



Studies on parenting styles towards their adolescents in Kangra district of Himachal Pradesh- II Fathers

Ruchi Thakur, Shubhangana Sharma, Raj Pathania and Shashi Seema Katoch

Department of Human Development, College of Home Science
CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Palampur-176 062, India.

Manuscript Received: 10.09.2010; Accepted: 01.05.2012

Abstract

The present study was undertaken during the year 2009 in Kangra District of Himachal Pradesh in two blocks namely Panchrukhi and Bhawarna to find out the parenting styles of father towards adolescents. Four schools from each Block were selected randomly from a list of schools. A sample of 200 adolescents in the age group of 13-19 years were surveyed from each block. Parenting style of father towards adolescents was assessed by the parenting style scale. The findings of the study revealed that majority of fathers were using positive parenting style such as acceptance, protection indulgence, realism, moralism, discipline, realistic role expectation and martial adjustment towards their adolescents. As reported by the respondents, fathers showed similar kind of relationship irrespective of the gender of the child. Correlation matrix test shows that the sex of the respondents was significantly and positively correlated with fathers' parenting styles. Correlation was also found to be statistically significant with respondents.

Key words: Parenting style, fathers, adolescent, Kangra.

Introduction

Parenting style is a complex activity that includes many specific behaviors that work individually and together to influence child's outcomes. Parenting style captures two important elements of parenting: parental responsiveness and parental demandingness. Parents may differ in how they try to control or socialize their children and the extent to which they do so, it is assumed that the primary role of all parents is to influence, teach, and control their children. The role of a father or the style of upbringing encourages curiosity and a will to face the challenges of the world. Inadequate fathering is usually understood to be a prime source of maladjustment (Erikson, 1963), truancy, guilt, self-devaluation and dependency (Coleman, 1970). Fathers' parenting style helps in promoting and supporting the physical, emotional, social and intellectual development of a child from infancy to adulthood. The socialization of the child starts with birth. It is the family which acts as first socializing agent. Family is a place in which children learn to

interpret reality. Fathering style is an important factor which plays an important role in constructing the social intelligence in adolescents (Berndt and Keefe, 1995). The migration of rural population to urban centers, stress among parents due to urban life style's demands has affected overall children's life. Keeping all these facts in view the present study was executed with the purpose to determine the functional relationship between the fathering styles used at home towards adolescents.

Methodology

The study was conducted in Kangra District of Himachal Pradesh. Two blocks namely Panchrukhi and Bhawarna were randomly selected. Four schools from each block were selected randomly from the list of schools. A sample of 200 adolescents belonging to age group of 13-19 years was procured from these two blocks. Parenting Styles Scale (Bharadwaj *et al.*, 1998) was administered to each adolescent to assess the fathering style. Eight dimensions of parenting have been included in the scale which may be enumerated as under:

Assigned score values for Low and High with respect to Parenting Styles

Low Score					5.5	High Score				
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
			Rejection		A		Acceptance			
			Carelessness		B		Protection			
			Neglect		C		Indulgence			
			Utopian Expectation		D		Realism			
			Lenient standards		E		Moralism			
			Freedom		F		Discipline			
			Faulty role expectation		G		Realistic role expectation			
			Marital conflict		H		Marital adjustment			

An interview schedule was used to collect background information of the respondents. Data were analyzed by calculating frequency, percentage and coefficient of correlation.

Results and Discussion

Area of fathering styles of male respondents

Fathering style of the male respondents (Table 1) revealed that majority of the male respondents' fathers (63.70%) showed the acceptance towards their adolescents, whereas, 36.29 per cent showed rejection towards their adolescents. Majority (68.54%) of male respondents' fathers were of protecting nature as reported by the respondents, while 31.45 per cent showed carelessness for male respondents. Indulgence of fathers with their adolescents was 73.38 per cent. However, 26.61 per cent male respondents' fathers showed neglect towards their adolescents. Attitude of realism was found among 72.58 per cent fathers in comparison to utopian nature of male respondents' fathers (27.41%). It was also found that there were 66.12 per cent male

respondents' fathers who developed moralism in them. Whereas, there were more number of male respondents' fathers who showed lenient attitude towards their adolescents (33.87%). Most of the male respondents' fathers, i.e., 79.03 per cent observed discipline to their adolescents, whereas, only 20.96 per cent male respondents' fathers gave freedom. Majority of fathers (70.96%) were having realistic role expectations as reported by the respondents. However, 29.03 per cent male respondents' fathers were having faulty role expectation. Most of the male respondents' fathers (62.90%) showed the marital adjustment. However, few of the male respondents' fathers (37.09%) were having marital conflicts. Fischer and Lazerson (1984) also found that parental style often affects boys and girls differently. Girls whose fathers were punitive tended to be more independent and less conforming than girls fathers with warm and accepting nature.

Area of fathering styles of female respondents

Most of the respondents' fathers (84.21%) were having acceptance towards their adolescents

Table 1. Frequency distribution of area of fathering styles of the male respondents (N=124)

Low Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A (Rejection)	3 (2.41)	3 (2.41)	7 (5.64)	9 (7.25)	23 (18.54)	45 (36.29)
B (Carelessness)	2 (1.61)	1 (0.80)	1 (0.80)	7 (5.64)	28 (22.58)	39 (31.45)
C (Neglect)	2 (1.61)	2 (1.61)	3 (2.41)	11 (8.87)	15 (12.09)	33 (26.61)
D (Utopian)	0 (0.00)	1 (0.80)	0 (0.00)	11 (8.87)	22 (17.74)	34 (27.41)
E (Lenient)	3 (2.41)	0 (0.00)	3 (2.41)	7 (5.64)	29 (23.38)	42 (33.87)
F (Freedom)	2 (1.61)	1 (0.80)	1 (0.80)	6 (4.83)	16 (12.90)	26 (20.96)
G (Faulty role expectation)	3 (2.41)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	15 (12.09)	18 (14.51)	36 (29.03)
H (Marital conflict)	4 (3.22)	3 (2.41)	5 (4.03)	10 (8.06)	24 (19.35)	46 (37.09)
High Score	6	7	8	9	10	Total
A (Acceptance)	35 (28.22)	28 (22.58)	16 (12.90)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	79 (63.70)
B (Protection)	45 (36.29)	29 (23.38)	11 (8.87)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	85 (68.54)
C (Indulgence)	57 (45.96)	22 (17.74)	12 (9.67)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	91 (73.38)
D (Realism)	33 (26.61)	28 (22.58)	14 (11.29)	13 (10.48)	2 (1.61)	90 (72.58)
E (Moralism)	34 (27.41)	30 (24.19)	18 (14.51)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	82 (66.12)
F (Discipline)	24 (19.35)	34 (27.41)	28 (22.58)	12 (9.67)	0 (0.00)	98 (79.03)
G (Realistic role expectation)	40 (32.25)	35 (28.22)	13 (10.48)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	88 (70.96)
H (Marital Adjustment)	32 (25.80)	29 (23.38)	17 (13.71)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	78 (62.90)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages of male respondents

(Table 2). However, 15.78 per cent fathers showed rejection for their adolescents. 88.15 per cent respondents' fathers had a protecting nature, while few of them (11.84%) were of carelessness nature as reported by the respondents. Regarding indulgence, 89.47 per cent of respondents' fathers were indulged with adolescents. However, 10.52 per cent adolescents were neglected by their fathers. Majority (80.26%) of respondents' fathers were having realistic expectations for their adolescents. Though, 19.73 per cent respondents' fathers were with utopian expectation from their adolescents. Most of the

respondents' fathers (80.26%) developed moralism in their adolescents. But 19.73 per cent of respondents' fathers showed lenient attitude towards adolescents. Most of the respondents' fathers (85.52%) were promoting discipline in their adolescents. However, 14.47 per cent respondents' fathers gave freedom to their adolescents. Most of (85.52%) respondents' fathers presented themselves with a realistic nature. Whereas, 14.47 per cent respondents' fathers were having faulty role expectation towards their adolescents. Almost all the respondents' fathers (93.42%) showed marital harmony. However, few of

Table 2. Frequency distribution of area of fathering styles of the female respondents (N=76)

Low Score	1	2	3	4	5	Total
A (Rejection)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.31)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.31)	10 (13.15)	12 (15.78)
B (Carelessness)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.31)	2 (2.63)	6 (7.89)	9 (11.84)
C (Neglect)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.31)	0 (0.00)	2 (2.63)	5 (6.57)	8 (10.52)
D (Utopian)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	7 (9.21)	8 (10.52)	15 (19.73)
E (Lenient)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.31)	2 (2.63)	1 (1.31)	11 (14.47)	15 (19.73)
F (Freedom)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1 (1.31)	4 (5.26)	6 (7.89)	11 (14.47)
G (Faulty role expectation)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	6 (7.89)	5 (6.57)	11 (14.47)
H (Marital conflict)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	5 (6.57)	5 (6.57)
High Score	6	7	8	9	10	Total
A (Acceptance)	20 (26.31)	32 (42.10)	12 (15.78)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	64 (84.21)
B (Protection)	36 (47.36)	26 (34.21)	5 (6.57)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	67 (88.15)
C (Indulgence)	37 (48.68)	24 (31.57)	7 (9.21)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	68 (89.47)
D (Realism)	12 (15.78)	11 (14.47)	16 (21.05)	18 (23.68)	4 (5.26)	61 (80.26)
E (Moralism)	30 (39.47)	15 (19.73)	16 (21.05)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	61 (80.26)
F (Discipline)	14 (18.42)	29 (38.15)	20 (26.31)	2 (2.63)	0 (0.00)	65 (85.52)
G (Realistic role expectation)	22 (28.94)	35 (46.05)	7 (9.21)	1 (1.31)	0 (0.00)	65 (85.52)
H (Marital Adjustment)	25 (32.89)	20 (26.31)	26 (34.21)	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	71 (93.42)

Figures in parentheses indicate percentages of female respondents

them (6.57%) were having marital conflicts as reported by the respondents. According to present study majority of the female respondents' fathers showed positive fathering style. This can be attributed to parental behavior connected with secure, avoidant, and ambivalent attachment styles. Rai *et al.* (2009) also revealed that boys had significantly more rejection from father as compared to girls and girls had shown significantly better emotional warmth in comparison to boys from father.

Relationship between the father parenting styles of the respondents and ecological variables

Results of correlation between father parenting styles and ecological variables of respondents (Table 3) depicted that from all ecological variables only sex of the respondents showed a significant correlation with most of the father parenting styles *viz.* rejection vs. acceptance, carelessness vs. protection, neglect vs. indulgence and utopian expectation vs. realism. Rest of the ecological variables of respondents did

Table 3. Correlation between ecological variables with father parenting styles of the respondents

Variables/ Categories	Rejection vs. Acceptance	Carelessness vs. Protection	Neglect vs. Indulgence	Utopian Expectation vs. Realism	Lenient Standard vs. Moralism	Freedom vs. Discipline	Faulty role expectations vs. Realistic role	Marital conflict vs. Marital adjustment
Age	-0.093	-0.086	0.052	-0.102	-0.084	-0.122**	0.005	0.066
Sex	0.160**	0.221**	0.201**	0.130**	0.028	0.155**	0.344**	0.200**
Occupation of Father	-0.026	0.017	0.034	0.013	-0.026	-0.011	0.870	0.134**
Qualification of Father	-0.041	0.102	-0.044	0.020	-0.015	0.075	0.051	-0.020
Occupation of Mother	-0.049	-0.011	-0.047	-0.009	-0.011	0.021	-0.003	0.072
Qualification of Mother	-0.065	0.068	0.008	0.044	-0.046	0.052	0.074	-0.002
Family Income	-0.101	0.047	-0.019	-0.031	-0.024	0.060	0.012	-0.027
Family type	-0.006	0.082	0.050	-0.005	-0.092	-0.058	0.080	-0.067
Caste	0.062	-0.013	-0.075	0.021	0.152**	0.014	-0.092	0.076
Religion	0.021	0.032	0.038	-0.039	0.074	-0.102	0.072	-0.037
Rural/Urban	0.049	0.106	0.024	0.098	0.051	0.188**	0.175**	0.048
Ordinal Position	-0.074	0.005	0.040	-0.030	0.106	-0.045	-0.0002	-0.074

** Significant at 5% level

not show any significant correlation with parenting styles of father. However, lenient standard vs. moralism was found to be significantly correlated with caste of respondents. A significant correlation was observed between freedom vs. discipline with sex and residence area (rural/urban) of the respondents. However, age of respondents had a negative correlation with freedom vs. discipline. Further, sex and residence area (rural/urban) of respondent showed a significant positive correlation with faulty role expectation vs. realistic role of father parenting style. Marital conflict vs. marital adjustment was found to be significantly correlated with sex and father's occupation of the respondents. Rest of the ecological variable did not show any significant correlation with marital conflict vs. marital adjustment. The findings of the present study are in accordance with the findings of Rai (2000) who observed that fathers use physical punishment and verbal prohibition more with boys than girls. On contrary to the present findings,

Achoui (2006) observed that the mean score of the authoritarian style was higher among males, whereas the mean score of the authoritative style was higher among females. However, the effects of urbanization, parents' education, and the family economic level on parenting style was minor.

Conclusion

From the study it can be concluded that fathers showed similar kind of parenting style irrespective of the gender of the child. Majority of the fathers were using positive parenting dimensions such as acceptance, protection indulgence, realism, moralism, discipline, realistic role expectation and marital adjustment towards their adolescents. Most of the fathers' parenting styles were found to be significantly positively correlated with sex of the respondents. Contrary to this, parenting styles also showed a negative correlation with some ecological variables of respondents.

References

- Achoui M 2006. Introduction to three cross-regional Research Studies on Parenting Styles, Individuation and Mental Health in Arab societies. *J. Cross-Cultural Psychol.* **37** (3): 1-9.
- Berndt TJ and Keefe K 1995. Friend's influence on adolescents adjustment to school. *Child Dev.* **66** (5): 1313-29.
- Bharadwaj RL, Sharma H and Garg A 1998. Parenting Styles Scale/ Agra: National Psychological Corporation 1-18.
- Coleman JC 1970. *Abnormal Psychology and Modern life.* Bombay: D.B. Taraporawala and Sons.
- Erikson EU 1963. *Children and Society* (2nd ed.) New York: W.S. Norton and Co.
- Fischer KW and Lazerson A 1984. *Human Development.* New York: Freeman Seleshi.
- Rai RN 2000. Perceived paternal rearing style among Mizo boys and girls. *Indian Psychol. Rev.* **54** (1): 79-81.
- Rai RN, Pandey RC and Kumar K 2009. Perceived Parental Rearing Style and Personality among Khasi Adolescents. *J. Indian Acad. App. Psychol.* **35**: 57-60.