CHAPTER-I

INTRODUCTION

“Family is a group which is based on perfect and permanent type of sexual relationship and the work of family is reproduction and child raring practice.” All members in the family help, love and show affection to each other. Mother and Father bring up child; give education which provides direction to its life.

The development in science and technology brings industrial revolution and in most of the nation around the world women start working with men and left the family. Ultimately it changes the structure of the family joint family, separate family, single child family, multi child family, with out a child single parent family, aged parent’s family etc. These are the different types of the families whatever may be the type of family; the relation in family members gives direction to individual life. The family relations have emotional value as well.

In family relations mother and father relation, parent-child relation, relation among the children and other person’s relation included for the best development of the child. Parent child relation should and must be cordial child raring is an art, as well as it as science sometime more love of affection and more dictatorship in family creates behavioral problem in child. Adler gives important to birth order in personality development. In a view of Adler in single child family, is always in a shadow of parents and parents are too much careful about the child such a child is unable to take his or her own decisions in life such a child has no one to play or talk of its age group in a home and it’s adjustment among friends is below average.

But in single child family, some advantages are also there, they are parents consecrate on the single child. Conflicts among the children’s is also absent. It also helps to control the growth of the population and it’s also helps parents to bring up child excellently.

From last thirty years people are aware about the family planning. So the explosion of population is checked. In present condition it not easy to bring and brought up two or more than two children. Husband and wife give importance to their
careers, so the old concept i.e. “Vanshacha Diva” etc. are vanishing and “Small family is big family” such concepts are emerging. Instead of natural delivery the caesarean delivery cases are more and more. Naturally it cases fear of pregnancy among the number of parents who believe in single child family is increase. With birth rate sharply declining in most developed nations and record number of women opting to stop at child, in empirical evidences shows that “only” are not destined to spoiled misfits or misanthropes is welcome news around the globe.

1.1 The Family:-

The family in its most common form – a lifelong commitment between a man and woman who feed, shelter, and nurture their children until they reach maturity-arose tense of thousands of years ago among our hunting-and-gathering ancestors. Many other species live in social groups, but rarely do they organize into family-like units.

Anthropologists believe that bipedalism-the ability to walk upright on two legs-was an important evolutionary step that led to the human family unit. Once arms were freed to carry things, our ancestors found it easier to cooperate and share, especially in providing for the young. Men usually traveled in search of game, women gathered fruit and vegetables as a temporary food supply when hunting was unsuccessful. The human family pattern in which a man and woman assumed special responsibility for their own children emerged because it enhanced survival. It ensured a relatively even balance of male hunters and female gathers within a social group, there by creating the greatest possible protection against starvation during times when game as scarce (Lancaster & Whitten, 1980).

Kinship groups expanded to include ties with other relatives, such as grandparents, aunts, under and cousins, because larger kin networks offered greater chances for successful competition with other humans for resources. Within these clans, elders, helped their children and other younger relatives reproduce by assisting with mate selection and child care. In this way, they increased the likelihood that their own genetic heritage would continue (Geary, 1998). And because economic and social obligations among family members were so important for survival, strong emotional
bonds evolved to foster long term commitment among parents, children, and other relative (Nesse, 1990 Williams, 1997)

**1.1.1 Functions of the Family :-**

Besides promoting survival of its members, the family unit of our evolutionary ancestors performed the following vital services for society:

1. Reproduction, replacing dying members.
2. Economic services. Producing distributing goods and services.
4. Socialization. Training the young to become competent, participating members of society.
5. Emotional support. Helping other surmount emotional crises and fostering in each person a sense of commitment and purpose.

In the early history of our species, families probably served all or most of these functions. But as societies became more complex, the demands placed on the family became too much for it to sustain alone. Consequently, other institutions developed to assist with certain functions, and families became linked to larger social structures. For example, political and legal institutions assumed responsibility for ensuring societal order, and schools built on the family’s socialization function. Religious institutions supplemented both child – rearing and emotional support functions by offering family members educational services and a set of common beliefs that enhanced their sense of purpose (Parke & Kellam, 1994).

Finally, although some family members still carry out economic tasks together (as in family-run farms and businesses), this function has largely been taken over by institutions that make up the world of work. The modern family consumes far more goods and services than it produces. Consequently, whereas children used to contribute to families economic well-being, today they are economic liabilities. According to a conservative estimate, today’s new parents well spend about $280,000 to rear a child from birth through 4 year of college-one factor that has contributed to the declining birth rate in industrialized nations (U.S. Department of Labour, 2002)
Although some functions are shared with other institutions, three important ones especially concerned with children – reproduction, socialization, and emotional support – remain primarily the province of the family. Researchers interested in finding out how families fulfill these functions take a social systems perspective, viewing the family as a complex set of interacting relationships influenced by the larger social context.

1.1.2 Different Types of Family

1. One Child Families:

Sibling relationships bring many benefits, but they are not essential for healthy development. Contrary to popular belief, only children are not spoiled. Instead, they are just as well adjusted as other children and are advantaged in some respects. Children in one-child families score higher in self-esteem and achievement motivation. Consequently, they do better in school and attain higher levels of education (Falbo, 1992). A major reason may be that they have some what closer relationships with their parents, who exert more pressure for mastery (Falbo & Polit, 1986).

Favorable development also characterizes only children in China, where a one-child family policy has been strictly enforced for 2 decades to control overpopulation. Compared with agemates who have siblings, Chinese only children are advanced in

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mentioned by Parents</th>
<th>Mentioned by Children</th>
<th>Mentioned by Parents</th>
<th>Mentioned by Children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having time to pursue ones own interests and career</td>
<td>A voiding sibling rivalry</td>
<td>Waling a “tighrope” between family attention and overindulgence</td>
<td>Not getting to experience the closeness of a sibling relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less financial pressure</td>
<td>Having more privacy</td>
<td>Having only one chance to ‘make good’ as a parent.</td>
<td>Feeling too much pressure from parents to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having to worry about</td>
<td>Enjoying greater affluence</td>
<td>Being left childless in case</td>
<td>Having no one to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agemats who siblings, Chinese only children are advanced in performance on a variety of cognitive tasks and in academic achievement (Falbo & Poston 1993 Jiao, Ji & Jing 1996) They also feel more emotionally secure, perhaps because government disapproval promotes tension in families with more than one child (Falbo & Poston, 1993, Yang et al 1995) Although many Chinese adults remain convinced that the one child family policy breeds self centered little emperors, Chinese only children do not differ from children with siblings in social skills and peer acceptance (Chen, Rubin & Li, 1995) Nevertheless, the one child family has both pros and cons, as dose every family lifestyle in a which American only children and their parents were asked what they liked and disliked about living in a single child family each mentioned a set of advantages and disadvantages, which are summarized in table

2. Adoptive Families :-

Adults who are infertile, who are likely to pass along a genetic disorder, or who are older and single but want a family are turning to adoption in increasing numbers. Adoption agencies try to find parents of the same ethnic and religious background as the child. Where possible, they also try to choose parents who are the same age as most natural. Because the availability of healthy babies has declined (since fewer young unwed mothers give up their babies than in the past), more people are adoption from foreign countries or taking children who are older or who have development problems.

Adopted children and adolescents whether born in a foreign country or the country of adoptive parents have more learning and emotional difficulties than do other children (Levy shiff 2001, Peters, Atkins, & Mckay 1999) There are many reasons for this trend. The biological mother may have been unable to care for the child because of problems believed to be partly genetic, such as alcoholism or severe depression and she have passed this tendency to her offspring. Or perhaps she experienced stress, poor diet, or inadequate medical care during
pregnancy. Furthermore, children adopted after infancy often lacked parental affection or experienced conflict-ridden family relationships. Finally, adoptive parents and children, who are genetically unrelated, are less alike in intelligence and personality than are biological relatives; differences that may threaten family harmony.

But despite these risks, most adopted children fare well. In a Swedish longitudinal study researchers followed more than 600 infant adoption candidates into adolescence and young adulthood. Some were adopted shortly after birth, some were reared in foster homes and some were reared by their biological mothers, who changed their minds about giving them up. Adoptees’ developed much more favorably than the other two groups (Bohman & Sigardsson, 1990). Furthermore, children with special needs usually benefit, even when they are adopted at older ages. From 70 to 80 percent of their parents report high satisfaction with the adoptive experience (Rosenthal, 1992) By adolescence, adoptees’ lives are often complicated by unresolved curiosity about their roots. Some have difficulty accepting the possibility that they may never know their parents. Others worry about what they would do if their birth parents suddenly reappeared (Grotevent & Kohler, 1999). Despite concerns about their origins, most adoptees appear optimistic and well adjusted as adults. And as long as their parents took steps to help them learn about their heritage in childhood, transracially or transculturally adopted young people generally develop identities that are healthy blends of their birth and rearing backgrounds (Simon, Altstein & Melli, 1994). Clearly, adoption is a satisfying family alternative for most parents and children who experience it. The outcomes are good because of careful pairing of children with parents and guidance provided to adoptive families by well-trained social service professionals.

3. Gay And Lesbian Families:--

Several million American gay men and lesbians are parents, most through heterosexual marriages that ended in divorce, a few though adoption or reproductive technologies (Bigner, 2000). In the past, laws assuming that homosexuals could not be adequate parents led those who divorced a heterosexual partner to lose custody of their children. Today several states hold that sexual orientation is irrelevant to custody. In others, fierce prejudice against homosexual parents still prevails.
Research on homosexual parents and children is limited and based on small sample. Nevertheless findings consistently indicate that gay and lesbian parents are as committed to and effective at child rearing as are heterosexual parents (Patterson 2001) some evidence suggest that gay fathers are more consistent in setting limits and more responsive to their children’s needs than are heterosexual fathers, perhaps because gay means less traditional gender identity fosters involvement with children (Binger & Jacobsen 1989) in lesbian families quality of mother child interaction is as positive as in heterosexual families. And children of lesbian mother regard their mothers partner as very much a parent (Brewaey et al 1997) Whether born to or adopted by their parents or conceived through donor insemination, children in homosexual families seem as well adjusted as other children. Also, the large majority are heterosexual (Allen & Burrel, 1996, Chan Roboy & Patterson 1998 Golombok & Tasker 1996).

4. Never Married Single Parent Families :-

About 10 percent of American children have parents who have never married. Of these 89 percent are mothers, 11 percent fathers (U.S. Bureaus of the Census, 2001) More single women over age 30 in high status occupations have become parents in recent years. However they are still few in number, and little is known about how their children fare.

The largest group of never married parents are African American young women. Over 60 percent of births to black women in their twenties occur out of wedlock, compared with 18 percent to white women. African American women postpone marriage more and childbirth less than do all other American ethnic groups (Glick, 1997) Job loss, persisting unemployment, and consequent inability of many black men to support a family have contributed to the postponement of marriage. Never married black mothers tap the extended family especially their own mothers, for help in caring for children (Gasden 1999). For most, marriage occurs several years after birth of the first child, not necessarily to the children biological father. Nevertheless, these couples function much like other first marriage parents. Their children are often unaware that the father is a stepfather, and parents do not report the
child rearing difficulties associated with remarriage that we will take up shortly (Ganong & Coleman, 1994)

Still, single mothers find it harder to overcome poverty. Many children in single mother homes, display problems associated with economic hardship. Also when children of never married mothers lack the warmth and involvement of a father, they achieve less well in school and engage in more antisocial behavior than do children in low income, first married families (Coley 1998, Florsheim, Tolan, & Gorman Smith 1998) Strengthening social support, education, and employment opportunities for low income parents would encourage marriage as well as help unmarried mother families.

5. Blended Families :-

Life in a single parent family often is temporary. Many parents remarry within a few years. Those cohabit, or share a renewal relational ship and residence with a partner of marriage. Parent, stepparent and children form a new family structure called the blended, or situated family. For some children, this expanded family network is positive and brings greater adult attention but for most, it presents difficult adjustments, stepparents often introduce new child rear and having to switch to new rules and expectation can be stressful. In addition, children often regard step relatives as intruders. But how well they adapt is, once again, related overall quality of family functioning (Hetherington & Kelly 2002) This often depends which parent forms a new relationship and on the children age and sex. As we will see, older and girls seem to have the hardest time.(refer to table-2)

6. Mother Stepfather Families :-

The most frequent form of blended family is a mother stepfather arrangement, since mother generally retain custody of the child. Boys adjust quickly. They welcome a stepfather who is warm and involved, who refrains from exerting his authority too quickly, and who offers relief from the coercive cycles of interaction that tend to build with their divorced mother.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTOR</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Form of blended family</td>
<td>Children living in father stepmother families display more adjustment difficulties than do those in mother stepfather families perhaps because father custody children start out with more problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children’s characteristics</td>
<td>Early adolescents find it harder to adjust, perhaps because they view the presence of a stepparent as a threat to their freedom. Also they are more likely to notice and challenge negative aspects of stepfamily living. Girls adjust less well than boys due to interruptions in close bonds with custodial parents and greater conflict with stepmothers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repeated marital transitions</td>
<td>The more marital transitions, the greater the risk of severe and long lasting adjustment problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social support</td>
<td>The ability of parents to set aside their hostilities; contact with the noncustodial parent; and positive relationships with extended-family members. Teachers, and friends lead to improved outcomes for children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mothers friction with sons also declines due to greater economic security, another adult to share household tasks, and an end to loneliness (Stevenson & Black, 1995). In contrast, girls adapt less favorably. Stepfathers disrupt the close ties many girls have established with their mothers in the single-parent family and girls often react to the new arrangement with sulky, resistant behavior (Hetherington, 1993). Note, however, that age affects these findings. Older school-age children and adolescents of both sexes display more irresponsible, acting out, and antisocial behavior than do their age mates in nonstop families. Parenting in stepfamilies particularly families with stepsiblings is highly challenging. Often parents are warmer and more involved with their biological children than with their stepchildren (Hetherington, Henderson, &
Reiss, 1999) Older children are more likely to notice and challenge unfair treatment and other negative consequences of stepfamily living, sparking conflict ridden family interaction. And adolescents are more likely to view the new stepparent as a threat to their freedom, especially if they experienced little monitoring in the single parent family (Hetherington & Stanley Hagan, 2000). About one third of adolescent boys and one fourth of adolescent girls disengage from their stepfamilies, spending little time at home. Instead, they may turn to a friend’s family (as a “surrogate”), extracurricular activities, a job or peers. When disengagement leads to positive relationships with adults and constructive pursuits, teenagers fare quite well. When is results in involvement with antisocial peers and little adult supervision, it is linked to serious difficulties (Hetherington & Jodi, 1994). For some teenagers, problems extend into adulthood. Adults from remarried families are more likely to be lower SES and to experience escalating material conflict than are those from first marriage families (Hetherington 1999b)

7. Father Stepmother Families :-

Remarriage of non-custodial fathers often leads to reduced contract, as they tend to withdraw from their “Previous” families, more so if they have daughters than sons (Hetherington & Henderson, 1997). Research reveals, however, more confusion, children typically react negatively to remarriage. One reason is that children living with fathers often start out with more problems. Perhaps the biological mother could no longer handle the unruly child (usually a boy), so the father and his new wife are faced with a youngster who has serious behavior problems. In other instances, the father is granted custody because of a very close relationship with the child, and his remarriage disrupts this bond (Buchanan, Maccoby, & Dornbusch, 1996). Girls, especially, have a hard time getting along with their stepmother. Sometimes (as just mentioned) this occurs because the girl’s relationship with her father is threatened by the remarriage. In addition, girls often become entangled in loyalty conflicts between their two mother figures. But the longer girls live in father stepmother households, the more positive their interaction with stepmothers becomes (Hetherington & Jodi 1994). With time and patience they do adjust, and eventually girls benefit from the support of a second mother figure.
8. Support For Blended Families :-

In blended families, as in divorce, multiple pathways lead to diverse outcomes. Family life education and therapy can help parents and children adapt to the complexities of their new circumstances. Effective approaches encourages stepparents to move into their new roles gradually by first building a friendly relationship with the child. Active parenting can begin only when a warm bond has formed between stepparents and stepchildren (Ganong & Colman, 2000). In addition, therapy can offer couples help in forming a “Parenting coalition” through which they cooperate and provide consistency in child rearing. By limiting loyalty conflicts, this allows children to benefit from stepparent relationships and increased diversity in their lives.

9. Repeated Marital Transitions :-

Unfortunately, many children do not have a chance to settle into a happy blended family, since the divorce rate for second marriages is higher than for first marriages. In a study of fourth grade boys, the more marital transitions children experienced the more severe and prolonged their adjustment difficulties. Furthermore, parents, with poor child rearing skills and antisocial tendencies (as indicated by arrest records, drug use, and personality tests) were particularly likely to undergo several divorces and remarriages. In the process they exposed their children to recurring episodes of high family conflict and inconsistent parenting (Capaldi & Patterson, 1991)

10. Material Employment And Dual - Earner Families: -

For many years, divorce has been associated with a high rate of maternal employment, due to financial strains experienced by single mothers. But over the past several decades, women of all sectors of the population not just those who are single and poor have gone to work in increasing numbers. Today single and married mothers are in the labor market in nearly equal proportions. Sixty eight percent of all mother are employed. This figure rises from 64 percent during the preschool year to over 78 percent in middle childhood (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2001). As in infancy the consequences of material employment for children and adolescents depend on the parent child relationship. In addition the mothers work satisfaction, the support the
receives from her partner, the children sex and the quality of child care have a bearing on how children fare:

**Maternal Employment And Child Development :-**

Children of mothers who enjoy their work and remain committed to parenting show very favorable adjustment a higher sense of self esteem more positive family and peer relations, less gender stereotyped beliefs, and better grades in school. Girls especially from the image or competence. African American adolescent girls whose mother worked during the dangers early years are more likely to stay in school (Welfare & Moe 1996). And overall dangers of employed mothers perceive the woman role as moving more freedom of choice and satisfaction and are more achievement and career oriented (Holfiman 2000). These benefit undoubtedly result from parenting practices. Employed mothers who value their parenting role are more likely to use authoritative child rearing and co regulation granting their child independence with oversight. Also children in dual earner households devote more daily hours to doing homework under parental guidance and participate more in household chores. And maternal employment results in more time with fathers, who take on greater child care responsibility (Gottfried et al 1999). Hoffman & Youngblade, 1999). More paternal contract is related to higher intelligence and achievement, nature social behavior, and gender stereotype flexibility (Gottfried, 1991, Radin 1994). However when employment place heavy demands on the mother’s schedule, children are at risk for ineffective parenting. In contrast, part time employment seems to have benefit for children of all ages, probably because it prevents work overload, thereby helping mothers meet children’s needs (Hart et el.) 1997.

**11. Support For Employed Parents And Their Families:-**

In dual earner families, the husbands willingness to share responsibilities helps mother engage in effective parenting. If the father helps very little or not at all the mother carries a double load at home and at work leading to fatigue, distress and reduced time and energy for children. Employed mothers and dual earner parents need assistance from work settings and communities in their child
rearing roles. Part time employment, flexible schedules, job sharing and paid leave when children are will help parents juggle the demands of work and child rearing. Although these supports are available in other industrialized nations, at present only unpaid employment leave is mandated by U.S. federal law. Equal pay and equal employment opportunities for women also are important. Because these policies enhance financial status and morale, they improve the way mothers feel and behave when they arrive home at the end of the working day.

1.2 Styles Of Child Rearing:-

Child-rearing styles are constellations of parenting behaviors that occur over a wide range of situations, there by creating a pervasive and enduring child-rearing climate. Ina landmark series of studies, Diana Baumrind gathered information on child rearing by watching parents interact with their preschoolers (Baumrind 1971, Baumrind &Black 1967) Her findings, along with many others that extend her work, reveal three features that consistently differentiate an authoritative parenting style from less effective, authoritarian and permissive styles. They (1) Acceptance of the child and involvement in the children life to establish an emotional connection with the child,(2) Control of the child to promote more mature behavior ,and (3) Autonomy granting to encourage self reliance (Barber &Olsen 1997,Gray &Steinberg 1999 Hart, Newel,& Olsen 2002).Table-3 shows how child-rearing styles differ in these features. Let’s discuss each style in turn.

1. Authoritative Child Rearing :-

The authoritative style is the most successful approach to child rearing. Authoritative parents are high in acceptance and involvement warm, responsive, attentive, patient and sensitive to their children needs .They establish an enjoyable, emotionally fulfilling parent–child relationship that draws the child into close connections and interaction.

At the same time, authoritative parents use adaptive control techniques. They make reasonable demands for maturity and consistently enforce those demands. In doing so, they place a premium on communication. They give reasons for their expectations and use disciplinary encounters as ‘teaching moment’ to promote the children self regulation of behavior. Finally, authoritative parents engage in gradual, appropriate
autonomy granting. They allow the child to make decisions in areas where he is ready to make choices. They also encourage the child to express his thoughts, feelings and desires. And when parents and child disagree, authoritative parents engage in joint decision making when possible. Their willingness to accommodate to the children perspective increases the chances that the child will listen to their perspective in situations where compliance is vital (Kuczynski & Lollis, 2002, Russell, Mize & Bissaker, 2002).

Throughout childhood and adolescence, authoritative parenting is linked to many aspects of competence. These include an upbeat mood self-control, task persistence, and cooperativeness during the preschool years and, at older ages, responsiveness to parents’ views in social interaction and high self esteem, social and moral maturity, achievement motivation, and school performance (Baumrind & Black 1967, Eccless et al, 1997a herman et al, 1997, Kaisa, Statting, & Nurmi 2002, Luster & McAdoo, 1996; Mackey, Aronold & Pratt, 2001; Steinberg, Darling, & Fletcher, 1995).

2. Authoritarian Child Rearing :-

Parents who use an authoritarian style are low in acceptance and involvement. They appear cold and rejecting, frequently degrading their child by mocking and putting her down and although authoritarian parents focus heavily on control of their.

Table :- 3 Features of Child-Rearing Styles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Rearing</th>
<th>STYLE</th>
<th>ACCEPTANCE AND INVOLVEMENT</th>
<th>CONTROL</th>
<th>AUTONOMY GRATING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Is warm, responsive, attentive, patient, and sensitive to the children needs</td>
<td>Makes reasonable demand for maturity, and consistently enforces and</td>
<td>Permits the child to make decisions in accord with readiness Encourages the child to express thoughts, feelings, and desires.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
explains them When parents and child disagree, engages in joint decision making when possible.

| Authoritarian | Is cold and rejecting and frequently degrades the child | Makes many demands coercively, by yelling, commanding and criticizing | Makes decisions for the child. Rarely listens to the children point of view. |
| Permissive | Is warm but overindulgent or inattentive | Makes few or no demands | Permits the child to make many decisions before the child is ready. |
| Uninvolved | Is emotionally detached and withdrawn | Makes few or no demands | Is indifferent to the children decisions making and point of view. |

Children behaviors, they, do so coercively, by yelling, commanding, and criticizing. “Do it because I say so!” is the attitude of these parents. If the child disobeys, authoritarian parents resort to force and punishment. In addition, authoritarian parents are low in autonomy granting. They make decisions for their child and expect the child to accept their word in an unquestioning manner. If the child does not, authoritarian parents resort to force and punishments. The authoritarian style is clearly biased in favor of parents’ needs; children’s self-expression and independence are suppressed. Research shows that children with authoritarian parents often are anxious and unhappy. Girls especially, appear dependent, lacking in exploration, and overwhelmed in the face of challenging task. When playing with peers, children reared in an
authoritarian climate react with hostility when frustrated. Like their parents, they resort to force when they do not get their way. Boys, especially show high rate of anger, defiance, and aggression (Baumrind, 1967, 171, Hart et al., 1998b 2002; Nix et al., 1999). In adolescence, young people with authoritarian parents continue to be less well adjusted than those with authoritative parents (Steinberg et al., 1994). Nevertheless, because of authoritarian parents’ concern with controlling their children behavior, teenagers experiencing this style do better in school and are less likely to engage in antisocial acts than are those with undemanding parents – that is, parents, who use the two styles we are about to discuss (Baumrind, 1991; Kurdek & Fine, 1994; Lamborn et al., 1991).

3. Permissive Child Rearing :-

The permissive style of child rearing is warm and accepting. But rather than being involved, such parents are overindulging or inattentive. Permissive parents engage in little control of their children’s behavior. Most of the time, they avoid making demands imposing limits. And rather than engaging in effective autonomy granting, permissive parents allow children to make many of their own decision at an age when they fell like it and which as much television as they want. They do not have to learn goods manners or do any household chores. although some permissive parents truly believe that his approach is best, many others lack confidence in their children behavior. Children of permissive parents have great difficulty controlling their impulses and are disobedient and rebellious when asked to do something. They are also overly demanding and dependent on adults, and they show less persistence at tasks than do children of parents who out more control. The link between permissive parenting and dependent, no achieving behavior is especially strong for boys (Baumrind, 1971). In adolescence, parental indulgence continues to be related to poor self control. Permissively and teenagers do less well academically, are more defiant of authority figures, and display and antisocial behavior than do teenagers whose parents communicate clear standards for.

4. Ininvolved Child Rearing:-

The uninvolved style combines low acceptance and elements with little control and general indifference to issues of autonomy. Uninvolved parents child
rearing barely exceeds the minimum effort required to feed and clothe the child often these parents are emotionally detached and depressed and so overwhelmed by the many stresses in their lives that they have no time and energy to spare for children. As a result they may respond to the children demands for easily accessible objects, but any parents strategies that involve long term goals, such as establishing and enforcing rules about social work and social behavior, listening to the children point of view and providing guidance a appropriate choices, are weak and fleeting (Maccoby & Martin, 1993).

As its extreme, uninvolved parenting is a form of child maltreatment called neglect. Its is characterize depressed parents with many stresses in their lives, such as marital concept life or no social support, and poverty, especially when it being early, it disrupts various all aspects of development, including attachment, cognition play, and emotional and social skills, Even when parental disengagement is less extreme, it is linked to adjustment problems mole scents whose parents rarely interact with them take little interest in their life at school and do not monitor their whereabouts show poor emotional self-regulation, low academic self-esteem and school performance, and frequent antisocial behavior.

**Table :- 4 Relationship of Child-Rearing Styles to Development and Adjustment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child-Rearing Style</th>
<th>Childhood</th>
<th>Adolescence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authoritative</td>
<td>Upbeat mood, high self-esteem, self-control. Task persistence, and cooperativeness</td>
<td>High self esteem, social and moral maturity, and academic achievement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoritarian</td>
<td>Anxious, withdrawn and unhappy mood, hostile when frustrated</td>
<td>Less well adjusted than agemates reared with the authoritative style, but better school performance and les antisocial behavior than agemates reared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permissive</td>
<td>Impulsive, disobedient, and rebellious, demanding and dependent on adults, poor persistence at tasks.</td>
<td>Poor self-control and school performance defiance and antisocial behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uninvolved</td>
<td>Deficits in attachment, cognition, play and emotional and social skills.</td>
<td>Poor emotional self-regulation, low academic self esteem and school performance, antisocial, behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3 Parent-Child Relationship: -

The new comer in this world depends upon the adult’s care and nurturance for his physical survival. Parents are the vital source of satisfaction of his physical and psychological needs. Whether the child is weaned early or late, fondled or ignored, praised or rebuked, is relatively less important than the beliefs, attitudes and broad predispositions be acquired from his parents. He receives a firm set of guiding values by perceiving them, expressed and endorsed by both his mother and his father. Rosen (1964) say that “parents transact value to their children in several ways explicitly through instructions and selective reinforcements or implicitly through their own behavior”. He further adds that the effectiveness with which transmission takes place differs from family to family. In some families children have values very similar to those of parents whereas in other families the value systems of parents and children differ markedly.

The foremost duty of the parents is to provide their child with need satisfaction by creating in home an emotional climate conducive to their healthy personality development. This climate is the product of cordial relationship between the two parents the personal adjustment of one parent to the other determines the general atmosphere of home. In addition to fulfilling physical needs of their child by providing food, clothing and shelter, they are also responsible to satisfy his
psychological needs for affection, security, belonging, praise and above all suitable models for behavior.

**Definition**

The parent-child relationship consists of a combination of behaviors, feelings, and expectations that are unique to a particular parent and a particular child. The relationship involves the full extent of a children development.

**Characteristics of the parent :-**

Parental self-confidence is an important indicator of parental competence. Mothers who believe that they are effective parents are more competent than mothers who feel incompetent. Also, mothers who see themselves as effective also tend to believe their infants as less difficult to handle. Parental age and previous experience are also important. Older mothers tend to be more responsive to their infants than younger mothers. In addition, parents who have had previous experience with children, whether through younger siblings, career paths, or previous children, are often times better able to cope with parenthood.

**Characteristics of the Child :-**

Characteristics that may affect the parent-child relationship in a family include the children physical appearance, sex, and temperament. At birth, the infant’s physical appearance may not meet the parent’s expectations, or the infant may resemble a disked relative. As a result, the parent may subconsciously reject the child. If the parents wanted a baby of a particular sex, they may be disappointed if the baby is the opposite sex. If parents do not have the opportunity to talk about this disappointment, they may reject the infant.

Children who are loved thrive better than those who are not. Either parent or a no parent caregiver may serve as the primary caregiver or form the primary parent-child love relationship. Loss of love from a primary caregiver can occur with the death of a parent or interruption of parental contact though prolonged hospitalizations. Divorce can interface with the children need to eat, improve, and advance. Cultural norms within the family also affect a children like hood to achieve particular developmental milestones.
Concept of parent & child in Modern World :-

The relationship between parent and child is of fundamental importance to U.S. Society, because it preserves the safety and provides for the nurture of dependent individuals. For this reason, the parent-child relationship is given special legal consideration. Increasingly, local, state, and federal governments have become more involved in the relationship, especially when a child is abused or neglected. In addition, parental roles have shifted over time, and the law has moved with these changes. Legal rights that were once the sole province of the father are now shared with the mother, and, in general the law seeks to treat parents equally.

The term child is used in the limited sense to indicate an individual below the age of majority. The more precise word for such an individual is minor, juvenile, or infant. The age of majority, which transforms a child legally into an adult, has traditionally been the age of 21 years. Many states however, have reduced the age of majority to 18 years. In 1874, a badly beaten girl known only as Mary Ellen became the first legally recognized victim of Child Abuse in the United States. Before 1874, society offered little protection for minors. Children were considered the property of their parents, and neither the government not private individual intervened when they were injured, overworked, or neglected. Mary Ellen was rescued from unfit parents only after the American Society for the prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) stepped in on her behalf. ASPCA advocates pointed out that if Mary Ellen were a horse or a dog, her mistreatment would be prohibited by statute. A judge agreed that the young girl deserved at least the same protection as an animal.

The status of U.S. children has improved dramatically since Mary Ellen’s ordeal. At the turn of the twentieth century, a national wide child protection movement helped eliminate the long hours, poor wages, and punishing conditions faced by child workers. Child Labor Laws paved the way for later reforms regarding compulsory education, foster care, protective services, HEALTH CARE, and criminal justice for juveniles. Just how far these reforms should go is the subject of debate. A mild uproar over children’s rights arose during the 1992 U.S. presidential race
between incumbent GEROGE H.W. BUSH (R) and challenge BILL CLINTON (D). Scholarly articles written in the early 1970s by Clinton’s wife, Hillary Rodham Clinton, were at the heart of the controversy. A former lawyer for the Children’s Defense Fund, Clinton questioned the traditional legal presumption of incompetence for children. She believed that children were capable making many of their own decisions; thus the proposed the elimination of minority status for children the same substantive and procedural rights enjoyed by adults. Further, because children’s interest are not always the same as their parents, Clinton felt that minors should be allowed to hire their own lawyers. During the presidential campaign, Clinton’s views were attacked by political opponents who claimed she encouraged children to sue their parents. Her critics predicted that Clinton’s ideas would lead children to “divorce” their parents over trivial matters such as curfews, homework, allowances, and household chores.

However, Clinton’s views were actually much less extreme than those of so called child liberationists who believe that children should be allowed to vote, choose their residence, refuse to attend school, enter into contracts, and take part in activates currently reserved for adults. More radical child advocates maintain that children are just as rational as adults and that the nation’s commitment to justice requires equal treatment of all people, regardless of age.

Critics of children’s rights believe conferring too many rights on children would erode parental authority and the traditional family. Many conservatives believe that children lack the wisdom to make important decision and require the guidance of responsible adults. They approve of a paternalistic approach to children’s welfare rather than one that empowers young people. Critics also resent the legal system’s intrusion into parents domain, arguing that parents are entitle to the final word in their children’s upbringing. Conservatives fear that if children have ready access to attorneys, a rash of frivolous or retaliatory lawsuits will erupt destroying many fragile families in need of help. So strong is this fear that the United States is one of only two countries (Somalia is the other) that have not ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. Among other concerns some critics have raised against children’s rights are that children could be allowed legally to join Gangs or have
ABORTIONS. Some critics have gone so far as to claim that ratification of the United Nations treaty would take control of children away from parents and hand it to the United Nations (even though the U.S. Constitution does not allow any treaty to override its precepts). Some groups, such as the Children’s Rights Council (CRC), believe that children have the “right” to be raised in a two-parent household. One CRC goal is to keep marriages together, but in the case of Divorce, it seeks to encourage parents to share custody equitably. Of the many different relationships people from over the course of the life span, the relationship between parent and child is among the most important. The quality of the parent-child relationship is affected by the parent’s age, experience, and self-confidence; the stability of the parent’s marriage; and the unique characteristics of the child compared with those of the parent.

In its most restricted use, the term parent refers only to a mother or father who is related to the child by blood. This definition holds whether the child is legitimate (the natural parents are married to each other) or illegitimate (the parents are not married to each other). As of 2003, as a result of statutes, adoptive parents have the same rights and responsibilities as natural parents. Other persons standing in the place of natural parents, such as stepparents, are not however, given such extensive rights and responsibilities to nurture a minor, they are not entitled to the full status of parent. A child is the issue or offspring of his parents. A posthumous child is one conceived prior to, and born after, the death of his father. Such a child has the same inheritance rights as a child born while his father is alive. A child is not entitled to full legal rights unless the child is born alive. The law does not ordinarily consider a fetus to be a child.

1.4 Importance of Parenting and the Parent-Child Relationship :-

What role did parenting play in determining child adjustment? How harshly a parent punished was an important determinant of how children perceived their relationships with parents. Harsher discipline was related to children’s perceptions of their parents as less warm and more rejecting. In turn, as predicted, the quality of parent–child relationships was an important predictor of child adjustment throughout this period of development. Children who enjoyed positive relationships
with their parents were less likely to engage in overt or indirect aggression, bully others, commit property offences, or affiliate with deviant peers. They also were more involved in their schoolwork, had higher self-esteem and fewer internalizing problems, and were less likely to be victimized by others. In addition, they reported fewer hyperactivity-attention problems, were more likely to use safety precautions (i.e. seatbelts and helmets), and experienced fewer serious injuries. Children who perceived their parents as rejecting were especially likely to use alcohol, to smoke and to affiliate with deviant peers.

These results are consistent with a recent analysis of NLSCY data on the role of parenting in predicting behavior problems in younger children. Miller, Jenkins and Keating (2002) found that harsh parenting was the primary determinant of behavior problems for both 2-3 and 8-9 year-olds; indeed in risk for behavior problems. Similarly, in analyses of the NLSCY data on 2-11 year-olds, Chao and Willms (2002) found that positive parenting practices (i.e. responsive, rational, firm parenting) had a variety of positive effects on children’s outcomes, including levels of behavior problems and prosocial behavior. Moreover, the positive influence of responsive parenting on child adjustment increased with children’s age. Our findings extend this work by showing that the quality of parenting continues to play a significant role in determining social and emotional adjustment as children move from late childhood to adolescence. Overall, these findings are consistent with other research on the importance of a positive parent-child relationship for adjustment (Aseltine, 1995; Smith & Krohn, 1995). These results are also consistent with previous findings that hostile punishment and coercive interactions between parents and children combined with poor parental monitoring contribute to conduct problems in preadolescence and antisocial behaviour in adolescence (Dishion, Patterson, Stoolmiller & Skinner, 1991; Conger, Patterson & Ge, 1995). Though neither the HBSC nor NLSCY studies included measures of child-parent attachment, many of the above associations between parent-child relationships and adjustment are strikingly parallel to findings in the attachment literature. Securely attached adolescents are those who perceive their parents as available and themselves as worthy of love. Insecurely attached adolescents either view themselves as unlovable or their parents as
unavailable or rejecting (Kobak, Cole, Ferenz-Gillies, Fleming et al., 1993). Specifically, securely attached adolescents have been found to be less aggressive, to have fewer conduct problems, to be less anxious and lonely, more attentive and less hyperactive, and to have better peer relations (e.g. Kobak & Sceery, 1988; Nada-Raja et al., 1992; Kerns & Stevens, 1996). Securely attached adolescents have also been found to use substances less (Cooper et al., 1998). In sum, these results suggest strongly the importance of secure adolescent-parent attachment for adolescent adjustment. Moreover, these results clarify the meaning of some age difference in adjustment. Age differences in drug use, self-esteem and risk-taking behavior could be attributed to quality of the parent-child relationship.

As noted earlier in this report, though attempting to cope with difficult, distressing child behavior many lead parents to punish more harshly, and to be more rejecting and less warm, parental rejection is likely to have stronger negative effects of child adjustment than the reverse (e.g. Simons et al., 1989). The fact that previous analyses of younger NLSCY children have linked parenting and child adjustment in a similar way (Chao et al., 2002; Miller et al., 2002) supports the present findings that parenting may play a causal role in determining child adjustment. Nonetheless, to assess the directionality of these associations, analyses of parenting and children’s development over time are necessary.

It is also possible that both parents and children’s behaviour may be a result of another factor, such as their genetic makeup. Analyses of NLSCY longitudinal data taking into account the shared family background of children in the same family will provide the opportunity to clarify both these issues regarding the link between parenting and child adjustment. Although parent-child relationships undergo a transformation during adolescence, the quality of the parent-child relationship remains important in guiding adolescent behavior choices and determining psychological health. The availability of fathers to their adolescents appears to be of added importance. A major implication of these findings is that parents, including fathers, need to recognize the continued importance of their relationship with their adolescents, despite the fact that adolescents spend less time with their families than younger children. The findings contained in this report highlight the importance of
parenting skills, such as negotiated, rather than arbitrary, limit setting, listening to adolescents opinions and ideas, appreciating adolescents efforts and consistent, rather than harsh, discipline for adolescent adjustment.

**The Effects of Social Contest:**

The relationships between parenting, parent-child relationship quality and child adjustment were similar in contexts assumed to be high risk (e.g. income inadequacy, poor maternal education, maternal employment, single-parent families, divorce). Results again confirmed the central importance of the nature of parenting and the quality of parent-child relationships for adjustment in all contexts: although children who lived in some high-risk contexts were at greater risk for negative adjustment, the impact of high-risk factors could most often be attributed to the quality of parent-child relationships, which operated similarly in both low-and high-risk contexts.

That is, it was noteworthy that maternal employment and single-parent family status did not affect child adjustment independent of parenting and the parent-child relationship. Moreover, although analyses of the HBSC data indicated that low income was significant contextual factor associated with child adjustment, results in the NLSCY data set suggested that maternal education, which was positively associated with income, was the most significant determinant of adjustment. In both data sets, however, the direct effects of these risk factors (low income or low maternal education) on adjustment were often too small to be noteworthy. Moreover, when all factors were examined together, the effects of these contextual factors seemed to operate primarily though their impact on the parent-child relationship. In the case of the HBSC data, low maternal education predicted poor family organization, which in turn predicted harsh parenting. As previously discussed, harsh parenting predicted child perceptions of low parental warmth and high rejection, which in turn predicted a host of negative adjustment outcomes. Nevertheless, there were some direct effects of social context on child adjustment, at least in the HBSC data set. Specifically, children’s perceptions of their family’s economic hardship were direly related to their frequency of bullying and difficulty in peer relations. In the NLSCY data set however, neither income adequacy nor maternal education was associated with child adjustment.
independent of parenting and the parent-child relationship. In this regard, our results differ somewhat from previous analyses on younger children in this data set. Miller et al. (2002) concluded that the relationship between socio-economic status and childhood internalizing and externalizing disorders did not significantly decline when parenting factors were taken into consideration. Both socio-economic status and parenting had independent and significant effects on childhood adjustment. Chao and Willms (2002) reached a similar conclusion; although parenting practices were found to mediate the relationship between socio-economic factors and child outcomes, mediating effects were generally small. Both Miller et al. (2002) and Chao and Willms (2002) conclude that children who grow up in poverty or under the influence of poor parenting practices are equally at risk. Based on their findings, they call for greater social investment in healthy child development though a blend of targeted and universal programs (Keating and Hertzman, 1999). There are several reasons that may account for difference between our results and previous analyses of the NLSCY data. First, our work focused on a later developmental period late childhood to adolescence—rather than early to middle childhood. It is possible that the influence of social factors, such as income adequacy, on child adjustment change with development. In this case, our findings suggest that adjustment in late childhood to adolescence is more strongly determined by parenting practices and less strongly determined by socio-economic factors than is adjustment in early to middle childhood. Another factor to consider is that our conclusions regarding the relative importance of parenting practices versus socio-economic factors are based on the use of path analyses rather than regression procedures. Like Miller et al. (2002) and Chao and Willms (2002), our regression analyses also suggested that socio-economic factors and parenting practices exerted independent effects on child adjustment. The limited direct role of socio-economic factors only became clear when we used path analytic procedures. Finally, our results were based on reports of parenting and adjustment from different sources, with adjustment reported by the children themselves, rather than by parents as in previous analyses. Parents’ perceptions of their children’s adjustment may be colored by parents socio-economic situation as well as by the parents behavior, but child reports of adjustment are colored only by the parenting they receive.
Although our results on the role of socio-economic influences on child adjustment differ somewhat from previous NLSCY analyses, we reached similar conclusions regarding the role of maternal employment. Cook and Williams (2002) found that although maternal employment status and family structure influenced parental engagement with children, the overall influence of family structure influenced parental engagement, and hence child adjustment, was weak. Even though child adjustment outcomes appeared to be largely determined by parenting and the quality of parent-child relationships, not all changes in adjustment between late childhood to mid-adolescence could be explained in this way. Independent of socio-economic and family factors, parenting practices and the quality of parent-child relationships, age and gender made a difference. Older children were more likely to have higher levels of externalizing behavior problems, lower levels of school involvement, to engage in alcohol use and smoking and to affiliate with deviant peers. On the other hand, older children felt safer going to and from school, were less victimized by others, enjoyed more positive peer relationships and were more prosocial in their behavior. Obviously, adolescent adjustment is determined by factors outside the family and parent-child relationship. Further research is required to determine whether parenting and the quality of parent-child relationships play a role in determining how other factors such as peer influences contribute to determining child adjustment. Even if parents only indirectly affect how peers, romantic partners and other social influences determine the adjustment of their children, the support of parents through the stressful challenges of adolescence remains important.

Cultural Impact:

In some countries, childrearing is considered protective nurturing. Children are not rushed into new experiences like toilet training or being in school. In other countries, children are commonly treated in a harsh, strict manner, using shame or corporal punishment for discipline. In Central American nations, toilet training may begin as early as when the child can sit upright. Childhood in the United States stretches across many years. In other countries, children are expected to enter the adult world of work when they are still quite young girls assume domestic responsibilities,
and boys do outside farm work. In addition, in Asian cultures, parents understand an infant’s personality in part in terms of the children year and time of birth.

**Impact of Birth Order:**

The position of a child in the family, whether a firstborn, a middle child, the youngest, an only child, or one within a large family, has some bearing on the children growth and development. An only child or the oldest child in a family excels in language development because conversations are mainly with adults. Children learn by watching other children; however, a firstborn or only child, who has no example to watch, may not excel in other skills, such as toilet training, at an early age.

**Infancy:**

As their parents care for babies, both parties develop understandings of the other. Gradually, begin to expect that their parent will care for them when they cry. Gradually, parents respond to and even anticipate their baby’s needs. This exchange and familiarity create the basis for a developing relationship.

**Parent-Infant Attachment:**

One of the most important aspects of infant psychosocial development is the infant’s attachment to parents. Attachment is a sense of belonging to or connection with a particular other. This significant bond between infant and parent is critical to the infant’s survival and development. Started immediately after birth, attachment is strengthened by mutually satisfying interaction between the parents and the infant throughout the first months of life, called bonding. By the end of the first year, most infants have formed an attachment relationship, usually with the primary caretaker.

If parents can adapt to their babies, meet their needs, and provide nurturance the attachment is secure. Psychosocial development can continue based on a strong foundation of attachment. On the other hand, if a parent’s personality and ability to cope with the infant’s needs for care are minimal, the relationship is at risk and so is the infant’s development. By six to seven months, strong feelings of attachment enable the infant to distinguish between caregivers and strangers. The infant displays an obvious preference for parents over other caregivers and other unfamiliar people. Anxiety, demonstrated by crying, clinging, and turning away from the stranger, is revealed when separation occurs. This behavior peaks between seven and nine months.
and again during toddler hood, when separation may be difficult. Although possibly stressful for the parents, stranger anxiety is a normal sign of healthy child attachment and occurs because of cognitive development. Most children develop a secure attachment when reunited with their caregiver after a temporary absence. In contrast, some children with an insecure attachment want to be held, but they are not comfortable; they kick or push away. Others seem indifferent to the parent’s return and ignore them when they return.

The quality of the infant’s attachment predicts later development. Youngsters who emerge from infancy with a secure attachment stand a better chance of developing happy and healthy relationships with other. The attachment relationship not only forms the emotional basis for the continued development of the parent-child relationship, but can serve as a foundation for future social connections. Secure infants have parents who sensitively read their infant’s cues and respond properly to their needs.

**Toddler hood:**

When children move from infancy into toddler hood the parent-child relationship begins to change. During infancy, the primary role of the parent-child relationship is nurturing and predictability, and much of the relationship revolves around the day-to-day demands of care giving; feeding, toileting, bathing, and going to bed.

As youngsters begin to talk and become more mobile during the second and third years of life, however, parents usually try to shape their children social behavior. In essence, parents become teachers as well as nurturers, providers of guidance as well as affection. Socialization. (preparing the youngster to live as a member of a social group) implicit during most of the first two years of life, becomes clear as the child moves toward his or her third birthday. Socialization is an important part of the parent-child relationship. It includes various child-rearing practices, for example weaning, toilet training, and discipline.

Dimensions of the parent-child relationship are linked to the children psychological development, specifically how responsive the parents are, and how demanding they are. Responsive parents are warm and accepting toward their children,
enjoying them and trying to see things from their perspective. In contrast, non-responsive parents are aloof, rejecting, or critical. They show little pleasure in their children and are often insensitive to their emotional needs. Some parents are demanding, while other are too tolerant. Children’s healthy psychological development is facilitated when the parents are both responsive and moderately demanding.

During toddlerhood, children often begin to assert their need for autonomy by challenging their parents. Sometimes, the children newfound assertiveness during the so-called terrible twos can put a strain on the parent-child relationship. It is important that parents recognize that this behavior is normal for the toddler, and the healthy development of independence is promoted by a parent-child relationship that provides support for the children developing sense of autonomy. In many regards, the security of the first attachment between infant and parent provides the child with the emotional base to begin exploring the world outside the parent-child relationship.

1.5 Different types of Parent-Child Relationships: -

There are different kinds of attachment relationships that can be put into different categories. These categories can describe children’s relationships with both parent and childcare providers. Research has found that there are at least four attachment categories. The categories describe the ways that children act and the ways that adults act with the children. The strongest kind of attachment is called ‘secure’. The way a parent or provider responds a child may lead to one of the four types of attachment categories. The way a child is attached to her parents also affects how she will behave around others when her parent is not around.

1. Secure relationships:--

This is the strongest type of attachment. A child in this category feels he can depend on his parent or provider. He knows that person will be there when he needs support. He knows what to expect.

- The secure child usually plays well with other children his age.
- He may cry when his mother leaves. He will usually settle down if a friendly adult is there to comfort him.
• When parents pick him up from childcare, he is usually very happy to see them.
• He may have a hard time leaving childcare, though. This can be confusing if the child was upset when the parents left at the beginning of the day. It does not mean that the child is not happy to see the parents.

How do adults build secure attachment relationships?
• Adult are consistent when they respond to the children needs.
• When a child cries, the adult responds in a loving or caring way.
• When a child is hungry, the adult feeds her fairly soon.
• When a child is afraid, the adult is there to take care of her.
• When the child is excited about something, the adults are excited about it, too.

Over time, a securely attached child has learned that he can rely on special adults to be there for him. He knows that if he ever needs something, someone will be there to help. A child who believes this can then learn other things. He will use special adults as a secure base. He will smile at the adult and come to her to get a hug. Then he will move out and explore his world.

Note about different cultures: - Parents and other caregivers show love in different ways in different cultures. In any culture, though, children can be have good relationships with parents and providers. In all cultures, adults can build secure attachments if they are sensitive and respond to children’s signals. They way they respond will be very different from one culture to another, however. Providers who work with children from different cultures should watch for difference. Ask parents and other people form that culture how they care for children.

2. Avoidant relationships:

This is one category of attachment that is not secure. A avoidant children have learned that depending on parents won’t get them that secure feeling they want, so they learn to take care of themselves.
• Avoidant children may seem too independent.
• They do not often ask for help, but they get frustrated easily.
• They may have difficulty playing with other children their age. They may be aggressive at times.
• Biting, hitting, pushing, and screaming are common for many children, but avoidant children do those things more than other children.
• Avoidant children usually do not build strong relationships with providers in their childcare setting.
• They don’t complain when the parents leave them, and they usually do not greet them when the parents return. They know that the parents have returned, but it is almost like they want to punish them by ignoring them.
• They seem to try to care for themselves.

What kind of parent behavior is linked to this category of attachment?
• Parents respond to their children’s needs, but it usually takes a while.
• When a child is hungry, the child will be fed, but probably after she’s been waiting for a long time.
• When a children frightened, she is usually left to deal with it on her own.
• When a child is excited about something, the parent may turn away or ignore her.
• The child gets used to not having her needs met, so she learns to take care of herself.

There are different reasons why parents might act this way. Some parents just don’t know when their baby or child needs something. Other parents might think that it will make their child more independent if the parents do not give in to the child. Providers who have an avoidant child in their care may be able to help parents recognize and understand their children’s needs.

3. Ambivalent relationships :-

Ambivalence (not being completely sure of something) is another way a child may be insecurely attached to her parents. Children who are ambivalent have learned that sometimes their needs are met, and sometimes they are not. They notice what behavior got their parent’s attention in the past and use it over. They are always looking for that feeling of security that they sometimes get.
• Ambivalent children are often very clingy.
• They tend to act younger that they really are and may seem over-emotional.
• When older preschoolers or early-elementary children want an adult’s attention, they might use baby talk or act like a baby.
• Ambivalent children seem to latch onto everyone for short periods of time.
• They have a very hard time letting parents go at the beginning of the day, and the crying may last a long time.

What kind of parent behavior is linked to this category of attachment?

• When an infant is crying, these parents sometimes respond; sometimes they don’t.
• When a child is hungry, she might be fed, but it is more likely that she will be fed when she’s not hungry.
• When a child is frightened, she is ignored sometimes and overly comforted at other times.
• When a child is excited about something, a parent doesn’t understand the children excitement or responds to her in a way that does not fit.

4. Disorganized relationships :-

Disorganized children don’t know what to expect from their parents. Children with relationships in the other categories have organized attachments. This means that they have all learned ways to get what they need, even if it is not the best way. This happens because a child learns to predict how parent will react, whether it is positive or negative. They also learn that doing certain things will make their parents do certain things.

• Disorganized children will do things that seem to make no sense.
• Sometimes these children will speak really fast and will be hard to understand.
• Very young children might freeze in their footsteps for no apparent reason.
• Most disorganized children have a hard time understanding the feelings of other children.
• Disorganized children who are playing with dolls might act out scenes that are confusing and scary.
• Disorganized children may be very hard to understand. They may seem very different from day to day.

There are two types of disorganized attachments:
1. Controlling-Disorganized, children who are controlling tend to be extremely bossy with their friends.
2. Care giving-Disorganized, children who are care giving might treat other children in a childish way, acting like a parent.

What kind of parent behavior is linked to this category of attachment.

• The parents rarely respond to their needs when they are infants.
• If the parent does respond, the response usually does not fit.
• It is common for disorganized children to come from families in which some form of neglect or maltreatment.
• It is also possible that these children may have one or more parents suffering from depression.

If you think you see a child with disorganized attachment, you may be very concerned. There are reasons to be concerned. At the same time, it is not your job to fix the family. First, try to find out what is happening in the children home. Sometimes, when a family is going through a major change (for example, a divorce, a death in to family, or a move), a parent-child relationship can look disorganized for a short time. It usually lasts only as long as the situation does. If you notice signs of disorganization that last for a long time, however, you may want to help the family.

1.6 Parenting Styles :-

Parenting has four main styles: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive (indulgent), and detached. Although no parent is consistent in all situations, parents do follow some general tendencies in their approach to childrearing, and it is possible to
describe a parent-child relationship by the prevailing style of parenting. These descriptions provide guidelines for both professionals and parents interested in understanding how variations in the parent-child relationship affect the children development.

Parenting style is shaped by the parent’s developmental history, education, and personality; the children behavior; and the immediate and broader context of the parent’s life. Also, the parent’s behavior is influenced by the parent’s work, the parents marriage, family finances, and other conditions likely to affect the parent’s behavior and psychological well-being. In addition, parents in different cultures, from different social classes, and from different ethnic groups rear their children differently. In any event, children’s behavior and psychological development are linked to the parenting style with which they are raised.

1. Authoritarian parents: -

Authoritarian parents are rigid in their rules; they expect absolute obedience from the child without any questioning. They also expect the child to accept the family beliefs and principles without questions. Authoritarian parents are strict disciplinarians, often relying on physical punishment and the withdrawal of affection to shape their children behavior. Children raised with this parenting style are often moody, unhappy, fearful, and irritable. They tend to be shy, withdrawn, and lack self-confidence. If affection withheld, the child commonly is rebellious and antisocial.

2. Authoritative Parents: -

Authoritative parents show respect for the opinions of each of their children by allowing them to be different. Although there are rules in the household, the parents allow discussion if the children do not understand or agree with the rules. These parents make it clear to the children that although they (the parents) have final authority, some negotiation and compromise may take place. Authoritative parents are both responsive and demanding; they are firm, but they discipline with love and affection, rather than power, and they are likely to explain rules and expectations to their children instead of simply asserting them. This style of parenting often results in children who have high self-esteem and are independent, inquisitive, happy, assertive, and interactive.
3. Permissive Parents:—

Permissive (indulgent) parents have little or no control over the behavior of their children. If any rules exist in the home, they are followed inconsistently. Underlying reasons for rules are given, but the children decide whether they will follow the rule and to what extent. They learn that they can get away with any behavior. Indulgent parents are responsive but not especially demanding. They have few expectations of their children and impose little of inconsistent discipline. There are empty threats of punishment without setting limits. Role reversal occur; the children act more like the parents, and the parents behave like the children. Children of permissive parents may be disrespectful, disobedient, aggressive, irresponsible, and defiant. They are insecure because they lack guidelines to direct their behavior, however, these children are frequently creative and spontaneous. Although low in both social responsibility and independence they are usually more cheerful than the conflicted and irritable children of authoritarian parents.

4. Disengaged Parents:—

Disengaged (detached) parents are neither responsive nor demanding. They may be careless or unaware of the children needs for affections and discipline. Children whose parents are detached have higher numbers of psychological difficulties and behavior problems than other youngsters.

1.7 Dimensions of Parenthood:—

The widespread prevalence of various addictions to substances, behaviors, and relationships among adults today are (sic) traced to early family of origin experiences in which poor and ineffective parenting is though to play major role. Sexual, emotional and physical abuse by parents is the result of poor preparation for parenthood and lack of adequate skills for coping with the stresses of parenting.

Shouldn’t there be a license to parent? Prevalent myths need to be deconstructed:

- There are generally smooth interactions between parents and children.
- Children improve the parents marriage.
- Children turn out well if they have good parents.
- Children are generally compliant with parents request or demands.
• Parents are solely responsible for the children character, personality and achievements.

Classroom activity: Plan a parenting course for first-time new parents. What would the curriculum include?

Parents are responsible for the well-being of their children until the age of maturity. When is that? What was the cutoff date for your family? Note that the human being has a much longer period of dependency than most other species. Recent research on the adolescent brain suggests that the brain is not completely nature until the age of 24! Parents are responsible for the socialization of the child. We must teach them to conform to the conventions to the society. They must become pro-social. They must internalize the values held in esteem by the family, the community and the culture. Unidirectional model of socialization child as active learner Bi-directional model of socialization: children influence parents as much as parents influence children. Reciprocal interaction: Give some examples of the children influence over the parents? Family systems theory is bi-directional; as children change, parents change to maintain an expected stability flow in daily functioning. The age developmental status of both parent and child affect the nature and context of this relationship. Example: what are the pros and cons being young parents? Of older parents?

The family is influenced too by the broader ecological systems that are recognized by Bronfenbrenner.

Parenthood is a social construct. Parenthood is a social expectation and adults who are not parents may be devalued by our society. What are the pros and cons of choosing to be “child free”?

Is our culture “child-centered”?

Historical Precedents:
• Plato: separate children from parents and allow the state to raise them.
• Aristotle: raise children base on their individual natures.
• Middle Ages: parenting not a high priority; dichotomous views: child as pure, child as evil.
• Rousseau: Children should be raised by allowing them to follow their own natural tendencies; maturationism; emphasized mother-child relationship and primacy of early childhood.
• Locke: environmentalism; tabula rasa; learning, interactions, experience in social and physical environments.
• Industrialization: father away from home; mother in charge of home and children; number of children decreased as they were seen as economic liabilities rather than assets.
• 20th century: Freud, Spock: promotion of permissiveness; authoritarian and restrictive (Watson); child rearing experts emerged, often contradictory, poverty, divorce, remarriage, blended families; diversity in family forms and structures.

Parenthood as a Developmental Role: Galinsky’s Six Stages of Parenthood:

1. Image-Making Stage: imagine the parent you will be.
2. Nurturing State: Successful Attachment; dealing with reality.
3. Authority State: Focus on governance and establishing boundaries.
4. Interpretative State: teaching values, skills competence in the world, ends with entrance into adolescence.
5. Interdependent Stage: Adaptation, redefinition, negotiation, limit-setting during a period of increasing independence.
6. Departure Stage: letting go, redefining relationship as adult-adult.
   Predisposing Factors that Influence Parenting Styles.

1. Cultural influences: Social class; family and peer values related to education and academic achievement; level of independence expected.
2. Development time: Young parents, more mature; parental goals may interfere with nurturing roles.
3. Primary parental functioning: providing structure (boundaries, self-esteem, safety, security, trust, values, ethics, prosocial character traits, personal responsibility, fully-functioning individual) and nurturance (unconditional love, meeting emotional needs, supportive care)

4. Family of origin influences: were your parents good model? What would you imitate/ change? What aspects of your parenting would you consider outmoded, inappropriate, unrealistic?

5. Child influences: Temperament, personality variables; P-C synchrony; effects noted in 11 areas, including, parental health, activates, employment status, financial resources, quality of relationship with spouse, intimate relationships, community interactions, life plans, values, belief systems, sens of personal control.


8. Attitudes about parenting: Specific beliefs regarding the roles.

1.8 The Changing Parent-Child Relationship

Holding their newborn infant for the first time, many parents are overwhelmed by the child-rearing responsibilities that lie a head. Many parents believe they are solely responsible for how their children “turn out”. Parents are often led to their that if they do things “right”, they will raise “perfect” adults. With this kind of expectation and pressure, it’s little wonder that the normal struggles between parents and teens take on such enormous importance. Teenage fads-teens taste in clothing or music, which is often strange to parents – may strike concerned parents as evidence they failed to raise their children properly. Where it’s baggy clothes, long hair, punkroc or body piercing, these fads are all part of teen’s efforts to set themselves apart from their parents.

Struggles between parents and teens are normal.

As the parent of a teenager or pre-teen, you may find it helps to realized that these normal struggles occur in every family. Once you know that, you can relax more and worry less about how your children are “turning out”. Chances are they will
“turn out just fine. And the rebellious teen now living in your home will grow up to be a responsible adult—just like you did. In the early years of your children’s lives, you as parents are the most important figures in their world. Your support—in the form of assurances of love and caring—is critical to your child consequently, much of what your child does and says is aimed at maintaining that love and approval. As your children get older, they have more contact with other people who also influence their behavior and attitudes. Still, parents remain central figures for most teens. In fact, one of the greatest challenges for teens as they grow to adulthood is establishing independence only becomes a problem when teens or parents view this as a struggle for control.

In general, teen maintains close relationships with their parents throughout adolescence. University of Wisconsin-Madison and UW-Extension researchers surveyed more than 50,000 teens in 40 Wisconsin counties. According to 1989-94 Teens Assessment Project (TAP) data, the majority of adolescents perceived their parents as supportive and loving. And despite typical teen objections to family rules, most teens surveyed said they believed that their parents enforced family rules fairly.

Young children need parents to guide and control many aspects of their lives. As children grow, they need to gain a sense of mastery through independence. During adolescence, the need for independence intensifies. Teens assert their desires to try new experiences and make choices on their own.

Friendships also become particularly important for adolescents. As teens spend more time with friends and less time with parents, the importance of the family mat seem to diminish. Parents may feel rejected or hurt by the behavior of their once obedient child, who may now challenge parental authority. For adolescents, the struggle for autonomy—being able to think and act independently—can be quite stressful while teens may behave in ways to assert their autonomy from the family, they still depend on parents for emotional support and stability.

It might help parents to know that teens worry about the parent-child relationship perhaps as much as parents do. According to TAP surveys, one in three teens (34%) report that they worry “quite a bit” or “very much” about their relationship with their parents. Younger teens tend to worry more than older teens about how well they are
getting along with their parents. This is not surprising, given that the tension between autonomy and parental control is greatest during early adolescence.

1.9 Parental Attitude:-

The study on childrearing practices has been the focus of research in Psychology. Attempts have been made to relate the specific child-raising practices to the development of specific personality traits. Child-raising attitude of the parents are equally important in influencing personality development of the child. Several studies pertaining to the parental attitudes towards child-raising have been conducted. (Symonds 1939; Radke, 1946; Brofenborener, 1953; Read, 1945 and others)

The above stated studies suggest that the type of infant are determine by the personality structure and that the quality of the parent child relationship, in general, and mother child relationship in particular would be of major importance in the personality development. The recent interest in the parent child relation on the personality development arouse primarily through psychotherapeutic measures with adults and the clinical studies of families by child-guidance clinics (Schaefer, E.S. and Bell R.Q. 1958) Symonds (1939), Radke (1939) and Orlansky (1949) reviewed the early studies in the field of parent–child relationship. Symonds was also of the opinion that the quality of parent child relationship is of crucial important in the personality development of the child. Since the most extensive and intensive social interaction of the child during crucial development stages occurs within the family and specially with the mother, the mother relationship would be of major importance in the personality development (Schaefer and Bell, 1958) Schudermann and Schudermann also conducted several methodological studies in this area.

1.9.1 Parental attitude towards the Girl child:

Attitude towards the Girl child can be defined as degree of positive or negative affect associated with psychology of parents. An individual who has associated negative effect to said to have and unfavorable attitude towards girl child, and with the positive attitude it’s the other way round. “Don’t kill your daughter. The government will raise her” says Union Minister for women and child development. The Government ahs appealed to women contemplating aborting female fetuses to instead bring them to full term and then hand them over. The Government introduced
“cradle baby Scheme” in the year 1992 to deal with female infanticide, which encouraged women to surrender their daughters rather than killing them.

But even the most strictly implemented law will not change the mindset, especially of the propertied classes who want sons to ‘carry on the family’ this belief that the family is somehow not complete unless there is a son has to somehow change. Multiple campaigns and awareness programmers were conduce to promote the importance of “Girl child: to encourage parents to educate their daughters, to condemn the giving and taking of dowry and to expose those in the medical fraternity who knowingly transgress the law to facilitate sex selective abortions.

**Negative attitudes**

Negative attitudes towards girl child some families think sons are assets and daughters are liability. Even well-to-do families are under pressure in to terminating a pregnancy when tests indicate that the fetus is a girl. In poor families people go to the extent of killing a girl child as soon as its is born. This is a crime according to law, a sin according to religion and an avoidable stress on the woman. What is an evaluation?

Evaluation is the process for determining whether a child has a disability and needs special education and related services. It’s the first step in developing an educational program that will help the child learn. A full and individual initial evaluation must be done before the initial provision of any special education or related services to a child with a disability, and students must be reevaluated at least once every three-year. Evaluation involves gathering information from a variety of sources about a children functioning and development in all areas of suspected disability, including information provided bye the parent. The evaluation may look at cognitive behavioral, physical and developmental factors, as well as other areas. All this information is used to determine the children educational needs why have an evaluation? A full and individual educational evaluation serves many important purposes. Identification. It can identify children who have delays or learning problems and many need special education and related services as a result Eligibility. It can determine whether your child is a child with a disability and need special education and related services. Planning an individualized education Program (IEP). It provides
information that can help the parent and the school develop an appropriate IEP for the child instructional strategies. It can help determine what strategies may be most effective in helping the child learn. Measuring progress. It establishes a baseline for measuring the children educational progress. The evaluation process establishes a foundation for developing and appropriate educational program what measures are used to evaluate a child no single test may be used as the sole measure for determining whether a child has disability or for determining an appropriate education program for your child. Both formal and informal tests and other evaluation measures are important in determining the special education and related services your child needs. Testing measures a children ability or performance by scoring the children responses to a set of questions or tasks. It provides a snapshot of a child and the children’ performance on a particular day. Formal test data is useful in predicting how well a child might be expected to perform in school it also provides information about unique learning needs. Other measures of a children growth and development, such as observation or interviews with parents and others who know the child, provide vital information on how the child functions in different Settings and circumstances. Evaluation also includes other types of information such as medical information comparisons of the children progress to typical expectations of child development observations of how the child functions in school at home, or in the community interviews with parents and school a staff as a parent, you have a wealth of information about the development and needs of your child. When combined with the results of tests and other revaluation materials, this information can be sused to make decisions about your children appropriate educational program. What types of tests are available? There are May types of tests that are used to measure student progress. Here are a few important terms parents may need to know. Group tests. Group achievement tests may not be used to determine eligibility for special services. They furnish information about how a child performs in relations to other of the same age or grade level, but they do not identify an individual student’s pattern of strengths and needs. Individual tests. Tests administered in individually to your child can clarify the special education and related services your child needs to progress in school. Curriculum-based assessments (CBAs) or curriculum-based
measurements (CBMs). These types of tests are developed by school staff to examine the progress a child has made in learning the specific materials the teacher has presented to the class. They can be useful tools for teachers and parents in determining whether learning is taking place, but they must never be used to determine eligibility for services. Standardized tests. Standardized tests are administered according to specific standards. Standardized tests can evaluate what a child has already learned (achievement), or predict what a child may be capable of doing in the future (aptitude). Norm-referenced tests. Norm-referenced tests are standardized tests that compare a children performance to that of peers. They can tell you where your child stands in relation to other children of the same age or grade. Criterion-referenced tests. These tests measure what the child is able to do or the specific skills a child has mastered. Criterion-referenced tests do not assess a children standing in a group but the children performance measured against standard criteria. They may compare a children present performance with past performance as a way of measuring progress what is functional assessment? While tests are an important part of a full and individual evaluation, sometimes what children can do or need to learn is not reflected in their scores. A functional assessment looks at how a child actually functions at home, at school, and in the neighborhood. Functional assessment for some students includes looking at reading, writing, and math skills, for others, evaluating whether the student is able to ride the city bus, dress independently, or handle money might be more appropriate. What is functional behavioral assessment? When a child has behavior problems that do not respond to standard interventions, a functional behavioral assessment can provide additional information to help the team plan more effective interventions. A clear description of the problem behavior. Observations of the child at different times and in different settings. These observations should record (1) what was happening in the environment before the behavior occurred, (2) what the actual behavior was, and (3) what the student achieved as a result of the behavior. Positive behavioral interventions, strategies, and supports to address that behavior, and to teach behavior skills. Once the functional behavior assessment has been completed, the results may be used to write a behavior intervention plan or to develop behavior goals for the individualized education program. How are evaluation results helpful
after your children evaluation is complete, you’ll meet with a group of qualified professional to discuss the results and determine whether your child has a disability under IDEA. The school must provide you with a copy of the evaluation report and a written determination of eligibility. If the team determines, based on the evaluation results, that your child is eligible for special education and related services, the next step is to develop an IEP to meet your children needs. The goals and objectives the IEP team develops relate directly to the strengths and needs that were identified through evaluation. It’s important for you to understand the results of your children evaluation before beginning to develop an IEP. Parents should ask to have the evaluation results explained to them in plain language by a qualified professional. You will want to request the evaluation summary report before meetings with other members of the IEP team to develop the IEP. Reviewing the results in a comfortable environment before developing the IEP can reduce stress for parents and provide time to consider whether the results fit their own observations and experiences with their child. When are students reevaluated? Students receiving special education services must be reevaluated if conditions warrant a reevaluation, or if the children parents or teacher request a reevaluation. The results are used to monitor the children progress in meeting the goals and objectives in his or her IEP the IEP team then decides if any additional data is needed to determine if the child continues to have a disability and continues to need special education and related services.

1.9.2 Different type of Parenting Styles on Children Impact of Parenting Attitude: -

1. Impact of parenting styles on children: -

The following charts are from the handouts included in the Alfred Adler Institute of Northwestern Washington’s Distance Training Program, Course DT304: classical Adlerian Child and Family Therapy. Most of the content in these two charts is based on the ideas developed by Hugh Misseldine in his book, Inner Child of the Past. Material has been added to reflect the Adlerian perspective of democratic parenting style.
### Table no.3

**Parenting Styles – Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parental Style</th>
<th>Image or Metaphor</th>
<th>Parental Attitude</th>
<th>Children Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Democratic and Encouraging</td>
<td>Child is seen as equal, integrated part of family, cooperative, and doing his share. He is loved and accepted. Child is offered reasonable progressive challenges and permitted to develop at his own pace.</td>
<td>Accepts children uniqueness. Provides love, respect, and feeling of equality. Encourages child to correct mistakes and develop capacities. Guides child to find significance in contribution.</td>
<td>Feels security of love and acceptance. Experiences own strength by conquering difficulties. Finds satisfaction in achievement and contribution. Not afraid to try and fail. Sees world as safe and friendly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over Indulgent</td>
<td>Child at a receiving end of a cornucopia with goods and services endlessly pouring out. Child is passive, bored and discontented in the midst of this indulgence.</td>
<td>Showers the child with presents, privileges, and services, with little regard for the children actual needs.</td>
<td>Child is bored, and indifferent. He loses initiative and spontaneity. Expects everything to come to him. Sees adults as providers of pleasure and comfort.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over</td>
<td>Child sitting</td>
<td>Submits to</td>
<td>Child insists on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Consequences</td>
<td>Implications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submissive</td>
<td>Submissive imperiously on a throne, placed there by parents who bow low. Child is active, impulsive, and demanding.</td>
<td>Children's whims, demands, temper and impulsiveness. Makes child the boss, and becomes a slave or servant. Cannot say no.</td>
<td>Having his demands fulfilled. Has tantrums, ignores the rights of others lacks any sense of limits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionist</td>
<td>Child is a perpetual runner, trying to go faster, but never finishing the race. The finish line keeps moving up.</td>
<td>Accepts child only when performance is exceptional. Very high standards,</td>
<td>Excessive striving and preoccupation with performance. Cannot meet standards, feels unworthy, may</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excessively</td>
<td>He is constantly trying to do better.</td>
<td>impossible to please.</td>
<td>give up (or develop physical symptoms such as ulcers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A giant child shouldering excessive responsibility blind to anything but work and responsibility.</td>
<td>Parents may heap excessive household, childcare, or companionship responsibilities on child because of economic circumstances, personal problems, death or illness of a parent.</td>
<td>Child may carry out burden resentfully, missing normal childhood carefree play.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recognizing and changing a dysfunctional parenting style to a more democratic one, often requires the support and insight of an experienced Adlerian psychotherapist, since the parent’s basic style of life may have to be changed as well.

**1.9.3 A Broad Approach to Parental Practices:**

Champney, an early and influential investigator in the area of parent-child relationships, expressed the opinion that parent-child behavior is too complex to be handled by the purely objective approach. He was of the opinion that the judgments of a psychologically trained home visitor should be utilized if one wishes to reflect the dynamic and interrelated influences of parental behavior on children’ psychological growth and adjustment. To this end, Champney developed a series of thirty rating scales (Fels Parental behavior Rating Scales ) for evaluating the major variables of parent behavior. Each of these was clearly defined through general definitions,
examples, and rating cues. Baldwin, Kalhorn, and Breese (1945) have published a
detrained manual for rating these different parent variables. They have presented
elaborate definition of the thirty variables, have made detailed suggestions for
obtaining relevant information on which valid ratings can be based, and have
published data supporting the substantially high reliability of the scales when they are
used by trained observers. They have further shown the descriptive and predictive
usefulness of the Fels parent Behavior rating scales in the clinical interpretation of an
individual home. Roff (1990) conducted a factor analysis by Thurston’s multiple-
group method of the Intercor relations between the thirty items of the Fels parent
behavior rating scales. He found that the following seven factors were adequate to
account for the original correlations: I. concern for child; II. Democratic guidance; III.
Permissiveness; IV. Parent-child harmony; V. sociability-adjustment of parents; VI.
activeness of home; VII. non-readiness of suggestion. It can be seen that five of these
primary factors involve parent child relationships, while the other two factors refer to
parental characteristics without direct reference to children. The relatively high
Intercor relations obtained among the first four factors led Roff to the conclusion that
“there is some indication of a ‘general goodness’ of parent-child relations running
through the four factors.” The substantial correlations between parents’ practices and
parent characteristics (independent of child relationships) also caused Roff to conclude
that the direct measurement of parental personality traits may be the most effective
single indicator of eventual personality status of children. Unequivocal data supporting
this latter conclusion are as yet unavailable. However, since parent personality is in
turn related to parent behavior, this hypothesis seems reasonable. Iorr and Jenkins
(1953) did a second order. Factor analysis of the interrelations of the seven first-order
factors extracted by Roff form the Fels parent behavior scales. They concluded that the
Fels scales could be condensed into the following significant relationships:
encouragement or denial of dependency satisfactions, democratic or authoritarian
tendencies in methods of child training, and strict orderliness or lax-unorganized
routines in the home. Milton (1946) conducted a factor analysis of forty-four parental
child-rearing behaviors. Some of the obtained factors obviously overlap the Fels
scales, while others are seemingly different. Five of the seven identified factors were
interpreted as “stable dimensions relevant to developmental theory”; strictness or no permissiveness of parental behavior, general family interaction or adjustment, warmth of the mother-child relationship, responsible child-training orientation, and parental attitudes toward aggressiveness and punitiveness. Milton’s factors overlap but are not coincident with those extracted by others like Roff (2000), Schaefer and bell (2003), and Sewell, Mussen, and Harris (2009), all agree that there are several general dimensions underlying parental behaviors in the child-rearing process. These dimensions probably vary across cultures but appear to be fairly stable within middle-class American families.

Baldwin, Kalhorn, and Breese made a “syndrome analysis” of the Fels parent behavior ratings of 125 families. This correlational-interpretative approach yielded three major syndromes (patterns) and a number of racy in the home, acceptance of the child, and indulgence. Each of these major syndromes was arbitrarily divided into “high,” “low,” and “maddening” groups, making twenty seven possible combinations or groups into which homes might be classified. Actually, some 75 per cent of the homes studied fell into only seven of these theoretical groups. The following interpretative parent-child relationships in an active rejectant, in an indulger, and in a worm democratic home.

1.9.4 The Mother’s role in child Rearing: -

In terms of time spent with the child, the mother has more opportunities than the father to influence her offspring’s psychological growth and behavior. Tradition also favors the mother’s influence, since child rearing in our culture is generally recognized as primarily the mother’s privilege and responsibility. The modern father may see his children only briefly before contrast sharply with the social life of our great-grandparents when children spent larger amounts of time with their home-bound fathers.

What are the effects of this predominantly matriarchal control of children’s behavior? How do modern mothers typically approach their child-guidance responsibilities? How do children respond to maternal guidance? One of the effects of this extreme degree of maternal attention is that both boys and girls prefer their mother’s presence when they are in personal-social difficulties. Although there are many individual
differences among children, most boy’s and girls would like to resemble the parent of
the same sex but rate the parent of the opposite sex somewhat higher in genial
disposition and character. The need for mother’s presence during psychological
conflicts appears to raise no special problem in the rearing of girl’s. However, this
response in boys has been viewed by some psychiatrists with increasing alarm. Are we
rearing generations of “Mamas’ boys?” what does it do to boys to be reared principally by their mothers, and then experience some eight years of instruction under
a majority of female teachers? Are these guidance practice consistent with the social
roles that boys are supposed to assume during adult life in our culture? There are
unambiguous answers to these questions, since maternal practices in child rearing are
extremely varied. However, there is some evidence that the overprotective mother has
an unusually deleterious effect on her son’s social and emotional growth. This
situation could be partially corrected by father’s assuming a more active role in the
rearing of their sons.

Variations in “Mothering” and Related child Behaviors:

What is the dynamic nature of mother-child interactions? Only a partial
answers can be given to this questions, since mother’s behavior patterns conditioned
by a number of variables: personal factors like health and pregnancy (Baldwin, ;
Zemlick and Waston, ), age of the child (Baldwin,), social class of the family (Davis
and Havighurst,) and a host of other factors. However, some general tendencies in
maternal behavior which are related to children’s response tendencies have been
noted.

It is generally agreed among child psychologists that the satisfaction of a basic need of
infant and child calls for an affectionate and nurturing mother. Mother differ in their
abilities to accept and display genuine affection toward their offspring. Some mothers
have extreme difficulty in expressing love and affection, and seem generally aware of
their limitation in this material function (Crandall and preston,24). Other mothers
attempt to play the role of the affectionate giver of nurturance even though it be
foreign to their usual regard toward others. This adopted role usually it be foreign to
their usual regard toward others. This adopted role usually results in cancellation
between excessive devotion and cool detachment (mark, ) and ultimate bewilderment
and confusion by their offspring. This mother’s ability to give love and affection is probably related to many antecedent conditions in her own childhood. For example, Hart found that mothers with authoritarian attitudes used fewer love-oriented controls over their children than non-authoritarian mothers. Lasko found that mothers are generally less warm and affectionate toward their first child as compared with their second born. Their attempts to be “good” mothers result in more restrictiveness and coerciveness toward the first born which seems to inhibit a warm, relaxed enjoyment favorable to the expression of affection and full acceptance.

A low level of maternal affection prolongs the period of child dependency. It is as if the child who is unsure of his mother’s affection needs continuous reassurance of her concern and is thereby bound to her for aid, approval, and attention. Overprotection (regarded by most psychologists as a symptom of maternal rejection of the child) tends to produce over dependency in the child.

Sears and colleagues have shown that maternal child-rearing practices are significantly related to the development of both dependency and aggressiveness in young children. The kinds and amounts of frustration seemed to be the most significant variables influencing children’s needs for dependency and aggression. They noted differential maternal treatment of boys and girls that was associated with sex differences in dependency and aggression. However it is difficult to know whether the mothers were responding differentially to the boy’s and the girl’s “natural” tendencies or they were responding differentially to her “natural” treatment of them. Dameron has shown that mothers may be very permissive about many “irregularities” in child behavior yet be very restrictive of any behaviors that “smack of aggressiveness or destructiveness.” Maternal restrictiveness toward child aggression may very well be different for boys and girls. Despite the narrowing of the gap between male and female roles in the American culture there are probably still some remnants of the once stanch belief that aggressive assertiveness is a masculine characteristic worthy of selective nurturance during childhood. Although interpreted otherwise of by the authors, the findings of Levin and Turgeon are consistent with this hypothesis. The found that boys display more aggression than girls during doll play and that both boys and girls increase in aggressiveness during the second session.
of doll play when the mother is present—as contrasted with a decrease in aggressiveness when a stranger is present. These findings could be interpreted as perceived maternal permissiveness for aggressive acts since the mothers did nothing in the doll play session to inhibit this form of behavior. It seems possible, and probable, that further investigation would show that boys are selectively sensitive to those forms of aggressiveness which are permitted them but denied to girls.

Tucker recorded the practices of eleven mothers and the behavior of fourteen children in a cooperative, home nursery school in which each mother serves her turn as an assistant teacher. This situation provided an opportunity for the experimenter to observe each mother’s responses to, and attitudes toward, her own child (or children) as contrasted with her behavior toward other children. It was found that the “average” mother made greater use of the following practices when interacting with her own child: seeks information, offers explanations, encourages, commends, warns, and overlooks. When interacting with other children, the “average” mother made greater use of the following practices: impedes, directs, urges, forces, discourages, diverts attention, and reassures. It can be seen that the “average” mother of this group was more personal, sympathetic, and democratic toward her own child—probably identifying her own feelings and needs more directly with her own offspring! This tendency of mothers to be sympathetic and democratic with their own children is a wholesome sign from a mental hygiene point of view; however, this positive attitude is subject to many variations as the findings of the following investigation reveal.

Merrill conducted an ingenious study with thirty mothers and children which throws some much needed light on the dynamic aspects of mothers’ changing behavior patterns. In this research the interactions of each mother-child pair in a standardized play situation were recorded the control group were observed for two half-hour periods under the same experimental conditions. The fifteen mother-child pairs in the experimental group were first observed for a half-hour period under the same conditions as the control group. Then the experimental mothers were told individually it was assumed that this mild form of criticism would increase the mothers’ motivation to have their children make a better showing in the next play session. The results of this research showed that the control mothers did not vary their
behavior patterns form the first to the second play session. In contrast, the experimental mothers showed significant increases in the following; directing, interfering, criticizing, and structuring changes in activities. It appears that outside criticism of the children behavior generally increases the mother’s motivation to have her child accepted and praised by all his associates. Under this increased motivation middle-class mothers of the type studied by Merrill tend to assume direct control of the child behavior in an authoritarian manner. Authoritarian interference by the mother in the children activities would appear to be produced by many different kinds of criticism, e.g., critical suggestions from grandparents, other relatives, neighbors, teachers, youth leaders and the like. Anyone who may wish to extend the democratic practices of a given mother can reflect profitably upon these findings. An outsider’s critical evaluation of child behavior will probably increase rather than decrease parental authoritarian controls! We can only surmise that criticism of current parent practices in child management would have similar effects. Research on the most effective and appropriate procedures for altering maternal attitudes behavior is so rely needed.

Some psychologists have proposed a drastic solution to instances of inadequate or deleterious mothering. For example, Moloney has expressed the view that some mothers are incapable of loving their children and that conditions could be greatly improved by the substitution of surrogate mothers who have the capacity to meet the needs of these unfortunate children. Moloney cites two classes of mothers who are often inadequate in their maternal functions: the career woman who tends to be overprotective, tense, and demanding of the child; the career woman who has motherhood forced upon her and tends therefore to be despotic and regimented in the rearing of her child. Moloney calls for a giving up of sanctimonious, “hallowed” attitudes toward women who are mothers in name only. What are the characteristics of mothers who predispose their children toward future unhappiness and mental illness? Block and research associates studied the mothers of matched pairs of neurotic and schizophrenic children in an effort to secure a partial answer to this question. They found that the mothers of neurotic children tended to be uncertain, submissive, tormented by worry and guilt, and in constant need of reassurance. The mothers of
schizophrenic children tended to be hostile, selfish, sarcastic, distrustful, and competitive. In a study of mothers of clinic children as contrasted with mothers of “well-adjusted,” happy children, Law concluded that both groups of mothers experienced problems, uncertainties, conflicts, and anxieties. However, the mothers of clinic children were largely symptoms of deeper conflicts. The findings of these investigations suggest why parent education programs are so often ineffective in modifying child-rearing practices. The inadequate mother is often a psychologically disturbed person in need of individual psychotherapy rather than additional knowledge about more wholesome ways of rearing her children. She is typically unable to assimilate advice and encouragement.

1.9.5 The Measurement of Parental Attitudes Toward Child-Rearing Practices:

Parental attitudes toward child-training procedures and desirable undesirable forms of child behavior have been investigated through many different avenues: questionnaires, interviews, pencil-and-paper tests, and inferences based on the direct observation of parents’ behavior (Stogdill). Since parental attitudes are one step (although an important one!) removed from parental behavior, a somewhat less close relationship might be expected between parental attitude and children’s behavior than between parental practices and children’s behavior. The research evidence tends to support this theoretical deduction (Read). The only advantage in attempting to relate children’s behavior to parental attitudes rather than to parental practices is that parental attitudes are typically more accessible for measurement and evaluation. It is obviously less time consuming and less expensive to talk with parents in an interview or to have them respond to attitude tests than it is to visit their homes often enough for reliable and valid judgments of parent practices in child care. Shoben demonstrated that it is possible to develop a parental attitudes scale which will reliably differentiate the mothers of problem children and the mothers of problem children. This scale in its final form consisted of eighty-five items which were classified into Dominant, Possessive, Ignoring, and Miscellaneous categories. When this final scale was administered to twenty mothers of problem children and twenty mothers of no problem children, the point-bacterial correlations for the total scale and the subscales
ranged from .624 to .769. Shoben's attempt to relate parental attitudes to the Fels Parent Behavior Rating Scales failed for lack of home judges cooperation. One of Shoben’s analyses showed that both the mothers of problems children and of no problem children differed significantly in attitudes from the “ideal” parent (the composite of eight clinical psychologists’ judgments of the attitudes of the ideal parent). Although the mothers of no problem children showed the smallest deviations from the “ideal” even their attitudes could stand substantial improvement from the clinicians viewpoint.

The Parent Attitude Survey developed by Shoben has failed to yield uniformly significant predictive information in other investigations. Bornston and Coleman found the Survey mildly predictive of college students’ aggressive tendencies but the few significant correlations were extremely. Low – there was some evidence that domineering or ignoring mothers tended to have offspring with higher hostile aggression scores. Gordon found that scores on the Parent Attitude survey were not significantly related to rating of maternal behavior based on extensive observations of mother-child interaction during a twelve-day camp program for deaf preschool children. Burchinal failed to find a significant relationship between Shoben’s scale and the Porter scale of parental acceptance of children. Buechinal also found that fourteen out of sixteen correlations between the Shoben scale and children’s personality scores (as measured by the California and Rogers scale) were non significant. The two that were significant were in a direction opposite to expectation.

Schaefer and bell have recently developed a Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI) that may turn out to be more useful than the older Shoben Parent Attitude Survey. The PARI in its final form consists of twenty-three subscales of five items each. subscales were carefully selected on the basis of available research evidence and refined psychometric procedure. The negative correlations obtained between many of these subscales and mothers’ level of education are interpreted as promising evidence for the validity of the instrument- “mothers of higher education having more usually approved attitude towards child – rearing.” “It is suggested that logically, psychologically, and empirically homogeneous scales of attitudes toward child-rearing will be useful in investigating theories of the influence of maternal
attitudes upon development of the child.” Estimates of the reliability of the subscales PARI range from 0.37 through 0.85. The subscales have been given the following types of labels: suppression of aggression, infantilization, harsh punishment, fostering dependency, rejection of the homemaking role, and so on through the total of the twenty-three categories. Sample items to which respondents express their attitudes (strongly agree, mildly disagree, or strongly disagree) are: “A child should be taught to avoid fighting no matter what happens.” “Strict discipline develops a fine strong character.” “Mothers sacrifice almost all their own fun for their children.” Zuckerman and collaborators (134) administered the PARI to 222 mothers and factor-analyzed the matrix of intercorrelations among the twenty-three subscales. The following three factors were extracted: authoritarian-control, hostility-rejection, and democratic attitudes. The usefulness of this rigorously developed instrument awaits determination.

1.9.6 The Influence of Parental Attitudes On Child Behavior:

In an early investigation Ayer and Bernreuter found some interesting relationships between child behavior (as measured by the Merrill-Palmer personality Rating Scale) and parental practices of child discipline (as reflected by the parents’ verbal remarks and attitudes in interviews). They found that physical punishment tends to orient the child away from reality, and to make him more dependent upon adult affection and attention. When children are permitted to profit from their own mistakes with a minimum of adult interference and punishment, they tend to have more attractive personalities, i.e., are more sociable less dependent on adults, better able to face reality. Extreme parental punitiveness appears to bind the child to the parent in an abnormally dependent and emotional way. Although some parents may prefer this kind of parent-child relationship, clinical evidence indicates that their children will have greater difficulty in adjusting to school and community life. Trapp and Kausler found that either high or low parental dominance produced more avoidance behavior among nursery school children than did a moderate amount. Probably high dominance generates resentment and withdrawal while low amounts may be interpreted as a lack of parental concern. Watson found that greater freedom provided by parents tended to be associated with more child initiativeless hostility, and higher levels of spontaneity and originality.
Radke investigated the effects of parental attitudes and practices on preschool aged children’s behavior by a variety of research techniques. The parents (both fathers and mothers) of forty-three nursery-school and kindergarden children responded to extensive questionnaires, and were interviewed about their attitudes and practices in the area of child discipline and parental authority. Behavioral data on the preschool children were obtained through teachers’ ratings, interviews with the children, and several experimental and projective situations. When parents’ reports on discipline in their childhood were compared with the discipline now given their children, there was evidence of a decrease in autocratic methods of control, a decrease in emotionality during disciplinary actions, an increase in parent-child rapport, and an increase in fathers’ responsibility for the discipline of young children. The latter is probably related to the professional and semiprofessional occupational status of the fathers in this study. Despite the parents’ conception of an increase in fathers’ authority, the children still perceived the mother as the more influential authority in their lives. The children’s responses in both the interview and the doll-play situation reflected a preponderance of material supervision. In the interview, the father was perceived as somewhat more punitive, whereas in the projective play the mother was reflected as the more punitive. There was some indication that the father’s punishments were more severe which may have influenced the interview responses. In contrast to Radke’s findings, Jackson found mothers more coercive than fathers although the mothers did vacillate more between mild and severe methods. The latter vacillation was interpreted as due to role conflicts among mothers—the warm, loving, nonpunitive mother-role versus the responsible, socializing mother-role.

Although the majority of the children studied by Radke accepted their parents as “rightful authorities,” and generally agreed on the propriety of the disciplinary procedures used in their homes, they believed that punishment did not motivate them toward better behavior. The kinds of punishment employed by these “superior” parents. It can be seen that verbal appeals, rewards and praise, isolation, depriving, and letting the child suffer the natural consequences of his behavior occurred most frequently in parental disciplinary actions. However, spanking, shaming, and other “negative” approaches were not uncommon.
The children in this study reported a number of methods by which they “controlled” their parents. It can be seen that in their opinions direct refusals and whining or begging were the most effective methods of avoiding parental controls and getting what they wanted. Ignoring parental requests and crying were less effective methods. These data reflect basic parental attitudes might studied with profit by young children!

What effects do different methods of parental discipline have on childrens preschool behavior? Radke found that the children from homes in which an autocratic discipline prevailed were rated by their teachers as more unpopular with associates, more quarrelsome, more unstable emotionally, more daring and uninhibited, more sensitive to praise and blame, and less considerate of others than children from “democratic” homes. There was also some evidence that the children from the “autocratic” homes tended to dominate their associates more than children from democratic homes. The behavior characteristics of the children from autocratic homes could be partially deduced from a frustration aggression hypothesis. There is no way of knowing whether these behavior patterns were temporary and situationally determined by the nursery school atmosphere, or whether they became enduring behavior characteristics which were carried over into later life. From what is known about the psychology of social adjustment, we can deduce somewhat permanent effects of an authoritarian home on childrens eventual “style of living.” Our the basis of a careful reviews of the research literature on parent-child relationships Radke summarized the kinds of child behavior most commonly associated with different types of homes. Excerpts from her summary are positive fruits of child acceptance, consistent discipline, well adjusted parents, and parent-child companionship. The undesirable outcomes of child rejections, “beying, domination, poorly adjusted parents, and inconsistent discipline are also demonstrated. Although some of the investigations on which these concomitant relationships were based have serious scientific flaws, the general picture is probably a valid one. Staples and Smith have presented evidence suggesting that mothers of today as contrasted with their rearing attitudes. This is probably a favorable change, according to Abbe, who found high maternal restrictiveness associated with emotional disturbance among children.
However, the case is not clear because Abbe found the same undesirable results associated with maternal laxity and overindulgence. How far toward laxity has the greater permissiveness of today’s mothers moved them?

What are some of the personality and situational factors that tend to produce different patterns of attitudes among fathers and mothers toward the rearing of their children? Porter found a significant positive relationship between marital adjustment and parental acceptance of children. Block has noted that restrictive fathers tend to be submissive, suggestible individuals with little self-assurance, while permissive fathers are more self-reliant and ascendant. Lakin found that mothers of colicky infants (less adequate mothers) had stronger feelings of inadequacy, less favorable attitudes toward marriage and motherhood, and stronger feelings of rejection than mothers of normal, well-adjusted infants. It would appear that a happy marriage in which the father has reasonably high family status and the mother is freely accepting of her feminine role favors child acceptance and wholesome attitudes toward the responsibilities of child rearing.

A harmonious home in which consistent, democratic child-care procedures predominate would appear to be a desirable goal toward which all parents should strive in terms of their own happiness as well as that of their children. Well-adjusted parents have a high probability of rearing well-adjusted children. Nevertheless the further education of well-adjusted parents may enable them to carry on a more effective program of social guidance by showing them ways and means of doing those things toward which they are already naturally inclined. The child-rearing practices of poorly adjusted parents are likely to be defective at the base, and it is doubtful that any amount of educational “tinkering” at the superficial fringe will do much to alter them. Human behavior at the adult level is extremely resistant to change. Very often, the best that can be done is to help children live with “difficult” parents.

In present study researcher have been compare the parent-child relationship and parental attitude of boys and girls in single child families with special reference to urban and rural areas parents of Aurangabad district.