

Parenting Style on Adolescent Multidimensional aspects by using MESPA Self Rating Scale& PSFFQ along with standardization

Shyny T. Y.^[1]

Abstract:

Current research was an effort to investigate Mental health ,Emotional intelligence, Self esteem ,Personality & Achievement motivation of adolescents associated with their parent's parenting styles. A stratified sample of 600 adolescents from public and private schools of Thrissur , Kerala, and their 600 parents were selected to participate in this study. PSFFQ is specially constructed and standardized by pilot study on 64 parents to measure parenting styles. Self constructed Standardized MESPA (Mental health ,Emotional intelligence, Self esteem ,Personality, Achievement motivation) Self Rating Scale which use to measure Adolescent MESPA is also standardized by pilot study on 64 parents.

Keywords: *Mental health ,Emotional intelligence, Self esteem ,Personality, Achievement motivation, Authoritarian ,Power exerting , Disciplinarians , Authoritative , Warm giving, protectors , Permissive , Lenient, Freedom givers, Uninvolved , Selfish, Autonomy givers.*

I. INTRODUCTION

This research might contribute to create awareness among parents , teachers ,psychologists and counsellors about the effects of parenting styles on adolescents' behaviour as well as multi dimensional aspects. There have been significant increases in risk taking behaviours of adolescents. This research has begun to take a closer look at risk factors of adolescence due to the rates of substance abuse, depression, suicide and other deleterious behaviours that plague this age group. In this study NEOFFI with 60 item is used for the correlative study with MESPA self rating scale. NEOFFI is used to measure only five factors of personality . But newly constructed MESPA can measure five dimensions of a person like Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation. . It is well established that authoritative parenting fosters adolescents' positive well-being .Adolescents with authoritative parents are less prone to externalizing behaviours, and specifically are less likely to engage in drug use than individuals with uninvolved parents . One of the most studied approaches to understanding parental influences on human development is concept of parenting style. Here is the importance of measuring adolescent's parenting attitude as well as their parents parenting styles. Then only the teachers , counsellors or psychologist can find out the root causes of adolescent problems. This findings help them to give proper guidance and interventions for both parents as well as adolescents wherever necessary. PSFFQ is specially constructed to measure parenting styles of adolescents and their parents . Many of the studies followed three parenting styles originally proposed by Baumrind namely authoritative parenting, authoritarian parenting and permissive parenting, though in 1971, Baumrind grouped parents to three (or four) parenting styles according to their child rearing patterns, on the basis of her interviews with parents and children. For grouping parents to different styles, Maccoby and Martin suggested a

conceptual structure in 1983; they viewed parenting style as combinations of differing levels of parental demandingness and warmth. Now a days parents are too busy and so adolescents are more likely to face problems like parental separation, diverse, conflict etc. Which are thrown away from parental monitoring and supervision. PSFFQ is specially constructed to measure parenting styles of adolescents and their parents . These questionnaire help teachers, counsellors and psychologists to find out real causes behind the adolescent behavioural problems , poor academic achievements etc.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Baumrind (1991) identified Parenting Styles in Family Systems offer various amounts of responsiveness and demandingness to children As per the study of Awong, Grusec & Sorenson, 2008; Baumrind, 1991; Darling, 1999; Baharudin & Kordi, 2010; Hamon & Schrodt, 2012; Buboltz, Griffith Ross, Marsiglia & Walczyk, 2007; Moore, 1992 Authoritarian parenting includes strict parental demand, with very minimal to no parental support, or warmth. The study of Darling (1999) and Hamon & Schrodt (2012) showed effects of Ineffective Parenting Styles on Children Both of the ineffective parenting styles impact children differently. Gadeyne, Ghesquière, & Onghena, (2004); Nelson, Nelson, Hart, Yang, & Jin (2006) Authoritarian parents place high importance on conformity and obedience, but do not value warmth and responsiveness. Researchers like Leidy M.S & Marshel M.P (2000) have found that consistent discipline was associated with positive adolescent adjustment. Consistent discipline also buffers adolescents against the effects of a variety of stressful and negative events. For instance, researchers found that consistent discipline buffered the effects of peer group affiliation on girls' alcohol use, but not among boys. Dwairy M.A (2008) Further,

^[1] Research Scholar in Psychology, Bharathiar University – Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu State, India

inconsistent parental disciplinary behaviours may even inadvertently reinforce adolescent's conduct problems. Adolescents' aggressive and noncompliant behaviour is reinforced when parents engage in an inconsistent discipline practice when the parent makes a request, the adolescent responds negatively, and the parent backs down. Harsh Discipline Harsh parenting, such as threatening, yelling, or screaming in response to misbehaviour, is thought to contribute to more frequent externalizing behaviours that normalize violence or aggression. Studies demonstrate that harsh discipline is linked to behaviour problems ranging from conduct disorder to depression and low self-esteem. Bender H.L; Allen J.P (2007) found that the use of harsh discipline by Societies 2014, 4 512 either parent in a two-parent household was related to greater adolescent depression and externalizing behaviour. Some studies have considered differences in harsh discipline based on the gender of both parents and the adolescent. For example, researchers indicate that paternal harsh discipline was more strongly related to sons' aggression than to daughters' aggression, whereas there was no gender differential effect with mother's harsh parenting. Moreover, Roche K.M (2007) showed nurturing and involved parenting during adolescence appears to protect adolescents from the negative consequences of adversities in their lives. Further, researchers like Doyle A.B (2004) found parental warmth was associated with decreases in externalizing behaviours and increases in self-esteem over time. Research of Barnow S & Schuckit A.S (2002) has consistently shown that higher levels of perceived parental support are associated with lower levels of adolescent delinquency, aggression, or other adjustment problems. Researchers have also found that parental support during adolescence predicted lower levels of depressive symptoms and irritability among young adults. Researchers have examined how supportive parental behaviour influences adolescent outcomes in high-risk community. Shek (1997) studied family environment, adolescent psychological well-being, school adjustment and problem behaviour. Measures of the family environment include perceived paternal and maternal parenting styles, family functioning and conflict with father and mother. McClum and Merrell (1998) studied the relationship between adolescent's perception of their parent's responsiveness and demandingness, adolescent's locus of control orientation and adolescent's self-concept rating

III. TOOLS

1. Self constructed Standardized MESPA (Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality, Achievement motivation) Self Rating Scale
2. Self constructed Standardized PS FFQ (Parenting Style Four Factor Questionnaire)

IV. RESEARCH HYPOTHESIS

H1a. There will be consistent personal dimensions across ages as reported by Parent subjects of adolescents with age group twelve, fifteen & eighteen.

H1b. There will be relatively high positive correlation between NEOFFI Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness and MESPA Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness.

H1c. The Item analysis of Reliability Coefficient will be greater than .70 for the MESPA SELF RAINING SCALE

H2a. There will be consistent parenting styles across ages as reported by parent subjects of adolescents with age group twelve, fifteen & eighteen.

H2b. There will be relatively high positive correlation between authoritarian, authoritative and permissive parenting styles of PS-FFQ and PSDQ

H2c. The Item analysis of Reliability Coefficient will be greater than .70 for the PS-FFQ

H4a: The mean Score of MESPA are same for Male and female

H4b: The mean Score of are PSFFQ same for Male and female

H5a: The mean Score of MESPA are same for Urban and rural.

H5b: The mean Score of are PSFFQ same for Urban and rural.

H6a: The mean Score of MESPA do not differs with age.

H6b: The mean Score of are PSFFQ do not differs with age.

H7a: The mean Score of MESPA do not differs with parenting style.

H7b: The mean Score of are PSFFQ do not differs with parenting style.

H9a-- There is a positive correlation between parenting styles & MESPA variables

H9b-- There is a positive correlation between MESPA variables- Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality, Achievement motivation.

Table 1

Reliability-NEW	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
MESPA	0.990	45
Reliability-OLD	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
NEOFFI	0.961	60

TABLE 1 shows reliability is .99 for the MESPA and .96 for NEOFFI. So we can say this newly constructed MESPA Self Rating Scale has very strong internal consistency. Therefore we can accept H1c

Table-2

Age = 12 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Extraversion-Old and Extraversion-New	0.906	0.880*	0.932	9.572	<0.001
Openness-Old and Openness-New	0.496	0.388	0.604	2.555	0.018
Agreeableness-Old and Agreeableness-New	0.833	0.789*	0.877	6.733	<0.001
Conscientiousness-Old and Conscientiousness-New	0.713	0.642*	0.784	4.548	<0.001
Age = 15 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Extraversion-Old and Extraversion-New	0.890	0.860*	0.920	8.729	<0.001
Openness-Old and Openness-New	0.558	0.459	0.657	3.007	0.006
Agreeableness-Old and Agreeableness-New	0.943	0.927*	0.959	12.672	<0.001
Conscientiousness-Old and Conscientiousness-New	0.680	0.603*	0.757	4.148	<0.001
Age = 18 years	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Extraversion-Old and Extraversion-New	0.894	0.864*	0.924	8.465	<0.001
Openness-Old and Openness-New	0.422	0.298	0.546	1.975	0.062
Agreeableness-Old and Agreeableness-New	0.918	0.894*	0.942	9.821	<0.001
Conscientiousness-Old and Conscientiousness-New	0.439	0.317	0.561	2.073	0.051

*Significant correlation

For all variables other than openness correlation coefficient is less than 0.5 and p value is less than 0.05. So we can say correlation is significant.

Table-3

Variables	group	N	n	Mea	Std. Deviation	z	p value
1	MES	Low	16	0.81	0.40	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	21.706	
2	MES	Low	16	0.75	0.45	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	20.125	
3	MES	Low	16	0.44	0.51	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	20.006	
4	MES	Low	16	0.44	0.51	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	20.006	
5	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.31	0.79	11.662	
6	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.63	0.81	13.024	
7	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
8	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
9	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
10	MES	Low	16	0.31	0.48	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	22.456	
11	MES	Low	16	0.38	0.50	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	21.000	
12	MES	Low	16	0.38	0.50	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	21.000	
13	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.38	0.81	11.783	
14	MES	Low	16	0.06	0.25	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	47.000	
15	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.50	0.82	12.247	
16	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
17	MES	Low	16	0.44	0.51	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	20.006	
18	MES	Low	16	0.44	0.51	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	20.006	
19	MES	Low	16	0.25	0.45	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	24.597	
20	MES	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	33.669	
21	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
22	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.50	0.82	12.247	
23	MES	Low	16	0.06	0.25	-	<0.001
		High	16	1.81	1.05	6.504	
24	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
25	MES	Low	16	0.25	0.45	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	24.597	
26	MES	Low	16	0.25	0.45	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	24.597	
27	MES	Low	16	0.38	0.50	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	21.000	
28	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
29	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
30	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
31	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.69	0.70	15.267	
32	MES	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	33.669	
33	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.50	0.73	13.693	
34	MES	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	33.669	
35	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
36	MES	Low	16	0.13	0.34	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	33.669	
37	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
38	MES	Low	16	0.19	0.40	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	27.908	
39	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
40	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.13	0.72	11.825	
41	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
42	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	<0.001
		High	16	2.50	0.82	12.247	
43	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
44	MES	Low	16	0.00	0.00	-	
		High	16	3.00	0.00	-	
45	MES	Low	16	0.06	0.25	-	<0.001
		High	16	3.00	0.00	47.000	

Table 7 result revealed there is a strong validity for each items. P value is less than .05 ie; correlation is Significant at .001 level.

There for we can conclude all items.

Table-4 Reliability of PSFFQ AND PSDQ

Reliability-	Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
PS FFQ	0.919	32
PSDQ	0.920	32

Internal consistency is estimated by using Cronbach's alpha. An alpha value of 0.70 or above is considered to be criterion for demonstrating strong internal consistency, alpha value of 0.60 or above is considered to be significant. Here reliability is .92 for the PSFFQ as well as PSDQ. So we can say this newly constructed PSFFQ has very strong internal consistency.

Table-5 CORRELATION TOTAL BETWEEN TWO RATING SCALES AS TOTAL, AGE AND SUBTYPE

Correlation Total	Correlation	Lowerbound	Upperbound	Z	p
PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.916	0.909	0.923	25.659	<0.001
Age- 12 PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.920	0.909	0.931	15.333	<0.001
Age- 15 PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.892	0.873	0.911	11.499	<0.001
AGE-18 PSDQ-PSFFQ	0.913	0.918	0.918	22.715	<0.001
Authoritarian PSDQ and PSFFQ	0.817*	0.795	0.839	13.095	<0.001
Authoritative PSDQ and PSFFQ	0.818*	0.796	0.840	13.153	<0.001
permissive PSDQ and PSFFQ	0.817*	0.795	0.839	13.095	<0.001

A positive correlation exist for the variables PSFFQ parenting styles & age group with PSDQ scales as in these case the correlation coefficient has value greater than 0.5 and p value less than 0.05.

TABLE-6 PSFFQ Item analysis and Validity

Variables	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	z	p value
PS1	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.38	1.02	13.175	
PS2	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.25	1.00	13.000	
PS3	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	
	High	16	5.00	0.00	-	
PS4	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.81	1.17	9.638	
PS5	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.94	0.85	13.760	
PS6	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.63	1.36	7.720	
PS7	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.44	0.51	26.837	
PS8	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.00	1.41	8.485	
PS9	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48	30.812	
PS10	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.44	1.21	8.062	
PS11	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	
	High	16	5.00	0.00	-	
PS12	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.69	1.40	7.674	
PS13	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48	30.812	

PS14	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.69	1.40	7.674	
PS15	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.81	0.40	37.831	
PS16	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.94	1.24	9.502	
PS17	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.94	0.25	63.000	
PS18	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.63	1.36	7.720	
PS19	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.75	0.45	33.541	
PS20	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.81	1.33	8.474	
PS21	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.50	0.52	27.111	
PS22	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.06	1.12	10.902	
PS23	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48	30.812	
PS24	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.06	1.29	9.501	
PS25	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.75	0.45	33.541	
PS26	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.88	1.02	11.223	
PS27	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.56	0.51	27.813	
PS28	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	3.69	1.66	6.468	
PS29	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.75	0.45	33.541	
PS30	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.25	1.18	10.987	
PS31	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.69	0.48	30.812	
PS32	Low	16	1.00	0.00	-	<0.001
	High	16	4.25	1.34	9.690	

Item analysis shows the p value less than 0.05. So we can conclude that correlation is significant.

Table 7: K-S test for Normality

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z	p value
PSFFQ	300	76.36	3.21	3.882	<0.001
MESPA	300	103.84	31.82	5.051	<0.001

It is very essential to test the normality of the data before conducting any statistical analysis as the statistical procedures and tests differs for normal data and non-normal data. In other words we use parametric test procedure for normal and distribution free methods for non-normal data. To test normality we use **Kolmogorov-Smirnov test** under which we test the hypothesis. If p value is less than 0.05, we reject the normality assumption, and if p value is greater than 0.05 the data is normal. The test indicate that the data is **non normal** so we use **non parametric method** for analysis

Table 8 Means, Standard deviation and Mann-Whitney U value for Gender

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mann-Whitney U	z	p value
MESPA	Male	300	104.05	31.56	11236.00	0.020	0.984
	Female	300	103.62	32.17			
PSFFQ	Male	300	76.37	3.22	11245.50	0.006	0.995
	Female	300	76.35	3.22			

Table 8 **Mann-Whitney test** are often used to compare the

mean or median scores of variables for two different groups of participants, that is, male and female. Hence a Mann-Whitney test was conducted, and the results are shown in Table 8. Illustrates that the p value are above the required cut-off of .05 for all the variables. Therefore, there were no significant differences ($p > .05$) in the mean value of the MESPA, PSFFQ between females and males.

Table 9 Means, Standard deviation and Mann-Whitney U value for Area

Variable	Area	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mann-Whitney U	z	p value
MESPA	URBAN	288	103.71	32.07	11224.50	-0.011	0.992
	RURAL	312	103.96	31.68			
PSFFQ	URBAN	288	76.27	3.23	10827.50	-0.548	0.584
	RURAL	312	76.45	3.21			

Table 9 illustrates that the p value are above the required cut-off of .05 for all the variables. Therefore, there were no significant differences ($p > .05$) in the mean value of the PSFFQ, MESPA between urban and rural.

Table10 Means, Standard deviation and Kruskal-Wallis H value for Age

Variable	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kruskal-Wallis H(Chi)	df	p value
MESPA	AGE-12	204	103.40	31.13	2.242	2	0.326
	AGE-15	206	102.81	33.03			
	AGE-18	190	105.42	31.47			
PSFFQ	AGE-12	204	76.16	3.23	1.486	2	0.476
	AGE-15	206	76.24	3.20			
	AGE-18	190	76.72	3.21			

Kruskal-Wallis test is used to test hypotheses about means when there are two or more groups of one independent variable. In this case, age group was considered to be the independent variable, which included three age groups: (a) age 12; (b) age-15; and (c) age-18. So Kruskal-Wallis was used to compare the mean scores of different age groups. The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test depicted in Table 10 reveals that a statistical value of p is greater than 0.05 for all the variables considered. So we conclude that the mean score of MESPA, PSFFQ does not differs with age.

Table 11 Means, Standard deviation and Kruskal-Wallis H value for Parenting Style

Variable	Parenting Style	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kruskal-Wallis H(Chi)	df	p value
MESPA	Authoritarian	38	25.00	0.00	258.732	3	<0.001
	Authoritative	316	124.96	8.34			
	Uninvolved	32	27.00	0.00			
	Permissive	214	98.13	6.99			
PSFFQ	Authoritarian	38	74.42	0.90	56.615	1	<0.001
	Authoritative	316	79.20	1.14			
	Uninvolved	32	73.19	0.40			
	Permissive	214	73.00	1.21			

The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test depicted in Table 11 reveals that a statistical value of p is less than 0.05 for all the variables considered.

Table12 Multiple Comparisons Test

Variable	Group	Mann-Whitney U	z	p value
MESPA	a1-a2	9.500	-8.994	<0.001
	a1-u	0.000	-5.831	<0.001
	a1-p	0.000	-8.234	<0.001
	a2-u	16.000	-8.404	<0.001
	a2-p	210.500	-14.557	<0.001
PSFQ	u-p	8.000	-7.690	<0.001
	a1-a2	12.500	-7.524	<0.001
	a1-u	39.000	-4.003	<0.001
	a1-p	370.500	-4.624	<0.001
	a2-u	1.500	-7.040	<0.001
	a2-p	26.500	-14.086	<0.001
	u-p	653.500	-4.128	<0.001

**Not significant*

We conduct man Whitney test or multiple comparison test for identify which among the parenting style differs significantly and the result is exhibited in the following Table. The result of the multiple comparison test indicate that the mean score of all the parenting style differs between each MESPA, &PSFFQ

Table13 Means, Standard deviation and Mann-Whitney U value for gender of PSFFQ parenting styles

Variable	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mann-Whitney U	z	p value
PSFFQ-A1	Male	300	16.12667	5.37868	10701.50	-0.797	0.425
	Female	300	15.52667	4.50458			
PSFFQ-A2	Male	300	25.06000	11.39895	11198.50	-0.071	0.941
	Female	300	24.66000	11.35151			
PSFFQ-P	Male	300	19.21333	8.80938	10531.00	-1.072	0.283
	Female	300	20.45333	9.20431			
PSFFQ-U	Male	300	16.02000	4.88316	11161.00	-0.128	0.898
	Female	300	15.66667	4.14934			

Table14 Means, Standard deviation and Mann-Whitney U value for area of PSFFQ parenting styles

Variable	Area	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mann-Whitney U	z	p value
PSFFQ-A1	UR	288	15.91667	5.05148	10688.5	-0.79054	0.429214
	BAN	312					
	RAL	312					
PSFFQ-A2	UR	288	25.20833	11.32537	11073.5	-0.22433	0.822497
	BAN	312					
	RAL	312					
PSFFQ-P	UR	288	19.56944	8.96509	10697	-0.79803	0.424852
	BAN	312					
	RAL	312					
PSFFQ-U	UR	288	15.63194	4.23067	10429	-1.15584	0.247748
	BAN	312					
	RAL	312					

Table 13&14 illustrates that the p value are above the required cut-off of .05 for all the variables. Therefore, there were no significant differences ($p>.05$) in the mean value of the area &gender with PSFFQ Parenting styles.

Table 15 Means, Standard deviation and Kruskal-Wallis H value for age group of PSFFQ

Variable	Age	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kruskal-Wallis Chi	df	p value
PSFFQ-A1	12 AGE-	204	15.93137	5.39024	1.159163	2	0.560133
	15 AGE-	206	15.86408	5.02162			
	18 AGE-	190	15.67368	4.43737			
PSFFQ-A2	12 AGE-	204	24.16667	11.49092	0.100715	2	0.950889
	15 AGE-	206	24.88350	11.40803			
	18 AGE-	190	25.57895	11.23405			
PSFFQ-P	12 AGE-	204	20.36275	9.20696	0.314563	2	0.854463
	15 AGE-	206	19.57282	8.96683			
	18 AGE-	190	19.54737	8.92971			
PSFFQ-U	12 AGE-	204	15.60784	4.26396	2.737061	2	0.254481
	15 AGE-	206	16.06796	4.92943			
	18 AGE-	190	15.85263	4.37830			

Table 16 Means, Standard deviation and Kruskal-Wallis H value for age group of PSFFQ

Variable	Parenting Style	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Kruskal-Wallis Chi	df	p value
PSFFQ-A1	Authoritarian	38	15.42105	4.57427	1.329238	3	0.722202
	Authoritative	316	15.85443	5.07376			
	Uninvolved	32	15.62500	4.97829			
	Permissive	214	15.88785	4.92074			
PSFFQ-A2	Authoritarian	38	25.05263	11.54928	0.299841	3	0.960058
	Authoritative	316	24.90506	11.42730			
	Uninvolved	32	24.25000	11.76152			
	Permissive	214	24.85047	11.32188			
PSFFQ-P	Authoritarian	38	20.15789	9.29912	0.612487	3	0.893568
	Authoritative	316	19.71519	9.01173			
	Uninvolved	32	19.06250	9.01457			
	Permissive	214	20.06542	9.08894			
PSFFQ-U	Authoritarian	38	15.84211	4.50016	0.58108	3	0.90075
	Authoritative	316	15.81013	4.54861			
	Uninvolved	32	17.00000	6.67333			
	Permissive	214	15.71963	4.14773			

Table 15&16 Since the Kruskal-Wallis test indicate that the mean value of age & parenting styles does not differs with PSFFQ parenting styles .

Table-17

Variables	Correlation	Lower bound	Upper bound	Z	p
Mental Health & Personality	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Mental Health & Self Esteem	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Mental Health & Emotional Intelligence	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Mental Health & Achievement Motivation	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Personality & Self Esteem	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Personality & Emotional Intelligence	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Personality & Achievement Motivation	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Self Esteem & Emotional Intelligence	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Self Esteem & Achievement Motivation	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001
Emotional Intelligence & Achievement Motivation	1.000	1.000	1.000		<0.001

Table 17 shows the correlation between MESPA Sub variables

V. SCORING

Pilot study on 64 Parents and 64 Adolescents are done for finding Reliability & Validity of PSFFQ & MESPA self rating scale. The pupil required to respond on the four point scale as Not true at all, Just a little, Often true, Very much true. The score was five to one, four to one respectively. There are no negative items. Scores for each parent (PSFFQ) or adolescent MESPA Self rating scale were taken separately and sum of scores of each were taken for overall score of an item. Thus the instrument yields separate scores for each participant, namely Authoritarian or Power asserting disciplinarians, Authoritative or Warm giving protectors, Permissive or Lenient freedom givers, Uninvolved or Selfish autonomy givers for PSFFQ based on parents Nature & Role. MESPA Self rating scale yields separate scores for each participant.

VI. ITEM ANALYSIS

Item analysis was done using the method suggested by Edwards (1969). 64 answer sheets were selected randomly and they were arranged in the descending order of scores so as to select the top and bottom subjects (27 percent of sample). Item analysis was done by finding out the 't' value of each item. On the basis of these scores, found out parenting style of each parent. Those items having t value exceeding 2.58 were selected for the final scale. The final scale consists of 32 items for PSFFQ & 45 Items for MESPA Self rating scale.

VII. RESULTS

Those items having t value exceeding 2.58 were selected for the final scale. The 't' value of each item are given in the table. All items have high validity. so we can include all items of the questionnaire. The reliability also is found as very high. All t variables of PSFFQ shows high correlation with the PSDQ, MESPA with NEOFFI. Reliability of PSFFQ is .92, & that of MESPA is .99 which show high internal consistency. Findings revealed that authoritative and permissive upbringing adolescents were established as most optimum style with least mental health problems while authoritarian and uninvolved parenting was associated with major mental health & personality problems.

VIII. DISCUSSION

This tool PSFFQ is specially constructed to measure adolescent's parents parenting styles and is proved as a good tool for this purpose with high reliability and validity. PSFFQ shows high correlation with PSDQ sub types. With the help of this instrument, found that authoritarian parents are more power asserting disciplinarians, authoritative parents are more warm giving protectors, permissive parents are more lenient freedom givers and uninvolved parents are more selfish autonomy givers. These findings are consistent with the construct of three parenting style proposed by Buri, J.R. (1991). But here in this tool there is one more parenting style - uninvolved or selfish autonomy givers. NEO FFI are limited to a few studies because It is constructed to measure only 5 factors of personality like Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. But for advance study and research multidimensional factors of human beings should be

measured. So there is a need for preparing new rating scale which can measure 5 aspects of human beings like Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation. This rating scale has a great significance in the study of correlating parenting styles with all these 5 dimensions of adolescents and also important in clinical and research settings with children suffering from poor self esteem, mental health disorders and personality problems.

IX. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to provide a five dimensional personal self rating scale to identify their Mental health, Emotional intelligence, Self esteem, Personality and Achievement motivation. This rating scale is also important in clinical and research settings with children suffering from poor self esteem, mental health disorders and personality problems. This study has great importance in academic field as well as job selection field to find out students with high achievement motivation, emotional intelligence and good personality. MESPA is a valuable gift for teachers, parents, researchers, psychologists, counsellors and psychiatrist to study their students, children, clients and patients. This research also indicates the correlation of parenting styles of parents and parenting attitudes of adolescents. Findings revealed that authoritative and permissive upbringing adolescents were established as most optimum style with least mental health & personality problem while authoritarian and uninvolved parenting was associated with major mental health & personal problem. The findings furnished above are providing further evidences for the validity of this scale. The present research was conducted to develop and validate an instrument to measure parenting style of adolescent's parents. The result of item analysis, validity and reliability indicates that the present instrument is capable to measure parenting style of adolescent's parents. Future research is needed to study how inconsistent or mixed parenting styles influence adolescent cognitive processes and mental health outcomes. Another limitation is that most of the studies included in this review are cross-sectional and not longitudinal.

X. REFERENCES

- Awong, T., Grusec, J. E., & Sorenson, A. (2008). Respect-based control and anger as determinants of children's socio-emotional development. *Social Development*, 17(4), 941-59. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00460.x
- Adams, G., Ryan, B., Ketschis, M., & Keating, L. (2000). Rule compliance and peer sociability: A study of family process, school-focused parent-child interactions, and children's classroom behavior. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 14, 237-250. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.14.2.237
- Aunola, K., & Nurmi, J. (2005). The role of parenting styles in children's problem behavior. *Child Development*, 76, 1144-1159. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00841.x
- Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. authoritative parental control. *Adolescence*, 3, 255-272.

- Baumrind, D. (1968). Authoritarian vs. authoritative parental control. *Adolescence*, 3, 255-272.
- Baumrind, D. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monographs*, 4(No.1, Pt.2).
- Baumrind, D. (2010, May). The authoritative construct and its effects revisited. New directions in authoritative parenting: Building on the legacy of Diana Baumrind. Symposium Oklahoma State University-Tulsa, Chautauqua on Parenting, Tulsa, OK. 57
- Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R., & Cowan, P. (2002). Ordinary physical punishment: Is it harmful? Comment on Gershoff (2002). *Psychological Bulletin*, 128, 580-589. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.128.4.580
- Baumrind, D., Larzelere, R. E., & Owens, E. B. (in press). Effects of preschool parents' power assertive patterns and practices on adolescent development. *Parenting: Science and Practice*
- Behar, L. (1977). The Preschool Behaviour Questionnaire. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 5, 265-275. doi:10.1007/BF00913697
- Bingham, G.E. (2007). Maternal literacy beliefs and the quality of mother-child bookreading interactions: Associations with children's early literacy development. *Early Education and Development*, 18, 23-49.
- Baharudin, R., & Kordi, A. (2010). Parenting attitude and style and its effect on children's school achievements. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, 2(2), 217-22.
- Bretherton, I. (1985). Attachment theory: Retrospect and prospect. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 50, 3-35. doi:10.2307/3333824
- Bryant, D., Burchinal, M., Lau, L., & Sparling, J. (1994). Family and classroom correlates of Head Start children's developmental outcomes. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 9, 289-304. doi:10.1016/0885-2006(94)90011-6
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95.
- Baumrind, D. (1989). Rearing competent children. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Child development today and tomorrow*. San Francisco, CA: JosseyBass.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11, 56-95.
- Bronte-Tinkew J, Moore KA, Carrano J. The Father-Child Relationship, Parenting Styles, and Adolescent Risk Behaviors in Intact Families. *J Fam Issues*. 2006; 27(6):850-81.
- Clausen S-E. Parenting styles and adolescent drug use behaviours. *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research*. 1996; 3(3):403-14.
- Besharat, M. A., Azizi, K., Poursharifi, H. (2012). The relationship between parenting styles and Children's academic achievement in a sample of Iranian families. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 1280-1283.
- Boon, H. J. (2007). Low- and high-achieving Australian secondary school students: Their parenting, motivations and academic achievement. *Australian Psychologist*, 42, 212-225. 108 A study on impact of parenting styles and self-esteem on academic achievement of postgraduate students
- Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental Authority Questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Assessment*, 57(1), 110-119. DOI: 10.1207/s15327752jpa5701_13
- Chao, R. K. (2001). Extending Research on the Consequences of Parenting Style for Chinese Americans and European Americans. *Child Development*, 72(6), 1832-1843. DOI: 10.1111/1467-amly, 72, 685- 704. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2010.00725.x 59
- Coolahan, K., McWayne, C., Fantuzzo, J., & Grim, S. (2002). Validation of multidimensional assessment of parenting styles for low-income African families with preschool children. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 17, 356-373. doi:10.1016/S0885-2006(02)00169-2
- Coplan, R., Hastings, P., Lagacé-Séguin, D., & Moulton, C. (2002). Authoritative and authoritarian mothers' parenting goals, attributions, and emotions across different childrearing contexts. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 2, 1-26. doi:10.1207/S15327922PAR0201_1
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113(3), 487-496.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P. L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D. F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescent school performance. *Child Development*, 58, 1244-1257.
- Dwairy, M., Achoui, M., Abouserfe, R., & Farah, A. (2006). Parenting styles, individuation, and mental health of Arab adolescents: A third cross regional research study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 37, 262-272.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487-496. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.113.3.487 doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2005.04.008
- Downer, J. T., & Pianta, R. C. (2006). Academic and cognitive functioning in first grade: Associations with earlier home and child care predictors with co
- ERIC Digest. Field, T. M., Ignatoff, E., Stringer, S., & Widmayer, S. M. (1980). Teenage, lower-class, black mothers and their preterm infants: An intervention and developmental follow-up. *Child Development*, 51(2), 426-36.
- Fisher, E., & Sharp, S. (2004). The role of emotions. In *The art of managing everyday conflict: Understanding emotions and power struggles* (pp. 59-68). Westport, CT: Greenwood Publishing Group.
- Jones, A. (2008). The AAI as a clinical tool. In H. Steele & M. Steele (Eds.), *Clinical Applications of the Adult Attachment Interview* New York: The Guilford Press.
- Klebold, S. (2009, November). I will never know why. Retrieved from <http://www.oprah.com/world/Susan-Klebolds-O-Magazine-Essay-I-Will-Never-Know-Why/7>

- Macallair, D., & Males, M. Center on Juvenile and Criminal Justice, (2000). Dispelling the myth: An analysis of youth and adult crime patterns in California over the past 20 years. Retrieved from website: <http://198.170.117.218/pubs/myth/myth.html>
- Maccoby, E. (1992). The role of parents in socialization of children: An historical overview. *Developmental Psychology*, 28(6), 1006-1017.
- McClun, L. A., & Merrell, K. W. (1998). Relationship of perceived parenting styles, locus of control orientation, and self-concept among junior high age students . *Psychology in the Schools*, 35(4), 381-390.
- Moore, S. (1992). The role of parents in the development of peer group competence. ERIC Digest.
- Noronha, C. (2012, October 15). Amanda todd: Bullied teen shared story, then committed suicide. Retrieved from <http://www.csmonitor.com/The-Culture/Family/2012/1015/Amanda-Todd-Bullied-teen-shared-story-then-committed-suicide>
- Ellis, B., & Nigg, J. (2009). Parenting practices and attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder: New ncurent home and classroom experiences. *School Psychology Review*, 35, 11-30.
- findings suggest partial specificity of effects. *American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 48, 146-154. doi: 10.1097/CHI.0b013e31819176d0
- Gilliom, M., & Shaw, D. (2004). Codevelopment of externalizing and internalizing problems in early childhood. *Development and Psychopathology*, 16, 313-333. doi:10.1017/S0954579404044530
- Griffiths, L. J., Wolke, D., Page, A. S., Horwood, J. P. & the ALSPAC Study Team. (2006). Obesity and bullying: Different effects for boys and girls. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*, 91, 121-125. doi: 10.1136/adc.2005.072314
- Hansen, B. M., Dinesen, J., Hoff, B., & Griesen, G. (2002). Intelligence in preterm children at four years of age as a predictor of school function: A longitudinal controlled study. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology*, 44, 517-521. doi:10.1017/S0012162201002481
- Hewison, J., & Tizard, J. (1980). Parental involvement and reading attainment. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 50, 209-215.
- Hoge, R. D., Meginbir, L., Khan, Y., Weatherall, D. (1985). A multitrait-multimethod analysis of the preschool behaviour questionnaire. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 13, 119-127. doi:10.1007/Bf0091837661
- Holden, G. W., & Miller, P. C. (1999). Enduring and different: A meta-analysis of the similarity in parents' child rearing. *Psychological Bulletin*, 125, 223-254. doi:10.1037/00332909.125.2.223
- Hollenstein, T., Granic, I., Stoolmiller, M., & Snyder, J. (2004). Rigidity in parent-child interactions and the development of externalizing and internalizing behavior in early childhood. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 32, 595-607. doi:10.1023/B:JACP.0000047209.37650.41
- Holmbeck, G. (2002). Post-hoc probing of significant moderational and mediational effects in studies of pediatric populations. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 27, 87-96. doi:10.1093/jpepsy/27.1.87
- Hubbs-Tait, L., Culp, A. M., Culp, R. E., & Miller, C. (2002). Relations of maternal cognitive stimulation, emotional support, and intrusive behavior during Head Start to children's kindergarten cognitive abilities. *Child Development*, 73, 110- 131. doi:10.1111/1467-8624.00395
- Jewell, J., Krohn, E., Scott, V., Carlton, M., & Meinz, E. (2008). The differential impact of mothers' and fathers' discipline on preschool children's home and classroom behavior. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 10, 173-188.
- Lonigan, C., Burgess, S., & Anthony, J. (2000). Development of emergent literacy and early reading skills in preschool children: Evidence from a latent-variable longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 36, 596-613. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.36.5.59662
- Lyytinen, P., Laakso, M., & Poikkeus, A. (1998). Parental contribution to child's early language and interest in books. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 13, 297-308.
- Maccoby, E., & Martin, J. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, personality, and social development* (pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Masten, A. S., Cutuli, J. J., Herbers, J. E., & Reed, M. J. (2009). Resilience in development. In S. J. Lopez and C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 117-131). New York: Oxford.
- Mattanah, J. (2005). Authoritative parenting and the encouragement of children's autonomy. The family context of parenting in children's adaptation to elementary school (pp. 119-138). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- McCarthy, D. (1972). *Manual for the McCarthy Scales of Children's Abilities*. New York: The Psychological Corporation.
- Mulvaney, M., & Mebert, C. (2007). Parental corporal punishment predicts behavior problems in early childhood. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 21, 389-397. doi:10.1037/08933200.21.3.389 National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Early Child Care Research Network. (2005). Duration and developmental timing of poverty and children's cognitive and social development from birth through third grade. *Child Development*, 76, 795-810. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00878.x 64
- Nelson, D. A., Nelson, L. J., Hart, C. H., Yang, C., & Jin, S. (2006). Parenting and peer group behavior in cultural context. In X. Chen, D. C. French, & B. H. Schneider (Eds.), *Peer relationship in cultural context* (pp. 213-246). New York: Cambridge University Press.

- O'Connor, E., & Yasik, A. (2007). Using information from an early intervention program to enhance literacy goals on the Individualized Education Program (IEP). *Reading Psychology*, 28, 133-148. doi:10.1080/02702710600846902
- Querido, J., Warner, T., & Eyberg, S. (2002). Parenting styles and child behavior in African American families of preschool children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 31, 272-277. doi:10.1207/153744202753604548
- Raikes, H., Luze, G., Brooks-Gunn, J., Raikes, H., Pan, B., Tamis-LeMonda, C., et al. (2006). Mother-child bookreading in low-income families: Correlates and outcomes during the first three years of life. *Child Development*, 77, 924-953. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00911.x
- Robinson, C., Mandleco, B., Olsen, S., & Hart, C. (1995). Authoritative, authoritarian, and permissive parenting practices: Development of a new measure. *Psychological Reports*, 77(3, Pt 1), 819-830.
- Steinberg, L., Moriss, A.S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 82 - 110. Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Rosenberg, M. (1989). *Society and the Adolescent Self-Image* (Rev.ed.). Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press. 112 A study on impact of parenting styles and self-esteem on academic achievement of postgraduate students
- Ross, C. E., & Broh, B. A. (2000). The roles of Self-Esteem and the sense of personal control in the academic achievement process. *Sociology of Education*, 73(4), 270-284.
- Wang, J., Wildman, L., & Calhoun, G. (1996). The relationships between parental influence and student achievement in seventh grade mathematics. *School Science and Mathematics*, 96, 395-399.

PS-FFQ

(Parenting Style Four Factor Questionnaire)

By

Shyny.T.Y & Dr. V.G.Omana

Research scholar in Psychology

Bharathiar University - Coimbatore, India

Name of Parent: Age: Sex: M/F.....

Name of Child: Age: Sex: M/F

Instructions: Read the following statements carefully and indicate your single response by putting a “tick” mark in the appropriate box

Sl.No	Statements	All of the time	Most of the time	Some time	Rarely	Never
1	I want my child to follow my instructions because I am the authority to decide what to do or what not to do.					
2	I would like to be a friend, philosopher and guide to my child.					
3	I am very soft with my child so that I cannot correct him/her at proper time by punishment.					

4	I do not have any demand or control on my child and I give total freedom.					
5	I have little patience to tolerate any misbehaviour of my child or to listen to the excuses in any kind of mistakes.					
6	I used to understand the feelings of my child in any situation and always try to get the opinion of my child whenever I buy something for him/her.					
7	Whenever the child comes with low marks, I will not give any punishments rather I feel he/she will become better next time.					
8	As I am very sad and depressed I cannot show much care and deep emotional tie up with my child.					
9	I strongly believe that my child's future is in my hand and so there is a strict time table for my child to follow.					
10	Important decisions of the family are done together and I give full freedom to my child to share everything with me.					
11	I give valuable reward to my child for obeying me or behaving well.					
12	As I am very busy with my household and office duties, I get less time to involve my child's studies or to listen his/her needs and wishes.					
13	I have clear expectations regarding my child's behaviour and I am not much bothered about the likings of my child regarding his/her future.					
14	As I understand the strength and weakness of my child, I set some appropriate rules for him/her and give friendly corrections whenever necessary.					
15	Though I have definite goal and planning about my child's future I cannot follow it strictly because of my leniency.					
16	I have enough stress and strain myself and hence I cannot take care of my child's welfare.					
17	I usually like to give physical punishment than giving advices to my child because I am sure he/she will not listen to it.					
18	I will not force my child in any of his/her future career and I also help him/her to set a realistic goal.					
19	As I was brought up by strictly disciplined parents, I am very liberal with my child.					
20	I usually give more important to my own likes and wishes but not bother much about needs or misbehaviours of my child.					
21	I believe that only through punishment a child can be corrected and I also do not like to give any financial freedom to my child.					
22	Whenever my child fails to follow the time table given to him/her, I remind the consequences with a touch of love and affection.					
23	I like to be a very affectionate parent towards my child and also I take the responsibility of my faulty parenting on my child.					
24	As I am busy and get little time to care my child, he/she is quite free to move on his/her own way to take decisions.					
25	The punishment I give to my child depends upon my mood.					
26	My child talks with me out of being punished after he/she has done something wrong.					
27	I always threaten my child with punishment but do not actually do it because of my leniency.					
28	As I am bounded with severe life problems, I ignore my child's misbehaviour and I have no idea about his/her life outside the home.					
29	Whenever my child shows disobedience, I scold and criticise him/her with bursting anger.					
30	Even though I am busy I have enough time to visit my child's school & to meet teachers to know his/her progress.					
31	Because of excessive love and sympathy I have shown towards my child, he/she has no self-discipline.					
32	I never like to tell my child where I am going or why I am late.					

PS-FFQ (Parenting Style Four Factor Questionnaire)

Answer Sheet

Score	5	4	3	2	1	Score	5	4	3	2	1	Score	5	4	3	2	1	Score	5	4	3	2	1
Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Some time	Rarely	Never	Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Some time	Rarely	Never	Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Some time	Rarely	Never	Q	All of the time	Most of the time	Some time	Rarely	Never
1						2						3						4					
5						6						7						8					
9						10						11						12					
13						14						15						16					
17						18						19						20					
21						22						23						24					
25						26						27						28					
29						30						31						32					

A1=.....; A2=.....; P=.....; U=.....

Have you responded to all of the statements	Yes/No
Have you entered your responses in the correct boxes	Yes/No
Have you responded accurately and honestly	Yes/No

By
Shyny T. Y & Dr. V.G. Omana
Research Scholar
Bharathiar University, Coimbatore, India

Instructions: Read each statement carefully and indicate your single response by putting a “tick” mark against it in an appropriate box.

Sl No	Statements	Not true at all	Just a little true	Often true	Very much true
1	Anxiety and tension				
2	Laughing easily				
3	Trying new and foreign food				
4	Sad and depressed				
5	Courteous				
6	Keeping Surroundings clean and neat				
7	Feeling of confidence with many good qualities				
8	Knowing others from their non verbal messages like voice tone, facial expression etc.				
9	Enjoying Challenging tasks and competition				
10	Disturbed sleep				
11	Enjoying gatherings				
12	Fond of art and nature				
13	Co-operative				
14	Feeling of helplessness and need for others help				
15	Perform assigned task on time				
16	Ability to do things as others				
17	Experiencing others emotions just by looking their face.				
18	Starting new work just after finishing the present one.				
19	Feeling of inferior to others				
20	Active and cheerful				
21	Intellectual curiosity				
22	Thoughtful and considerate				
23	Working hard to achieve a goal in an orderly fashion.				
24	Feeling of loneliness and helplessness				
25	Feeling of self respect and proud				
26	Complimenting others and helping them for positive thinking.				
27	Doing things indifferent from others by using unique skills				
28	Digestive problem and acidity.				
29	Light hearted				
30	Abstract thinking				
31	Harmonious with family members and co-workers				
32	Asthma or other allergy problems.				
33	Striving for excellence of a work.				
34	Feeling of worthiness and optimism				
35	Facing all life obstacles easily from previous experiences.				
36	Concentrating on own task by avoiding criticism.				
37	Easily frustrated.				
38	Ability to lead others				
39	Interesting to know human nature and conditions.				
40	Being helpful to others.				
41	Hiding from unfavourable conditions				
42	Trying to fulfil a commitment				
43	Dealings with problems well				
44	Aware of own emotions as it experience.				
45	Feeling of proud after finishing a new job.				

(M=Mental health, E=Emotional intelligence, S=Self esteem, P=Personality, A=Achievement motivation)

Name: Age: Sex: M/F