



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695

ISSN (P): 2349-8242

NAAS Rating: 5.03

TPI 2020; 9(3): 600-605

© 2020 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 17-01-2020

Accepted: 19-02-2020

Arti Kumari

Research Scholar, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Home Science, G.B.P.U.A.T., Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

Effects of family type on adolescents' perceptions of parent-adolescent relationship among families of different social class

Arti Kumari

Abstract

This study focused on the effects of family type on adolescents' perceptions of parent-adolescent relationship among Families of G.B.P.U.A. &T., pantnagar. The present study investigate effect of family type on adolescents' perceptions of parent-adolescent relationship from four different social classes Class I, Class II, Class III, and Class IV of G.B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar, Uttarakhand. Forty adolescents were randomly selected as respondents from each social class of families making a total of 160 adolescent respondents for the analyzing the effects of family type on adolescents' perceptions of parent-adolescent relationship among families of G.B.P.U.A. &T., Pantnagar. The results show that respondent showed high significant difference in the domains protecting, symbolic punishment, demanding, symbolic reward and object reward with their relation across nuclear and joint family type of class I and II as compared to class III and IV but in case of extended family type high significant difference was found in class II as compared to class III and IV. Whereas, rejecting, object punishment, indifferent and neglecting among family types of class III and class IV have high level of significant difference.

Keywords: Family type, adolescent, parent-adolescent relationship, protecting, symbolic punishment

Introduction

As the child enters teenage years, parent adolescent relationship sparks transformations change in the biological, cognitive, personality and emotional level of an adolescent. The transition consents with parent's transition into mid-life and this, in turn, may introduce additional challenges for the family member that falls over into the parent-adolescent relationship for the adolescence in many families. Adolescence is a storm and stress phase in life during which important physical, psychological and other changes occurs. The transition phase into adolescent can bring of insecurity, helplessness, uselessness, isolation and psychosomatic problems such as nervousness, worry, frustrations and emotional distress in the day to day life. These changes can have a negative impact on the parent-child relationship. In addition to this, decline in parental support may result in deteriorations in parent-child relationships, which may lead to troubles, such as academic stoppage, low self-esteem, misconduct behavior, stress, unhappiness, anxiety, and negative psychological problem as well as poor relationship with adolescent. According to Erikson (1968) ^[13], the main and most important developmental tasks for young people are to solve the identity versus role confusion crisis, construct their own inimitable sense of identity, and find the social surroundings where they can undergo right and create meaningful relationships with other people and their families (Chen *et al.*, 2007). Family problems during adolescence are to be expected, and may even serve an important developmental purpose (Santrock, 2014) ^[15]. However, teens who experience high levels of disagreement and low levels of support from their parents as well as from family are more likely to take on risk behaviors such as early drug addiction or drinking and smoking and are more likely to struggle with depressive symptoms (Dodge *et al.* 2006) ^[10]. Family is the most significant group in society and immediate social environment to which an adolescent is developed and exposed. Instruction method is very complex in adolescence period of "storm and stress". All type of changes take place in this period of life and affect the adolescent at a very great extent. Every child is unique in it and has its own rate of growth and development. As the child grows up, his relationships and family relationship changes and continues till adolescence. Adolescence is that critical phase of human development during which sudden organic, psychological and social alterations take place. This period inscription the end of childhood and sets the foundation for maturity. According to Sinha and Singh (2005) ^[14],

Corresponding Author:

Arti Kumari

Research Scholar, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, College of Home Science, G.B.P.U.A.T., Pantnagar, Uttarakhand, India

in the emotional adjustment area the girls of both joint and nuclear family were found greater adjusted than boys of both joint and nuclear family and the girls of joint family were extra emotionally adjusted than girls of nuclear family. In the same way the girls were establish better adjusted in social area. In the field of educational adjustment the girls were also better adjusted than boys. The mean scores of total adjustment of boys and girls of both family type shows that the adolescents of joint family were found better adjusted the adolescents of nuclear family. Over all the girls of joint family relations were found better adjusted than other adolescents. Adolescence is an important developmental phase along the path to adulthood, years during which adolescence become more and more independent from their families. Yet parents and other family members still play a critical responsibility in the promotion of adolescents' well-being, by providing a positive support system within which adolescent can explore their changing identity. In present days many types of families have come in survival such as joint family, nuclear family, divorced and single parent.

Eliot and Gray (2000) ^[12] stated that all family type bear a strong relationship that influences the life delineates of their members. These relationships are chief and secondary in nature. In the nuclear family main and direct relationship exists between the two generations living together while the joint family setup has an indirect and secondary kind of relationship with its members. Lopata (1973) ^[17] opinion that family type has a lot of important functions; it provides support, stimulating and strong intimation. Thus both joint and nuclear family groups have some obligations and functions regarding their children's academic and social success. Virginia Cooperative Extension (2009) ^[19] suggested that family type acts effectively in shaping the personalities and developing life skills among the adolescent. It means that family structure and the environment of a family can provide adolescent and provide confidence that is necessary for the academic achievement and goal achievement. Adolescence is a critical point in the existence course for accomplishing key developmental tasks. As children grow into adolescence, they desire greater independence and expend increasing amounts of time with peers (Furstenberg, 2000) ^[11]. When these relationships remain emotionally close, however, parents maintain to be valuable resources for their children. In addition, a positive home environment and better relationship with family can promote positive adolescent personality development and other development (Cavanagh, 2008; King, Boyd, & Pragg, 2016) ^[5, 16]. Adolescents still need their families as facts from which to move out into the world and gain independence and autonomy (Chubb & Fertman, 1992) ^[7].

Family members and parents in exacting can help meet this need in children by providing love and affection. A positive home environment and authoritative parenting styles in which children feel integral and supported, and where family members share pleasant experiences together, can also help children intellect that they fit in to the larger family group.

Above discussion clearly reflects that effect of family type on Adolescents' perceptions of parent-adolescent relationship among families of G.B.P.U.A. &T. However, the main interest in present study is to explore the effects family type on adolescents' perceptions of parent-adolescent relationship among families of G.B.P.U.A. &T.

Thus, the present study has been taken up with following

objectives:

- To investigate the effect of family type on adolescents' perceptions of mother-adolescent relationship among families of G.B.P.U.A. &T.
- To investigate the effect of family type on adolescents' perceptions of father-adolescent relationship among families of G.B.P.U.A. &T.

Methodology

Locale

The study was conducted exclusively in G.B Pant University of Agriculture and Technology, Pantnagar. The sample for the present study was selected randomly from the five schools running in the university, of G.B.P.U.A& T., Pantnagar. Name of the five schools, viz; Campus School, Government Girls Inter College (GGIC), Pantnagar Inter College (PIC), Balnilyam Junior School, and Saraswati Shishu Mandir.

Sample

The research study was carried out exclusively in G. B. Pant University of Agriculture & Technology Pantnagar. The respondents for the study were the adolescents studying in class 7th -9th standard of the various schools situated in Pantnagar. Out of the total eight schools situated in Pantnagar, only five schools could be purposively included in the study since these schools provided education up to intermediate level. All the adolescents studying in class 7th to 9th standard of the selected five schools were taken up as respondents for the present study, and classified into four categories on the basis of their parents' employment class (Class I, Class II, Class III, and Class IV) in the university. Out of four categories of class, 40 students were randomly selected from each class as respondents for the present study. The total sample for the present study comprised of 160 adolescents.

Research Tools

Self-designed socio-demographic questionnaire was used to study the socio-demographic characteristics of respondents. Parent child relationship of the respondents was assessed using Parent Child Relationship Scale developed by Nalini Rao. This 100 items scale measures parent child relationship contains ten dimensions, that is, Protective (PR), Symbolic punishment (SP), Rejecting (REJ), Object punishment (OP), Demanding (DEM), Indifferent (IND) Symbolic reward (SR), Loving (LOV) Objects reward (OR), Neglecting (NEG). Respondents were asked to rate their own perception of relationship with either mother or father on five point scale choice from always to rarely using 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 scoring points, respectively. The scale is scored separately for each of the parent, thus, every respondent gets ten score for mother or father form on the ten dimensions of the scale. Scoring was done with the help of assessment manuals.

Data Collection

The investigators approached the school principals through a letter of request from the department which clarified the purpose of the study. After the permission for the study in the selected schools was approved by their respective principals, the investigators carry on the respondents in a group of 4 to 5 in the school itself. Firstly the purpose of the study was made clear to them. Then, they were requested to give honest responses and they were positive that their identity would be kept confidential and information provided by them would be

used only for research work. After the selection of the eligible subjects, self-prepared background information Performa was administered to collect the detailed information about the features which have strong way on research variables. Parent Child Relationship Scale was also administered in the classroom setting to each subject individually after providing necessary instructions. The data collected was classified and tabulated in accordance with the objectives to arrive at meaningful and relevant inferences. The data was analyzed using statistical techniques like frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation and ANOVA.

Results and Discussion

Mean differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with mother across family type in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar

The data presented in Table 1 shows the mean difference of adolescents' relationship with mother across family types among different social classes. The association of relationship with mother's aspect in families from different social classes are represented which depicts significant difference in all the domains of mother adolescent relationship in the families except in loving. It is evident from the table that domains that are protecting, symbolic punishment, demanding, symbolic reward and object reward of relationship among nuclear family types of class I and class II has high level of significant difference. Whereas the rejecting, object punishment, indifferent and neglecting domain that is among nuclear family types of class III and class IV have high level of significant difference. Similar results were found with joint and extended family type's respondents among four different social classes.

Mean differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with father across family type in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar

In Table 2 mean difference of adolescents' relationship with father across family types among different social classes is shown. The association of relationship with father's aspect in families from different social classes are represented which depicts significant difference in all the domains of father-adolescent relationship in the families except in loving. It is evident from the table that domain that is protecting, symbolic punishment, demanding, symbolic reward and object reward among nuclear family types of class I and class II has high level of significant difference. Whereas the domain that is, rejecting, object punishment, indifferent and neglecting among adolescents' of class III and class IV have high level of significant difference. This is due to the fact that fathers provide ease to their children and avoids punishment which later on results that children do not feel scared of their father. Furthermore, it results in conflicts and development of domain rejecting, object punishment and neglecting in relationship. Main reason is that the parents fail to teach appropriate way to behave and respond to their children. Family size also has its own effect on students' academic achievement. Muola (2010) and Akhtar (2012), underlined that, a parent with a small family will not only easy to provide for the physical needs of the child, but will also be in a position to give attention, encouragement, stimulation and support with school work. Parents' behaviors can affect adolescent relationship in several ways including family types contributing to healthy or unhealthy environments for their overall development. A family's socioeconomic status remains a topic of great interest to those who study children's development. This interest derives from believing that high socioeconomic status families afford their children place in order goods, parental actions services and social connection that many low socioeconomic status access to those same resources and experiences, thus putting them at risk for developmental problems (Linver *et al.*, 2004).

Table 1: Mean differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with mother across family type in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar

mother-adolescent relationship	Social Class I (n ₁ =40)		F Cal. (C.D)	Social Class II (n ₂ =40)			F Cal. (C.D)	Social Class III (n ₃ =40)				Social Class IV (n ₄ =40)			
	Nuclear (n _{1a} =38)	Joint (n _{2a} =02)		Nuclear (n _{1b} =38)	Joint (n _{2b} =01)	Extended (n _{3a} =01)		Nuclear (n _{1c} =32)	Joint (n _{2c} =06)	Extended (n _{3b} =02)	F Cal. (C.D)	Nuclear (n _{1d} =17)	Joint (n _{2d} =12)	Extended (n _{3c} =11)	F Cal. (C.D)
Protecting	44.92 ^a	44.50 ^a	13.19** (4.4)	46.06 ^a	43.26 ^a	39.10 ^a	12.77** (3.5)	35.00 ^b	34.20 ^b	30.30 ^b	6.19* (2.40)	25.15 ^c	26.54 ^c	18.66 ^c	3.19* (1.40)
Symbolic Punishment	39.61 ^a	43.25 ^a	15.92** (4.7)	36.86 ^a	37.46 ^a	39.46 ^a	15.77** (4.5)	30.00 ^b	30.87 ^b	31.87 ^b	9.22* (2.7)	20.40 ^c	23.54 ^c	25.54 ^c	4.22* (1.7)
Symbolic Reward	39.56 ^a	39.35 ^a	47.64** (7.79)	49.07 ^a	45.26 ^a	40.60 ^a	46.14** (6.90)	33.56 ^b	31.33 ^b	30.95 ^b	10.83** (3.5)	17.35 ^c	14.00 ^c	12.44 ^c	4.83* (1.5)
Loving	45.11	37.90	1.99 (2.3)	40.03	38.48	35.72	1.97 (1.4)	39.83	38.09	35.32	1.52 (2.97)	39.32	37.74	36.80	1.52 (2.97)
Object Reward	37.11 ^a	40.95 ^a	27.15** (5.9)	39.57 ^a	39.13 ^a	37.00 ^a	26.05** (4.99)	29.20 ^b	27.73 ^b	26.30 ^b	14.37** (3.4)	14.42 ^c	14.36 ^c	12.22 ^c	4.37* (1.4)
Negative domains															
Rejecting	18.75 ^a	20.00 ^a	3.08* (1.9)	18.80 ^a	20.96 ^a	30.50 ^b	4.07* (1.04)	25.87 ^b	27.06 ^b	30.50 ^b	19.08** (2.92)	31.82 ^c	35.90 ^c	36.89 ^c	39.08** (4.90)
Object Punishment	17.06 ^a	19.18 ^a	3.35* (1.6)	17.15 ^a	19.95 ^a	30.40 ^b	3.46* (1.09)	29.18 ^b	29.66 ^b	30.40 ^b	6.15* (2.06)	36.40 ^c	38.54 ^c	40.78 ^c	26.15** (5.01)
Demanding	45.49 ^a	43.54 ^a	25.54** (6.6)	45.47 ^a	43.42 ^a	23.50 ^b	25.17** (5.7)	33.32 ^b	32.68 ^b	23.50 ^b	13.94** (2.6)	19.10 ^c	17.90 ^c	12.45 ^c	3.94* (1.6)
Indifferent	15.65 ^a	14.90 ^a	5.07* (1.76)	28.56 ^a	28.00 ^a	29.70 ^b	6.19* (1.8)	43.95 ^b	41.17 ^b	29.70 ^b	13.20** (2.21)	43.97 ^c	41.27 ^c	36.30 ^c	23.20** (4.21)
Neglecting	11.05 ^a	13.29 ^a	2.52* (0.94)	11.72 ^a	13.39 ^a	29.62 ^b	3.39* (1.09)	21.27 ^b	23.55 ^b	29.62 ^b	6.19* (1.4)	33.42 ^c	36.20 ^c	40.80 ^c	16.19** (5.4)

Note:

1. Higher the mean score on positive domains of mother - adolescent relationship, better the mother- adolescent relationship and higher the mean score on negative domains of mother - adolescent relation, poorer the mother- adolescent relationship
2. Means with different superscripts show significant differences.
3. * Significant at 0.05 level of significance
 ** Significant at .01 level of significance

Table 2: Mean differences in adolescents' perception of their relationship with father across family type in families from different social classes of G.B.P.U.A&T., Pantnagar

father-adolescent relationship	Social Class I (n ₁ =40)		F Cal. (C.D)	Social Class II (n ₂ =40)			F Cal. (C.D)	Social Class III (n ₃ =40)				Social Class IV (n ₄ =40)			
	Nuclear (n _{1a} =38)	Joint (n _{2a} =02)		Nuclear (n _{1b} =38)	Joint (n _{2b} =01)	Extended (n _{3a} =01)		Nuclear (n _{1c} =32)	Joint (n _{2c} =06)	Extended (n _{3b} =02)	F Cal. (C.D)	Nuclear (n _{1d} =17)	Joint (n _{2d} =12)	Extended (n _{3c} =11)	F Cal. (C.D)
Protecting	44.92 ^a	44.50 ^a	23.99** (4.6)	44.75 ^a	44.28 ^a	41.00 ^a	23.77** (4.5)	38.00 ^b	34.33 ^b	32.20 ^b	14.09** (4.40)	34.00 ^c	31.83 ^c	20.56 ^c	4.09* (1.40)
Symbolic Punishment	39.61 ^a	43.25 ^a	23.22** (5.71)	39.50 ^a	43.04 ^a	39.46 ^a	23.07** (5.51)	27.28 ^b	34.13 ^b	31.87 ^b	13.12** (4.07)	17.00 ^c	26.50 ^c	25.54 ^c	3.92* (1.07)
Symbolic Reward	39.56 ^a	39.35 ^a	47.64** (9.07)	38.18 ^a	34.29 ^a	40.50 ^a	40.14** (8.9)	29.00 ^b	29.26 ^b	30.90 ^b	10.73** (2.63)	17.75 ^c	19.75 ^c	12.44 ^c	4.73* (2.63)
Loving	45.11	37.90	1.94 (2.3)	44.50	37.42	35.70	1.87 (2.04)	44.80	37.03	35.30	1.27 (2.0)	44.00	36.42	36.78	1.09 (1.14)
Object Reward	37.11 ^a	40.95 ^a	29.79** (5.59)	36.75 ^a	40.47 ^a	38.00 ^a	27.42** (4.8)	33.00 ^b	30.67 ^b	26.30 ^b	14.12** (1.8)	27.85 ^c	19.00 ^c	12.22 ^c	4.12* (1.0)
Negative domains															
Rejecting	18.33 ^a	18.45 ^a	15.08** (4.09)	18.35 ^a	18.30 ^a	19.90 ^a	14.07** (4.04)	26.43 ^b	23.00 ^b	30.50 ^b	9.07* (2.09)	33.00 ^c	31.83 ^c	35.89 ^c	4.08* (1.10)
Object Punishment	18.70 ^a	21.00 ^a	3.35* (1.06)	18.75 ^a	21.30 ^a	22.90 ^a	3.46* (1.09)	20.57 ^b	31.33 ^b	30.40 ^b	14.26** (4.09)	26.00 ^c	36.00 ^c	42.78 ^c	26.15** (5.06)
Demanding	39.43 ^a	42.97 ^a	25.94** (5.26)	39.40 ^a	42.68 ^a	30.50 ^a	25.17** (5.7)	29.96 ^b	30.10 ^b	23.50 ^b	15.17** (2.7)	25.48 ^c	22.95 ^c	12.44 ^c	3.94* (1.6)
Indifferent	21.55 ^a	26.75 ^a	9.17* (2.09)	30.10 ^a	32.09 ^a	15.33 ^a	9.19* (2.8)	38.48 ^b	44.08 ^b	29.70 ^b	17.19** (3.4)	38.97 ^c	44.17 ^c	38.20 ^a	23.20** (4.21)
Neglecting	20.89 ^a	21.23 ^a	3.43* (1.5)	21.00 ^a	21.45 ^a	21.09 ^a	3.99* (1.09)	25.28 ^b	26.30 ^b	29.62 ^b	16.39** (2.09)	34.00 ^c	38.42 ^c	42.78 ^c	26.19** (5.4)

Note:

1. Higher the mean score on positive domains of mother - adolescent relationship, better the mother- adolescent relationship and higher the mean score on negative domains of mother - adolescent relation, poorer the mother- adolescent relationship.
2. Means with different superscripts show significant differences.
3. * Significant at 0.05 level of significance
** Significant at .01 level of significance

Conclusion

It is evident from the present study that respondent showed high significant difference in the domains protecting, symbolic punishment, demanding, symbolic reward and object reward with their relation across nuclear and joint family type of class I and II as compared to class III and IV but in case of extended family type high significant difference was found in class II as compared to class III and IV. Whereas, rejecting, object punishment, indifferent and neglecting among family types of class III and class IV have high level of significant difference.

References

- Ackerman RA, Kashy DA, Donnellan MB, Neppel T, Lorenz FO, Conger RD. The Interpersonal Legacy of a Positive Family Climate in Adolescence. *Psychological Science*. 2013; 24(3):243-250.
- Barber BK. Parental psychological control: Revisiting a neglected construct. *Child Development*. 2002; 67:3296-3319.
- Baer JC, Schmitz MF. Ethnic differences in trajectories of family cohesion for Mexican American and non-Hispanic White adolescents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 2007; 36:583-592.
- Baumeister RF, Leary MR. The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*. 1995; 117:497-529.
- Cavanagh SE. Family structure history and adolescent adjustment. *Journal of Family Issues*. 2008; 29:944-980.
- Chen E, Berdan LE. Socioeconomic Status and Patterns of Parent-Adolescent Interactions. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 2006; 16(1):19-27.
- Chubb NH, Fertman CI. Adolescents' perceptions of belonging in their families. *Families in Society. The Journal of Contemporary Human Services*. 1992; 73(7):387-394.
- Crosnoe R, Elder GH. Family dynamics, supportive relationships, and educational resilience during adolescence. *Journal of Family Issues*. 2004; 25:571-602.
- Chen E, Berdan LE. Socioeconomic Status and Patterns of Parent-Adolescent Interactions. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 2006; 16(1):19-27.
- Dodge KA, Malone PS, Lansford JE, Miller-Johnson S, Pettit GS, Bates JE. Toward a dynamic developmental model of the role of parents and peers in early onset substance use. *Families Count: Effects on Child and Adolescent Development*, 2006, 104-131.
- Furstenberg FF Jr. Sociology of adolescence and youth in the 1990s: A critical commentary. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 2000; 62:896-910.
- Elliott S, Gray A. Family structures, a report for the New Zealand immigration service. Retrieved from department of labour New Zealand, 2000. website: <http://www.dol.govt.nz/research/migration/pdfs/FamilyStructures.pdf>
- Erik Erikson H. *Identity, youth and crisis*. New York. Systems Research and Behavioural Science. 1968; 14(2):154-159.
- Sinha BP, Singh AK. Effect of parent's affection and competence: the home adjustment of school students. *Ind. Psych. Rev.* 2005; 50(2):106-112.
- Santrock JW. *Adolescence (XV)*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education, 2014.
- King V, Boyd LM, Pragg B. Parent-adolescent closeness, family belonging, and adolescent wellbeing across family structures; Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Population Association of America, 2016.
- Lopata HZ. *Marriages and families*, 1973. Retrieved from http://www.pearsonhighered.com/assets/hip/us/hip_us_pearsonhighered/samplechapter/0205735363
- Park AB. *The Effects of Family Structure on Juvenile Delinquency*. Electronic Theses, East Tennessee State University, 2013.
- Virginia Cooperative Extension. *Families First-Keys to Successful Family Functioning: Family Roles - Home - Virginia Cooperative Extension*, 2009. Retrieved on July 2, 2013, from <http://pubs.ext.vt.edu/350/350-093/350-093.html>