

Assessment of parenting styles on social intelligence among adolescents in Kangra district

■ Ruchi Thakur and Shubhangana Sharma

Received: 09.12.2017; Revised: 15.03.2018; Accepted: 01.04.2018

■ **ABSTRACT :** The present study is conducted to “assessment of Parenting Styles on Social Intelligence among Adolescents. Survey was done on 200 adolescents in the age group of 13-19 years were randomly selected in Kangra district. The information was collected by interview schedule, Parenting Style and Social Intelligence Scale. The result shows that most of the respondents’ mothers and fathers were using discipline at home. Most of the respondents had high level of patience and confidence. Most of the male respondents were having average level co-operativeness and memory. Majority of the respondents were at low level of sensitivity, Recognition of social environment, Tactfulness and Sense of Humour. Result indicates that positive significant relationship with sex, type of family, caste and residence area, negative significant correlation with religion and significant regression with sex. Positive significant correlation and regression with sex and parenting style.

■ **KEY WORDS:** Parenting Styles, Social intelligence, Adolescents

■ **HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER :** Thakur, Ruchi and Sharma, Shubhangana (2018). Assessment of parenting styles on social intelligence among adolescents in Kangra district. *Asian J. Home Sci.*, 13 (1) : 11-17, DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AJHS/13.1/11-17. Copyright@ 2018: Hind Agri-Horticultural Society.

See end of the paper for authors’ affiliations →

Ruchi Thakur

P.G. Department of Home Science, University of Jammu, Jammu (J&K) India
Email : ruchi.thakur26@gmail.com

Parenting as the style of child upbringing refers to a privilege or responsibility of mother and father, together or independently to prepare the child for society and culture (Veeness, 1973) which provides ample opportunity to a child to find roots, continuity and sense of belonging (Sirohi and Chauhan, 1991) and also serves as an effective agent of socialization. Parenting style is a psychological construct representing standard strategies that parents use in their child rearing. It connotes normal variation in parents attempts to control and socialize their children (Baumrind, 1991).

Social intelligence helps an individual to develop healthy co-existence with other people. Socially intelligent

people behave tactfully and prosper in life. Social intelligence is useful in solving the problems of social life and help in tackling various social tasks. Thus social intelligence is an important developmental aspect of education. Several studies have shown that social intelligence is multidimensional and distinguishable from general intelligence domains (Jones and Day, 1997; Marlowe, 1986 and Weis and Sub, 2007).

Relationship between social intelligence and parenting style is of a great importance in affecting the behaviour of adolescents. Social Intelligence of adolescents wholly depends upon the parenting styles adopted by parents. The education of parents is one of

the important factor which play an important role in constructing the social intelligence in adolescents, because the well educated parents can develop a social intelligence in their children better than uneducated parents, which further helps them in the buildup of their carriers. Social Intelligence of adolescents also depends upon the behaviour of parents, style of upbringing parents-child relationship, emotion of parents, time devotion for adolescent etc. The child rearing practices used by parents contributed a lot in the social development of the child. So the present study has been undertaken with the following objectives:

- To assess the parenting style and social intelligence of adolescents.
- To study the relationship of parenting style and social intelligence of adolescents with independent variables.

■ RESEARCH METHODS

Random sampling technique was used to select the areas for the study of Kangra District. A sample of 200 adolescents belonging to age group of 13-19 years was procured from these two Blocks. The information was collected by interview schedule and two standardized scales. Parenting Styles Scale (Bharadwaj *et al.*, 1998) was used to assess Parenting Style. Manual of Social

Intelligence (Chadha and Ganesan, 2009) was administered to each adolescent to assess the Social Intelligence Dimensions. Data was analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively by using statistical techniques like correlation and regression.

■ RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 indicated that majority of the respondents' mothers showed high score mothering style towards their adolescents *i.e.* acceptance (57.00%), protection (65.00%), indulgence (64.00%), realism attitude (63.00%), discipline (80.00%), realistic role expectation (72.00%) and marital adjustment (74.00%). Half of the respondents' mothers (50.00%) were moralistic for their adolescents, but other half of respondents' mothers (50.00%) were found to be lenient for their respondents.

Table 2 indicated that majority of the respondents' fathers showed high score fathering style towards their adolescents *i.e.* acceptance (71.50%), protection (76.00%), indulgence (79.50%), realism attitude (75.50%), moralism (71.50%), discipline (81.50%), realistic role expectation (76.50%) and marital adjustment (74.50%).

Table 3 depicted that majority of the male (48.38%) and female respondents (55.26%) had were having high level of patience. Most of the male respondents (37.90%)

Table 1 : Frequency distribution of area of mothering styles

Mothering Total (n=200)	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Low Score						
A(Rejection)	2(1.00)	1(0.50)	7(3.50)	23(11.50)	53(26.50)	86(43.00)
B(Carelessness)	1(0.50)	0(0.00)	8(4.00)	14(7.00)	47(23.50)	70(35.00)
C(Neglect)	2(1.00)	3(1.50)	5(2.50)	17(8.50)	45(22.50)	72(36.00)
D(Utopian)	0(0.00)	37(18.50)	5(2.50)	11(5.50)	21(10.50)	74 (37.00)
E(Lenient)	0(0.00)	3(1.50)	6(3.00)	27(13.50)	64(32.00)	100(50.00)
F(Freedom)	2(1.00)	2(1.00)	6(3.00)	3(1.50)	27(13.50)	40 (20.00)
G(Faulty role expectation)	2(1.00)	1(0.50)	3(1.50)	13(6.50)	37(18.50)	56(28.00)
H(Marital conflict)	4(2.00)	3(1.50)	5(2.50)	10(5.00)	29(14.50)	51(25.50)
High Score	6	7	8	9	10	
A(Acceptance)	65(32.50)	25(12.50)	24(12.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	114(57.00)
B(Protection)	71(35.50)	46(23.00)	13(6.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	130(65.00)
C(Indulgence)	77(38.50)	39(19.50)	12(6.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	128(64.00)
D(Realism)	50(25.00)	45(22.50)	25(12.50)	16(8.00)	13(6.50)	126(63.00)
E(Moralism)	55(27.50)	38(19.00)	6(3.00)	1(0.50)	0(0.00)	100(50.00)
F(Discipline)	43(21.50)	73(36.50)	35(17.50)	9(4.50)	0(0.00)	160(80.00)
G(Realistic role expectation)	69(34.50)	64(32.00)	11(5.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	144(72.00)
H(Marital Adjustment)	57(28.50)	49(24.50)	43(21.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	149(74.50)

Note: Parenthesis indicate percentages

were having average co-operativeness. Less than half of the female respondents (38.15%) had high level of co-operativeness. Data further revealed that a very high level of confidence was observed in more than half of male (52.41%) and female respondents (71.05%). Majority of the male (30.64%) and female respondents (55.26%) were at low level of sensitivity. Buss (2000) also reported that co-operation was not only a way to increase happiness but also a way to avoid unhappiness due to regular involvement in competition. Confidence was found to be positive in respondents, the reason for

this may be that it deals with the ability to develop firm trust in oneself and ones chances.

Table 4 further showed that almost all the male (96.77%) and female respondents (86.84%) had low level of recognition of social environment. Low level of tactfulness was observed in male (83.8%) and 67.10% female respondents. Data further revealed that sense of humour was low in almost all the male and female respondents *i.e.* in 91.93% and 94.73%. Almost all the male (69.35%) and female respondents (93.42%) were having an average memory. Kosmitzki and John (1993)

Table 2 : Frequency distribution of area of fathering styles

Fathering Total (n=200)	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Low Score						
A(Rejection)	3(1.50)	4(2.00)	7(3.50)	10(5.00)	33(16.50)	57(28.50)
B(Carelessness)	2(1.00)	1(0.50)	2(1.00)	9(4.50)	34(17.00)	48(24.00)
C(Neglect)	2(1.00)	3(1.50)	3(1.50)	13(6.50)	20(10.00)	41(20.50)
D(Utopian)	0(0.00)	1(0.50)	0(0.00)	18(9.00)	30(15.00)	49(24.50)
E(Lenient)	3(1.50)	1(0.50)	5(2.50)	8(4.00)	40(20.00)	57(28.50)
F(Freedom)	2(1.00)	1(0.50)	2(1.00)	10(5.00)	22(11.00)	37(18.50)
G(Faulty role expectation)	3(1.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	21(10.50)	23(11.50)	47(23.50)
H(Marital conflict)	4(2.00)	3(1.50)	5(2.50)	10(5.00)	29(14.50)	51(25.50)
High Score						
	6	7	8	9	10	
A(Acceptance)	55(27.50)	60(30.00)	28(14.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	143(71.50)
B(Protection)	81(40.50)	55(27.50)	16(8.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	152(76.00)
C(Indulgence)	94(47.00)	46(23.00)	19(9.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	159(79.50)
D(Realism)	45(22.50)	39(19.50)	30(15.00)	31(15.50)	6(3.00)	151(75.50)
E(Moralism)	64(32.00)	45(22.50)	34(17.00)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	143(71.50)
F(Discipline)	38(19.00)	63(31.50)	48(24.00)	14(7.00)	0(0.00)	163(81.50)
G(Realistic role expectation)	62(31.00)	70(35.00)	20(10.00)	1(0.50)	0(0.00)	153(76.50)
H(Marital Adjustment)	57(28.50)	49(24.50)	43(21.50)	0(0.00)	0(0.00)	149(74.50)

Note: Parenthesis indicate percentages

Table 3 : Frequency distribution of levels and dimensions of social intelligence

Male(n=124) Female(n=76)		Very Low	Low	Average	High	Very High	Total
Patience	Male	3 (2.41)	18 (14.51)	18 (14.51)	60 (48.38)	25 (20.16)	124 (62.00)
	Female	2 (2.63)	6 (7.89)	10 (13.15)	42 (55.26)	16 (21.05)	76 (38.00)
	Total	5 (2.50)	24 (12.00)	28 (14.00)	102 (51.00)	41 (20.50)	200 (100.00)
Co-operativeness	Male	7 (5.64)	20 (16.12)	47 (37.90)	35 (28.22)	15 (12.09)	124 (62.00)
	Female	2 (2.63)	5 (6.57)	19 (25.00)	29 (38.15)	21 (27.63)	76 (38.00)
	Total	9 (4.50)	25 (12.50)	66 (33.00)	64 (32.00)	36 (18.00)	200 (100.00)
Confidence	Male	3 (2.41)	5 (4.03)	7 (5.64)	44 (35.48)	65 (52.41)	124 (62.00)
	Female	2 (2.63)	2 (2.63)	2 (2.63)	16 (21.05)	54 (71.05)	76 (38.00)
	Total	5 (2.50)	7 (3.50)	9 (4.50)	60 (30.00)	119 (59.50)	200 (100.00)
Sensitivity	Male	27 (21.77)	38 (30.64)	34 (27.41)	19 (15.32)	6 (4.83)	124 (62.00)
	Female	18 (23.68)	42 (55.26)	12 (15.78)	4 (5.26)	0 (0.00)	76 (38.00)
	Total	45 (22.50)	80 (40.00)	46 (23.00)	23 (11.50)	6 (3.00)	200 (100.00)

Note: Parenthesis indicate percentages

revealed that social intelligence consists of the following components: understanding people, social insight, perspective taking ability, knowing social rules and norms, good at dealing with people, being warm and caring, open to new experiences and ideas, social adaptability, and being compromising and fair. However, social influence includes motivation and leadership, influence on others, dominance and activity, manipulating others. Social memory consists of memory for names and faces.

Table 5 shows that highly significant relationship with sex, type of family, caste and residence area (rural/urban) and negatively significant correlated with the religion and social intelligence. it was observed that only the sex of respondents and residence area (rural/urban) of respondents were found to be significantly positively correlated with parenting style of respondents. The

present findings are also supported by Dwairy *et al.* (2006) who observed three combined parenting patterns: *inconsistent* (permissive and authoritarian), *controlling* (authoritarian and authoritative), and *flexible* (authoritative and permissive) and found that the mean score of the authoritarian style was higher among males, whereas, the mean score of the authoritative style was higher among females. They also observed the effects of urbanization, parents' education, and the family economic level on parenting. Rai (2000) was also of the same view who studied perceived parenting style among boys and girls and observed significant sex differences.

Table 6 showed that rejection vs. acceptance had a significant correlation with age and sex of respondents. However, carelessness vs. protection, neglect vs. indulgence, lenient standard vs. moralism and marital

Table 4 : Frequency distribution of levels and dimensions of social intelligence

		Low	Average	High	Total
Male=124 Female=76					
Recognition of social environment	Male	120 (96.77)	4 (3.22)	0 (0.00)	124 (62.00)
	Female	66 (86.84)	10 (13.15)	0 (0.00)	76 (38.00)
	Total	186 (93.00)	14 (7.00)	0 (0.00)	200 (100.00)
Tactfulness	Male	104 (83.87)	20 (16.12)	0 (0.00)	124 (62.00)
	Female	51 (67.10)	25 (32.89)	0 (0.00)	76 (38.00)
	Total	155 (77.50)	45 (22.50)	0 (0.00)	200 (100.00)
Sense of Humour	Male	114 (91.93)	10 (8.06)	0 (0.00)	124 (62.00)
	Female	72 (94.73)	4 (5.26)	0 (0.00)	76 (38.00)
	Total	186 (93.00)	14 (7.00)	0 (0.00)	200 (100.00)
Memory	Male	38 (30.64)	86 (69.35)	0 (0.00)	124 (62.00)
	Female	5 (6.57)	71 (93.42)	0 (0.00)	76 (38.00)
	Total	43 (21.50)	157 (78.50)	0 (0.00)	200 (100.00)

Note: parenthesis indicate percentages

Table 5 : Correlation between ecological variables with parenting styles and social intelligence

Variables/ Categories	Social intelligence (SI)	Parenting style (PS)
Age	0.040	-0.052
Sex	0.296**	0.270**
Occupation of father	0.055	0.010
Qualification of father	0.021	-0.008
Occupation of mother	0.031	-0.012
Qualification of mother	0.074	0.015
Family income	0.040	-0.060
Family type	0.126**	0.029
Caste	0.122**	0.012
Religion	-0.132**	-0.003
Rural/Urban	0.132**	0.114**
Ordinal position	0.008	-0.036

** indicates significance of value at P=0.05 level

Table 6 : Regression between ecological variable with mother parenting styles

Ecological variables	Constant	Regression co-efficient	Standard error	F-value	r ²
Rejection vs. Acceptance					
Age	15.53	0.34**	0.14	5.73	0.02
Sex	14.87	0.72**	0.14	5.07	0.48
Family income	16.28	-5.58	3.55	2.47	0.60
Carelessness vs. Protection					
Sex	19.04	0.85**	0.36	5.52	0.03
Qualification of mother	20.38	-0.06	0.08	0.52	0.04
Family income	19.88	-5.44	3.55	2.35	0.04
Neglect vs. Indulgence					
Sex	18.45	1.09**	0.38	8.14	0.04
Family type	17.46	1.07	0.60	3.17	0.05
Utopian Expectation vs. Realism					
Sex	16.94	0.76	0.43	1.77	0.02
Lenient Standard vs. Moralism					
Sex	19.31	0.89**	0.38	2.33	0.03
Faulty role expectations vs. Realistic role					
Age	22.46	-0.25	0.14	-1.73	0.01
Marital conflict vs. Marital Adjustment					
Sex	19.02	1.21**	0.42	8.22	0.04
Occupation of father	18.53	0.21	0.12	2.94	0.05

** indicates significance of value at P=0.05 level

Table 7 : Regression between ecological variable with father parenting styles

Ecological Variables	Constant	Regression co-efficient	Standard error	F-value	r ²
Rejection vs. Acceptance					
Sex	18.96	0.92**	0.40	2.28	0.03
Carelessness vs. Protection					
Sex	18.20	1.41**	0.44	3.19	0.05
Neglect vs. Indulgence					
Sex	16.02	1.25**	0.43	2.88	0.04
Utopian Expectation vs. Realism					
Sex	19.66	0.77	0.42	1.84	0.02
Lenient Standard vs. Moralism					
Caste	19.37	0.95**	0.44	2.17	0.02
Freedom vs. Discipline					
Age	20.15	-0.30	0.15	3.65	0.05
Sex	19.90	0.72**	0.40	3.27	0.07
Rural/urban	15.80	3.02**	1.12	7.24	0.04
Faulty role expectations vs. Realistic role					
Sex	15.53	2.87	0.56	26.63	0.12
Rural/urban	13.29	2.43**	1.62	2.25	0.13
Marital conflict vs. Marital Adjustment					
Sex	19.02	1.21**	0.42	8.22	0.04
Occupation of father	18.53	0.22	0.13	2.94	0.05

** indicates significance of value at P=0.05 level

conflict vs. marital adjustment depicted significant positive correlation with sex of respondents. None of the ecological variables of respondents showed significant correlation with faulty role expectations vs. realistic role of mother parenting style. Contrary to this, marital conflict vs. marital adjustment had a significant correlation with sex of the respondents. Suldo and Huebner (2004) were also of the same opinion while evaluating environmental factors associated with adolescents' life satisfaction. They revealed that familial variables (e.g., parent-child conflict, family structure) were crucial correlates.

Table 7 revealed that most of the parenting styles of father *viz.*, rejection vs. acceptance, carelessness vs. protection, neglection vs. indulgence and marital conflict vs. marital adjustment showed a significantly positive correlation with sex of the respondents. Freedom vs. discipline exhibited a significant correlation with sex and residence area (rural/urban) of the respondents.

However, a significant correlation was observed between faulty role expectation vs. realistic role and residence area (rural/urban) of the respondents. Results

of the present study are also supported by Sharma and Sandhu (2006) who indicated significant mean differences for gender and age on aggression and conduct disorders. They also observed significant differences for age and gender on indulgence, punitive, physical coercion, and verbal hostility parenting dimensions. Regulation and connection parenting dimensions showed a significant negative correlation with externalizing behaviours.

Table 8 revealed that patience had a significant positive correlation with caste and negative correlation with religion. Co-operativeness also produced a significant correlation with sex. Significantly negative correlation was observed between confidence and religion of the respondents. Sensitivity had a significantly positive correlation with sex and negative correlation between religion with sensitivity. Further, recognition of social environment showed a negative correlation with family type. However, a significant positive correlation was observed between tactfulness and all the ecological variables of respondents *viz.*, residence area, qualification of father, sex and family type. Memory also showed a

Table 8 : Regression between ecological variables with social intelligence						
Ecological Variables	Constant	Regression co-efficient	Standard error	F-value	r ²	
Patience						
Caste	19.22	0.91**	0.32	7.90	0.04	
Religion	21.34	-1.97**	0.94	4.40	0.60	
Co-operativeness						
Sex	24.83	1.10**	0.33	10.85	0.05	
Family type	24.28	0.60	0.53	1.27	0.06	
Confidence						
Sex	22.64	0.47	0.26	3.20	0.04	
Religion	23.33	-1.73**	0.75	5.39	0.03	
Sensitivity						
Sex	20.26	1.09**	0.32	11.47	0.05	
Religion	22.28	-1.95**	0.90	4.65	0.08	
Family type	21.75	0.54	0.51	1.14	0.09	
Recognition of social environment						
Family type	0.92	-0.30**	0.14	4.66	0.02	
Qualification of father	0.54	0.03	0.02	2.97	0.03	
Tactfulness						
Rural/ Urban	1.75	1.88**	0.48	15.42	0.07	
Qualification of father	0.20	0.11**	0.03	13.08	0.13	
Sex	-0.26	0.50**	0.16	9.35	0.17	
Family type	-0.50	0.27**	0.26	1.14	0.17	
Memory						
Sex	8.19	0.52**	0.22	5.69	0.10	
Occupation of mother	9.69	0.33**	0.14	5.50	0.02	
Family income	9.06	6.69**	2.24	8.91	0.07	

** indicates significance of value at P=0.05 level

significant correlation with sex, mother's occupation and family. Results of the present study are also supported by Kaur and Kalaramna (2004) who revealed that socio-economic status had effect on social intelligence. They also observed the positive impact of home environment on social intelligence.

Conclusion :

Parenting style plays a very vital role in the upbringing of children. It is the duty of the parents to properly rear their children and up bring them to be a very responsible person in the society. Therefore, parenting is a very crucial social phenomenon as it determines the future of the children. There is a vital relationship between social intelligence and parenting style which directly or indirectly affects the behaviour of adolescents. Thus the relationship between the parents and the child happens to be a central factor in the social upliftment of the individual. Family as unit of social organization serves as an effective agent of socialization where parent child relationship happens to be a central factor in children's social development. From the present study it was concluded that parents showed similar kind of relationship irrespective of the gender of the child. Both fathers and mothers were observed with high percentage of positive parenting styles towards their adolescents. Results of the present study clearly show that majority of male and female respondents were having positive social intelligence dimensions such as patience, co-operativeness and confidence. This implies that most of respondents can manage well in stressful situations. Regression co-efficient of ecological variables of respondents with mother and father parenting style was also significant. Most of the mother and father parenting styles showed a significant positive regression with sex of the respondents.

Authors' affiliations:

Shubhangana Sharma, Department of Human Development, C.S.K. Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur (H.P.) India

■ REFERENCES

Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *J. Early Adolescence*, **11**(1): 56-95.

Bharadwaj, R.L., Sharma, H. and Garg, A. (1998). Parenting Styles Scale. 1-18.

Buss, David M. (2010). The Evolution of Happiness. *American Psychologist*, **55** (1) : 15-23.

Chadha, N.K. and Ganesan, U. (1971). Social Intelligence Scale 1-24.

Chadha and Ganesan (2009). Social Intelligence Scale, National Psychological Corporation, Agra (U.P.) India.

Dwairy, Marwan, Fayad, Mona and Benyaqoub, Naima (2006). Parenting profiles versus parenting factors and adolescents' psychological disorders. *J. Educational & Developmental Psychol.*, **3** (2) : 1-14.

Jones, K. and Day, J.D. (1997). Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive social intelligence from academic intelligence. *J. Educational Psychol.*, **89**(3) : 486-497.

Kaur, H. and Kalaramna, A. (2004). Study of interrelationship between home environment, social intelligence and socio-economic status among. *J. Human Ecol.*, **16**(2): 137-140.

Kosmitzki, C. and John, O. P. (1993). The implicit use of explicit conceptions of social intelligence. *Personality & Individual Differences*, **15** : 11-23. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(93\)90037-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(93)90037-4).

Marlowe, H.A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multi dimensionality and construct independence. *J. Edu. Psychol.*, **78**(1) : 52-58.

Rai, R.N. (2000). Perceived parental rearing style among Mozo boys and girls. *Indian Psychological Review*, **54** : 79-81.

Sharma, V. and Sandhu, G.K. (2006). Community study of association between parenting dimensions and externalizing behaviors. *J. Indian Association Child Adolescence Mental Health*, **2**(2): 48-58.

Sirohi, A. and Chauhan, N.S. (1991). Parenting in child socialization: A study of fathering in multivariate setting. *Indian J. Psychol.*, **66**(1-4): 29-35.

Suldo, S.M. and Huebner, E.S. (2004). The role of life satisfaction in the relationship between authoritative parenting dimensions and adolescent problem behaviour. *J. Social Indicators Res.*, **66**(1-2): 165-195.

Veeness, J.E. (1973). The social meaning of parenthood. *Psychiatry J. Study Interpersonal Processes*, **36**: 291-224.

Weis, S. and Sub, H. (2007). Reviving the search for social intelligence. A multi trait, multi method study of its structure and construct validity. *Personality & Individual Differences*. **42** (1) : 3- 14.

13th
Year
★★★★★ of Excellence ★★★★★