1988; Taylor et al., 2004).
In another investigation, Zhou et al. (2002) documented that parental positive expressiveness predicted greater empathy and social functioning in children in elementary school. Oravecz, Koblinsky and Randolph (2008) found that positive parenting was predictive of fewer internalizing and externalizing problems and higher levels of child self-control and cooperation.

With regard to authoritative disciplinary parenting practices, research demonstrates a positive link between flexible strategies of parental control and child competence and self reliance (Baumrind, 1971; Power & Chapieski, 1986). Parents who use positive, even-handed, inductive styles of discipline (e.g., explaining consequences, providing rationales, and limit setting and following through) are more likely to have children who relate positively to, and are accepted by their peers (Dishion, 1990; Hart et al., 1992). Furthermore, there is increasing evidence for the importance of parents’ use of proactive strategies like anticipatory guidance (setting up tasks to avoid conflict, attempting to guide the child’s behavior in future situations) in predicting children’s peer competency (Pettit et al., 1991 1997).

Conversely, permissive parenting has been associated with aggression and lower social competence among children (Rubin, Stewart & Chen, 1995)

However in several contradictory studies, (Crockenberg & Lourie, 1996; Lyons-Ruth et al., 1993) parenting style did not correlate with the problem behaviours and social skills.

Most of the research on impact of parenting styles on social competence focuses on maternal parenting. Previous studies suggest that it is the mother’s styles of parenting, but usually not fathers’, that is associated with children's social functioning and that mothers who utilized more positive parenting practices and engaged in more family routines had children who displayed higher levels of total prosocial skills (Eisenberg et al., 1996; Koblinsky et al., 2006). Also, few researches suggested that when both parents collaborated with children, children’s social competence with peers increased and that children’s social competence is influenced more by the parent of the same gender than by the parent of the opposite gender (Crockenberg et al., 1996)
Thus, all in all the review depicts that parenting styles, viz., authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, are significant indicators of child social competence.

**Parenting Style with Subjective Well Being**

Parenting styles viz., *authoritative*, *authoritarian* and *permissive*, not only have an impact on social competence but also effects subjective well being. The past few decades have witnessed several studies on subjective well being, but, most of them have been conducted on adults. As a result there is paucity in studies of subjective well being research on children. However there have been a few studies assessing correlates of subjective well being among adolescents and youth. In the present review, studies depicting the association between parenting styles and subjective well being are cited.

Parenting styles incur significant effects on a wide range of youth outcomes, including self-esteem and subjective well being, health and problem behaviour, as well as school results and attainment (Koo and Chan, 2008). Applying latent class analysis to data on parent–teenager interaction that was collected in the *Youth Panel of the British Household Panel Survey*, Koo and Chan (2008) compared youth from families with authoritative, authoritarian and permissive parents. Results revealed that the youth with authoritarian parents or permissive parents are likely to report lower level of self-esteem or subjective well-being.

Parenting and in particular parental involvement and closeness to parents, has often been linked to both later demographic and psychological outcomes which further determines psychological distress and negative affect as well as subjective well being (Flouri, 2004; Maccoby, 2000).

Research on impact of parenting style also identifies parental warmth and control as well as authoritative parenting style to influence child and adolescent psychological well-being, higher subjective quality of life, and satisfaction with life (Chen et al., 2000; Paulson, 1994; Petito & Cummins, 2000; Shek, 1999; Steinberg et al., 1989). High levels of parental warmth and support are
considered to be positively related to emotional well-being, greater self-esteem and lower depression and anxiety (Conger et al., 1993; Ge et al., 1996; Kurdek & Fine, 1994). In their investigation, Denham et al. (1997) showed that parents’ positive attentiveness towards their preschoolers’ positive and negative affective display was related to children’s emotional and social competence. Similarly, Rönkä and Poikkeus (2002) indicated that warm parenting with high involvement and autonomy-granting was related to fewer depressive symptoms.

Henry et al. (2008) attempted to report the relations of the well-being of college students whose parents immigrated to America from Arab countries with their perceptions of their parents’ (a) acculturation behaviors (i.e., openness to the American culture and preservation of the Arab culture) and (b) control. Results indicated that the perceived acculturation behaviors interacted with perceived parental control to predict students' subjective well-being. An expected positive association between parental openness to American culture and students' well-being is attenuated among students with autonomy-granting (low-control) parents. Conversely, a positive association between parental preservation of the Arabic culture and well-being is stronger among students with autonomy-granting parents.

It is also opined that positive families, encouraging authoritative parenting and effective communication among family members and focusing on emotional and instrumental support promote psychological well-being among children and youth (Phinney & Ong, 2003). In a study of affluent youth and children, Luthar and Latendresse (2005) found that excessive pressures to achieve and isolation from parents (both literal and emotional) manifested elevated disturbance in several areas—such as substance use, anxiety, and depression.

Driscoll, Russell and Crockett (2008) in their study examined generational patterns of parenting styles, the relationships between parenting styles and adolescent well-being among youth of Mexican origin, and the role of generational parenting style patterns in explaining generational patterns in youth behavior (delinquency and alcohol problems) and psychological well-being
(depression and self-esteem). Results indicated that youth with authoritative or permissive mothers had higher self-esteem and lower levels of depressive symptoms than did teens whose mothers fell into one of the non-supportive categories. Though, teens with permissive mothers were more likely to have experienced alcohol related problems than were those with authoritarian parents.

Parenting not only affects a child’s emotional well being, but also has an impact on life satisfaction. Research suggests link between authoritative parenting and life satisfaction among youth. Supportive parenting and high-quality interactions with significant others, parental emotional and instrumental support contribute as important factors for the development of life satisfaction and positive youth development (Park, 2004).

In their research on 202 undergraduate students, highlighting the role of parental behavior in subsequent development of pathology in children and adolescents, Seibel and Johnson (2001) noted that parenting style is one of the major determinants of life satisfaction among post-secondary students. They found that perception of parents (both mother and father) as psychologically controlling was significantly positively correlated with trait anxiety and significantly negatively correlated with satisfaction with life.

In another study, Phinney and Ong (2003) found that discrepancies between parents’ and youth’s views on values and attitudes were related to low life satisfaction across cultures. They stated that the more parents’ expectations and youth’s beliefs on family obligation were in agreement, the higher the life satisfaction was reported among youth. Shek (2002) in a study based on a sample from Hong Kong demonstrated that parental support was positively related to adolescent mental health including life satisfaction.

Milevsky et al. (2007) examined variations in adolescent adjustment as a function of maternal and paternal parenting styles in a sample of 272 students in grades 9 and 11 from a public high school in a metropolitan area of the Northeastern United States. Results showed that authoritative mothering was found to relate to higher self-esteem and life-satisfaction and to lower
depression. Paternal parenting styles was also related to psychological adjustment, however, although the advantage of authoritative mothering over permissive mothering was evident for all outcomes assessed, for paternal styles the advantage was less defined and only evident for depression.

Parental support has also been found to be strongly associated with life satisfaction (Stevenson et al., 1999; Suldo and Huebner 2006; Young et al., 1995). In his investigation, Henry (1994) demonstrated that parental support, such as encouragement, praise, or physical affection was associated with greater family life satisfaction reported by adolescents.

Similarly, Suldo and Huebner (2004) in their investigation endeavored to identify particular dimensions of authoritative parenting (supervision, social support, involvement, and psychological autonomy granting) that are related to life satisfaction during early, middle, and late adolescence in a sample of sample of 1201 middle and high school students. Results indicated statistically significant relationships between each authoritative parenting dimension and adolescent life satisfaction with perceived parental social support emerging as the strongest correlate. According to them parents’ promotion of autonomy within their children as well as their supervision of their children were significantly linked to higher levels of life satisfaction in adolescents. They stated that decreased parental support, supervision, and autonomy promotion related to decreased life satisfaction. In turn, diminished life satisfaction related to a higher likelihood of engaging in problem behavior. They further demonstrated that not only do authoritative parenting behaviors (particularly social support) predict adolescents’ life satisfaction, but that life satisfaction, in turn, partially accounts for the link between parenting and adolescents’ internalizing and externalizing behaviors.

Leung, Chang and Lai (2004) explored the relations among maternal concern and restrictiveness, self-evaluated academic competence, and life satisfaction in a short-term longitudinal study of 346 seventh-grade students (126 males and 220 females) in Hong Kong. Structural equation modeling found that adolescents’ perceived maternal concerns and academic competences
significantly predicted life satisfaction over time, whereas perceived maternal restrictiveness did not. The results supported the importance of perceived maternal concern and academic competence in predicting early adolescent life satisfaction.

Furthermore, Peterson and Leigh (1990) in their study depicted that adolescents’ who saw their parents as using punitiveness and love withdrawal to gain control over them reported a lower level of satisfaction with their family.

Using data from the *British National Child Development Study*, Flouri (2004) examined the role of parenting in later subjective well-being and found that even after adjusting for several socio-demographic factors (e.g., work, religion, marriage) closeness to mother at age 16 predicted life satisfaction at age 42 in both men and women, whereas mother involvement at age 7 predicted life satisfaction at age 42 in men. Closeness to mother at age 16 was also negatively related to poor psychological functioning at age 42 in women.

Hence, the review reflects that authoritative parenting, parental warmth and support, and a loving parental relationship are among the various factors incurring an impact on subjective well being; and children who feel loved and accepted are happier and more confident (Gray & Steinberg, 1999; Grossman & Rowat, 1995; Petito & Cummins, 2000; Stevenson et al., 1999; Wolfradt et al., 2003; Young et al., 1995).

**Parenting Stress with Social Competence**

Parenting stress has often been viewed to predict child’s adjustment problem, insecure child attachment, child disruptive behaviors as well as externalizing and internalizing problems (Coplan et al., 2003; Crnic & Greenberg, 1990; Cummings et al., 2000; Deater-Deckard, 2004; Dunlap et al., 2005; Jarvis & Creasey, 1991). A review of the literature highlighted the paucity of research assessing the impact of parenting stress on social competence.

However, one pertinent study conducted by Anthony et al. (2005) attempted to assess the relationships between parenting stress, parenting
behaviour and preschoolers’ social competence and behaviour problems in the classroom in two types of preschool programmes: private day care centers and Head Start. Results indicated that parenting stress was significantly related to teacher ratings of social competence, internalizing and externalizing behaviours, thus, highlighting the association between a parent’s level of stress, child’s behaviour and social competence.

**Parenting Stress with Subjective Well-Being**

Though, many psychologists (Crnic & Low, 2002; Deater-Deckard, 2004) have alluded to the impact of parenting stress on the child’s emotional development, but there is a scarcity of research assessing this view. Most of the research on parenting stress has assessed factors associated with parenting stress.

In a study, Tan and Rey (2005) investigated the relationship between depression in children and adolescent, parental depression and parenting stress. Fifty three depressed youth aged 9-16 years were matched for age and gender and compared with 53 non-depressed controls. Their respective parents completed questionnaires on depression and parenting stress. Results revealed parents of depressed children reported higher parenting stress and were more likely to perceive their child as difficult. Univariate analysis demonstrated a relationship between child’s depression and maternal depression but not paternal depression.

Parenting stress and children’s development are connected through these bi-directional processes, with the parent influencing the child and the child influencing the parent (Deater-Deckard, 2004). Hence, if a depressed child can have an impact on his or her parent’s depression level; a mother’s psychological health or state too may have an impact on the child’s subjective well being.