

Adolescents' Perception of Their Relation with Their Parents: Impact on Emotional Autonomy

Laitonjam Valentina¹ and Jatinder K. Gulati²

*Department of Human Development, Punjab Agricultural University,
Ludhiana 141 004, Punjab, India*

E-mail: ¹<valentinalaitonjam5@gmail.com>, ²<jkgulati@pau.edu>

KEYWORDS Autonomous. Parenting Style. Behaviour. Protecting. Punitive

ABSTRACT The present study has been designed to find out adolescents' perception of their relationship with both the parents and its impact on the emotional autonomy. A sample of 200 adolescents comprising of 100 boys and 100 girls in the age group of 16-18 years was drawn from four Government schools of Ludhiana city. Parent Child Relationship Scale by Nalini Rao and Emotional Autonomy Scale by Steinberg and Silverberg were used to assess parent adolescent relationship and emotional autonomy of the respondents respectively. Results revealed that highly autonomous boys considered their father to be more rejecting and neglecting and less loving than their mother. Highly autonomous girls perceived their father to be demanding and their mother to be less rewarding symbolically and objectively and less loving. Aspects of positive parenting such as protecting, symbolic reward, loving and object reward was associated with decreased emotional autonomy among adolescents.

INTRODUCTION

Parenting is considered to be an important determinant of several aspects of children's outcome (Gadeyne et al. 2004). Parenting can be a potentially satisfying and emotionally rewarding experience, conducive to feelings of gratification and personal fulfillment, while at the same time potentially generating exhaustion, stress, and emotional tension, given the highly demanding and multifaceted challenges that the role entails. Parents are the first role models children witness in their micro environment. As such, parental efforts affect children directly and in the most obvious way, the manner in which they try to manage their children's behaviour have an immediate impact on children's adjustment, especially among young adolescents (Griffin et al. 2000). Adolescent's fear of negative evaluation from peers and non-familial adults was associated positively with parent-adolescent conflict (Weymouth 2013). One of the major developmental tasks of adolescence is to achieve emotional independence from parents and other adults and therefore, development of autonomy is inevitable. It implies that the adolescents are

capable of managing themselves on their own without the constant support from their parents, making their own decisions and solving their own problems (Parra and Oliva 2009).

The literature has used two different concepts of autonomy, one based on detachment from parents (Steinberg and Silverberg 1986), and the other based upon close relationships with parents (Ryan and Lynch 1989; Allen et al. 1995). Both theories define autonomy as independent and self-regulated thought and behavior, but they differ in their explanations of the means by which adolescents reach autonomy. Cassidy and Kobak (1988) and Sessa and Steinberg (1991) found that emotional autonomy tended to be adaptive in situations where some emotional distance from parents would facilitate development such as when adolescents were exposed to a less supportive or maladaptive parenting environment which criticizes the contemporary view. In tune with this concept, Grotevant and Cooper (1986), Kandel and Lesser (1972) and Younis (1980) suggested that healthy autonomy is encouraged through a close and positive relationship with parents. According to this proposition, an emotionally close family that allows the expression of both negative and positive feelings within a supportive environment helps the child to develop psychosocial competence, which in adolescents includes responsible autonomy. Adolescents can distance themselves from childish images of their parents without detaching themselves physically or emotion-

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Laitonjam Valentina,
Department of Human Development,
Punjab Agricultural University,
Ludhiana 141 004, Punjab, India
Mobile: 7696138809,
E-mail: valentinalaitonjam5@gmail.com

ally from the family. Supportive parents who encourage negotiation and self-regulation raise adolescents who think and behave autonomously (Allen et al. 1994). Teenagers without supportive family relationships are less likely to learn to act independently, and are therefore more likely to conform both to their parents and to their peers (Ryan and Lynch 1989). Dotterer et al. (in press) reported that conflict in parent-adolescent relationship was linked to decrease in academic achievement and increase in parental warmth was related to increase in school bonding and school self-esteem in adolescents.

The quality of relationship of adolescents with their mother and father has been observed to be different for both boys and girls. The parents act in a gender specific manner and the boys and girls are treated differently which leads to a development of different personality and behaviours of boys and girls. Usually adolescents' descriptions of their mothers' and fathers' parenting behaviours overlap considerably, on the other hand findings suggested by research such as Johnson et al. (1991) revealed that fathers were perceived to be more rejecting than mothers. Stanik et al. (2013) revealed that mothers reported warmer relationships with adolescents than fathers, and both parents reported warmer relationships with younger versus older offspring. Greater maternal warmth was associated with fewer depressive symptoms and less risky behavior for sons, and more paternal warmth and shared time with fathers were associated with less risky behavior in youth. Allen et al. (2003) opined that adolescent's feeling of security is closely connected to the workings of the mother-adolescent relationship via a secure-base phenomenon in which the adolescent can explore independence in thought and speech from the secure base of a maternal relationship characterized by maternal attunement to the adolescent and maternal supportiveness. Tinkew et al. (2006) stated that having a father with an authoritarian parenting style is associated with an increased risk of engaging in delinquent activities and substance abuse among adolescents. The positive influence of father child relationship on risk behaviours was found to be stronger for male than for female adolescents. On the other hand, Shaban and Mattoo (2012) reported that parents do not show any significant difference in protecting levels when compared with their male and female children. Both mothers and

fathers were also found to show significant difference in the use of symbolic punishment between male and female children.

Keeping the above literature in mind, the present study was formulated to study adolescents' perception of their relationship with their parents and its impact on emotional autonomy.

METHODOLOGY

Sample Selection

The sample for the present study was drawn from four Government Senior Secondary Schools of Ludhiana city. The sample size consisted of 200 adolescents aged between 16-18 years who belonged to intact two parent families. The sample was divided to have equal number of boys ($n = 100$) and girls ($n = 100$).

Research Instruments

i. Parent Child Relationship Scale: Parent Child Relationship Scale by Nalini Rao (1989) was used to assess adolescent's perception of their relationship with their parents. It is a standardized scale adapted from the revised Roe-Seigalman Parent Child Relationship Questionnaire. It measures the characteristic behaviour of the parents as experienced by the children, that is, it measures the paternal and maternal relationship with children separately. This scale is meant for children studying from Class VII to Class XII and age range is 12 to 18 years. The scale contains 100 items categorized into the following ten dimensions viz. Protecting, Symbolic Punishment, Rejecting, Object punishment, Demanding, Indifferent, Symbolic reward, Loving, Object reward and Neglecting.

ii. The Emotional Autonomy Scale: The Emotional Autonomy Scale developed by Steinberg and Silverberg (1986) was used to assess the magnitude of emotional autonomy among the adolescents. This scale consists of four point Likert type 20 structured items. The items are presented as declarative statements, and the adolescents in the study were asked to indicate their degree of agreement with each item on a four-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree". Out of 20 items, 11 are negatively phrased whereas 9 are positively phrased. For the positive items, 'strongly agree'

is 1, 'disagree' is 2, 'agree' is 3 and 'strongly disagree' is 4. Higher score indicates a higher level of emotional autonomy. The internal consistency of the measure as determined by Cronbach's alpha is .75.

Data Collection

The respondents were contacted in their school settings and were administered the above research tools separately. After administration of tools, answer sheets were scored and raw scores were calculated following the scoring procedure given in the manual. Statistical tools such as mean values, chi square, correlation and regression were calculated to analyze adolescent's perception of their relationship with their parents and its impact on emotional autonomy of adolescents.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The following account presents the profile of gender differences in the perception of adolescents' relationship with their mother and father. It also highlights the impact of emotional autonomy among adolescents on the perceptions of their relation with their parents.

Profile of Parent Adolescent Relationship: Gender Differences

Table 1 represents gender differences in distribution of adolescents across different levels of perceived parent adolescent relationship. It can be noted that there were significant gender differences in their father's attitude in dimensions like symbolic punishment, indifference and symbolic reward and protecting attitude of the mothers. Majority of the adolescents considered their fathers to be less protecting but moderately symbolically punitive (45.50 %) objectively punitive (46.50%), rejecting (42.00%), demanding (41.50%), indifferent (54.00%) and neglecting (39.00%). They also considered their fathers to be moderately loving (54.50%) and rewarding both symbolically (50.00%) and objectively 49.00%).

As compared to daughters, sons perceived their father to be more moderate in dimensions of punishment both symbolically (56.00%) and objectively (52.00%), rejecting (47.00%), indifferent (57.00%), reward in terms of symbolic

(60.00%) as well as object (55.00%) and neglecting (46.00%). On the other hand, daughters perceived their relationship with their father to be more moderate than sons in dimensions of demanding (43.00%) and loving (57.00%). Mother adolescent relationship was perceived at moderate level in all the dimensions except rejecting (43.00%) which was perceived by adolescents to be low. Mother was perceived to be more protecting (32.00%) and loving (39.00%) and less rejecting (50.00%) by daughters than sons.

Sons perceived their mother to be more moderately punitive symbolically (57.00%) and objectively (56.00%), demanding (60.00%), indifferent (56.00%), giving reward symbolically (56.00%) and neglecting (49.00%). The findings of the study are in agreement with previous study by Shaban and Matto (2012) who also reported significant difference in the use of symbolic punishment, rejecting and loving dimensions and gender of the adolescent. However, in the present study, daughters perceived their parents to be more protecting than what sons perceived which is contradictory to the finding of Shaban and Matto (2012) who reported insignificant gender difference in terms of protecting dimension.

Mean Scores in Parent Adolescent Relationship: Gender Differences

Table 2 represents mean scores of male adolescents' perception of their relationship with their mother and father across various levels of emotional autonomy. It is evident from the table that when level of emotional autonomy among boys increased from low to high, their mean scores in their father's rejecting ($F=3.84, p<0.01$) and neglecting ($F=4.08, p<0.01$) attitude also increased. On the contrary, the dimension of loving depicted an altogether different picture. It can be observed from the table that as the level of emotional autonomy among boys increased, the mean scores in perception of their father in dimension of loving significantly decreased ($F=3.79, p<0.01$). Although the differences were non-significant yet increase in mean scores in dimensions of protecting and rewarding both symbolically as well as objectively was found to be associated with decrease in levels of emotional autonomy. However, increase father's object punishment and indifference was associated with increase in emotional autonomy. Thus,

Table 1: Gender differences in percent distribution of adolescents across different levels of perceived parent adolescent relationship

Dimensions of parent-adolescent relationship	Level	Father		χ^2	Mother		χ^2	
		Total (n=200)	Boys (n ₁ =100)		Girls (n ₂ =100)	Total (n=200)		Boys (n ₁ =100)
Protecting	Low	83 (41.50)	45 (45.00)	38 (38.00)	32 (16.00)	14 (14.00)	18 (18.00)	8.13**
	Medium	65 (32.50)	31 (31.00)	34 (34.00)	119 (59.50)	69 (69.00)	50 (50.00)	
	High	52 (26.00)	24 (24.00)	28 (28.00)	49 (24.50)	17 (17.00)	32 (32.00)	
Symbolic Punishment	Low	51 (25.50)	21 (21.00)	30 (30.00)	52 (26.00)	23 (23.00)	29 (29.00)	3.41
	Medium	91 (45.50)	56 (56.00)	35 (35.00)	101 (50.50)	57 (57.00)	44 (44.00)	
	High	58 (29.00)	23 (23.00)	35 (35.00)	47 (23.50)	20 (20.00)	27 (27.00)	
Rejecting	Low	74 (37.00)	30 (30.00)	44 (44.00)	86 (43.00)	36 (36.00)	50 (50.00)	4.13
	Medium	84 (42.00)	47 (47.00)	37 (37.00)	84 (42.00)	48 (48.00)	36 (36.00)	
	High	42 (21.00)	23 (23.00)	19 (19.00)	30 (15.00)	16 (16.00)	16 (16.00)	
Object Punishment	Low	55 (27.50)	22 (22.00)	33 (33.00)	65 (32.50)	29 (29.00)	36 (36.00)	1.12
	Medium	93 (46.50)	52 (52.00)	41 (41.00)	106 (53.00)	56 (56.00)	50 (50.00)	
	High	52 (26.00)	26 (26.00)	26 (26.00)	29 (14.50)	15 (15.00)	14 (14.00)	
Demanding	Low	53 (26.50)	24 (24.00)	29 (29.00)	50 (25.00)	21 (21.00)	29 (29.00)	2.04
	Medium	83 (41.50)	40 (40.00)	43 (43.00)	111 (55.50)	60 (60.00)	51 (51.00)	
	High	64 (32.00)	36 (36.00)	28 (28.00)	39 (19.50)	19 (19.00)	20 (20.00)	
Indifferent	Low	59 (29.50)	23 (23.00)	36 (36.00)	59 (29.50)	25 (25.00)	34 (34.00)	1.97
	Medium	108 (54.00)	57 (57.00)	51 (51.00)	114 (57.00)	61 (61.00)	53 (53.00)	
	High	33 (16.50)	20 (20.00)	13 (13.00)	27 (13.50)	14 (14.00)	13 (13.00)	
Symbolic Reward	Low	48 (24.00)	24 (24.00)	24 (24.00)	40 (20.00)	22 (22.00)	18 (18.00)	3.07
	Medium	100 (50.00)	60 (60.00)	40 (40.00)	105 (52.50)	56 (56.00)	49 (49.00)	
	High	52 (26.00)	16 (16.00)	36 (36.00)	55 (27.50)	22 (22.00)	33 (33.00)	
Loving	Low	35 (17.50)	21 (21.00)	14 (14.00)	37 (18.50)	22 (22.00)	15 (15.00)	2.54
	Medium	109 (54.50)	52 (52.00)	57 (57.00)	94 (47.00)	48 (48.00)	46 (46.00)	
	High	56 (28.00)	27 (27.00)	29 (29.00)	69 (34.50)	30 (30.00)	39 (39.00)	
Object Reward	Low	56 (28.00)	26 (26.00)	30 (30.00)	42 (21.00)	19 (19.00)	19 (19.00)	1.62
	Medium	98 (49.00)	55 (55.00)	43 (43.00)	101 (50.50)	55 (55.00)	55 (55.00)	
	High	46 (23.00)	19 (19.00)	27 (27.00)	57 (28.50)	26 (26.00)	26 (26.00)	
Neglecting	Low	74 (37.00)	34 (34.00)	40 (40.00)	62 (31.00)	32 (32.00)	30 (30.00)	1.05
	Medium	78 (39.00)	46 (46.00)	32 (32.00)	94 (47.00)	49 (49.00)	45 (45.00)	
	High	48 (24.00)	20 (20.00)	28 (28.00)	44 (22.00)	19 (19.00)	25 (25.00)	

***p<0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.10 Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

it can be stated that highly autonomous boys perceived their father to be more rejecting and neglecting and less loving.

Table 2 further presents the mean scores in boys' perception of their relationship with their mother across different level of emotional autonomy. It brings to light that as the level of emotional autonomy among boys increased, the mean scores in their mother's neglecting behaviour also increased ($F=3.35$, $p<0.01$). Thus, highly autonomous boys perceived their mother to be more neglecting. Although non-significant, the same pattern was observed in dimensions of symbolic and objective punishment, rejecting, demanding and indifferent behaviour. In contrary, less autonomous boys were found to perceive their mother to be more protecting, rewarding in terms of symbolic and object and loving. Thus, it was found that highly autonomous boys considered their father to be more rejecting and neglecting and less loving than their mother. Grundman (2013) stated that autonomy support parenting style leads children to develop intrinsic motivation, which then leads them to higher levels of exploration during identity development.

A close perusal of Table 3 highlights adolescent girls' perception of their relationship with their father and mother and its association with emotional autonomy. It can be observed from the table that an increase in level of emotional autonomy coincides with significant increase in mean scores of adolescent's perception of their father being demanding ($F=5.01$, $p<0.01$). This implies that highly autonomous girls perceived their father to be demanding. Likewise, although the differences were non-significant, yet highly autonomous girls were reported to perceive their father as more punitive both symbolically and objectively, rejecting and neglecting. On the other hand, daughters who were less autonomous were found to perceive their father to be more protecting ($F=3.47$, $p<0.01$) and more rewarding both symbolically ($F=5.49$, $p<0.01$) and objectively ($F=7.83$, $p<0.01$). Similarly, although non-significant, less autonomous girls were reported to perceive their father as more loving.

Adolescent girls' perception of their relationship with their mother and its association with emotional autonomy as depicted in Table 3 presented a similar picture as that of their relationship with father. It can be noted from the table

Table 2: Parent adolescent relationship (mean scores) across different levels of emotional autonomy of boys

Dimensions of parent adolescent relationship		Levels of emotional autonomy						F-ratio
		Low		Medium		High		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Father	Protecting	41.00	6.07	39.29	6.15	38.96	6.58	0.62
	Symbolic punishment	29.76	6.71	33.42	6.71	30.25	8.56	2.67
	Rejecting	19.47	6.22	25.27	8.87	26.63	9.45	3.84**
	Object punishment	23.00	9.25	26.97	7.80	26.97	7.61	1.73
	Demanding	30.41	5.57	33.20	6.77	31.54	8.39	1.24
	Indifferent	28.24	6.87	28.85	6.22	32.21	6.71	2.74
	Symbolic reward	39.71	6.25	36.97	6.28	36.13	7.43	1.60
	Loving	43.41	5.06	38.92	6.20	38.00	8.45	3.79**
	Object reward	33.53	9.00	31.73	6.70	31.38	8.49	0.46
Mother	Neglecting	22.82	6.67	27.36	6.55	28.83	7.72	4.08**
	Protecting	40.76	6.56	38.07	6.66	37.88	5.60	1.31
	Symbolic punishment	28.71	11.15	33.53	7.04	33.08	9.22	2.23
	Rejecting	24.41	9.75	26.31	9.04	28.00	10.88	0.70
	Object punishment	25.88	10.48	28.15	7.74	29.71	8.62	1.02
	Demanding	32.18	7.77	31.14	7.20	33.29	9.04	0.68
	Indifferent	29.12	9.68	30.02	6.27	31.42	6.55	0.58
	Symbolic reward	37.53	8.51	36.44	7.06	35.04	8.78	0.54
	Loving	41.29	7.03	37.95	8.04	37.13	7.27	1.62
Object reward	33.71	9.84	32.95	8.47	31.67	8.67	0.30	
Neglecting	23.00	8.90	27.63	7.88	29.42	7.59	3.35**	

** $p<0.01$

Table 3: Parent adolescent relationship (mean scores) across different levels of emotional autonomy of girls

Dimensions of parent adolescent relationship		Levels of emotional autonomy						F-ratio
		Low		Medium		High		
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Father	Protecting	39.63	6.43	41.35	5.24	37.29	8.00	3.47**
	Symbolic punishment	29.25	7.06	33.04	8.85	33.88	9.70	2.07
	Rejecting	19.63	6.63	22.69	9.71	25.21	10.96	2.12
	Object punishment	22.58	8.02	26.12	9.18	24.96	9.76	1.25
	Demanding	27.29	5.79	33.13	7.74	33.71	10.70	5.01**
	Indifferent	28.88	6.77	29.08	6.90	26.29	8.65	1.27
	Symbolic reward	38.75	6.86	41.13	6.36	35.00	10.11	5.49**
	Loving	40.92	7.17	41.56	6.14	37.00	10.54	3.02
	Object reward	32.75	7.83	35.17	8.31	26.67	10.29	7.83**
	Neglecting	26.08	7.49	26.98	9.39	28.13	10.58	0.29
Mother	Protecting	39.71	6.54	39.98	7.07	36.75	9.31	1.59
	Symbolic punishment	32.13	8.73	31.56	8.76	34.79	10.19	1.06
	Rejecting	23.63	8.42	23.63	9.69	27.75	12.66	1.49
	Object punishment	24.17	7.13	26.15	9.43	26.88	9.90	0.60
	Demanding	30.00	7.47	31.90	7.66	34.04	11.00	1.35
	Indifferent	30.38	7.26	29.81	6.91	26.71	6.78	2.07
	Symbolic reward	40.17	7.51	39.96	6.24	33.04	12.57	6.24**
	Loving	40.13	8.06	41.02	6.33	34.92	11.47	4.66**
	Object reward	34.21	8.61	35.42	8.06	26.38	11.54	8.37**
	Neglecting	26.67	7.81	27.29	9.08	27.67	9.22	0.08

**p<0.01

that highly autonomous girls perceived their mother to be less rewarding, symbolically (F=6.24, p<0.01) as well as objectively (F=8.37, p<0.01) and less loving (F=4.66, p<0.01). They also perceived their mother to be more protecting and independent. Though the difference in mean scores was non-significant, yet girls who were highly autonomous showcased their perception of their mother to be highly punitive, rejecting, demanding, indifferent and neglecting. In another study, Chan (2013) reported maternal warmth to be a negative predictor of adolescents' susceptibility to peer pressure in the areas of peer activities, family activities, school activities, and misconduct behaviors and its effects were mediated by adolescents' emotional autonomy from parents.

Correlation between Emotional Autonomy of Adolescents and Perceived Relationship with Their Parents

Table 4 depicts the correlation between emotional autonomy and parenting styles as perceived by adolescents. It can be noted from the table that father's rejecting (r=0.30, p<0.01) and neglecting (r=0.29, p<0.01) behaviour were positively and loving (r=-0.24, p<0.05) behaviour was negatively correlated with emotional autonomy of sons. Similarly, female adolescents' perception of their father being rejecting (r=0.25, p<0.05) and demanding (r=0.31, p<0.01) was positively correlated with emotional autonomy, while dimensions of symbolic reward (r=-0.24, p<0.05)

Table 4: Correlation between dimensions of emotional autonomy and perceived adolescent parent relationship among adolescents

Emotional autonomy		Dimensions of parent-adolescent relationship									
		PRO	SP	REJ	OP	DEM	IND	SR	LOV	OR	NEG
Boys	Father	-0.09	0.09	0.30*	0.18	0.08	0.14	-0.16	-0.24*	-0.07	0.29**
	Mother	-0.21*	0.18	0.16	0.19	0.13	0.09	-0.10	-0.20*	-0.04	0.22*
Girls	Father	-0.16	0.24	0.25*	0.14	0.31**	-0.02	-0.24*	-0.22*	-0.25*	0.20
	Mother	-0.21*	0.15	0.23*	0.17	0.20*	-0.12	-0.41**	-0.30**	-0.34**	0.15

**p <0.05, *p<

and loving ($r=-0.22$, $p<0.05$) behaviour were found to be negatively correlated with emotional autonomy. Adolescents' perception of their mother in dimensions of protecting and loving was found to be negatively correlated in both boys and girls. Also, girls' perception of their mother being symbolically rewarding ($r=-0.41$, $p<0.01$) and loving ($r=-0.30$, $p<0.01$) was found to be negatively correlated with their emotional autonomy. However, girls' perception of their mother being rejecting ($r=0.23$, $p<0.05$) and demanding ($r=0.20$, $p<0.05$) among girls was found to be positively correlated to their emotional autonomy.

This implies that adolescents who reported unsupportive relationship with their parents were more autonomous than their counterparts who reported more loving and supportive parents. In a similar study Karabanova and Poskrebysheva (2013) reported that high autonomous adolescents are characterized by low parental control, severity and defectiveness. The parents of these young people do not tend to take care of their children overtly; do not require absolute obedience and consider their children as independent persons. Similarly, in the present study, aspects of positive parenting such as protecting, reward-

ing both symbolically and objectively and loving were found to be negatively correlated with emotional autonomy in both boys and girls while component that characterises negative parenting such as punishment both symbolically and objectively, demanding, and neglecting were found to be positively correlated to emotional autonomy. A possible reason for this finding may be due to the fact that even if the family environment isn't supportive of development of emotional autonomy other contextual factors such as relationship with peers and teachers directly or indirectly affect adolescent development and their contribution cannot be subjugated.

Impact of Emotional Autonomy on Parent Adolescent Relationship: Regression Analysis

Table 5 represents the regression analysis of different dimensions of parent adolescent relationship on emotional autonomy of adolescents. Results indicate that in aspects of father adolescent relationship, parents' demanding ($F=1.544$, $p<0.10$) and indifferent ($F=1.9$, $p<0.10$) behaviour was positively contributing towards emotional autonomy of adolescents. It shows that father's indifferent attitude contributed to

Table 5: The estimates of multiple linear regression of dimensions of parent adolescent relationship on emotional autonomy among total adolescents

Dimensions of parent-adolescent relationship		β (Estimate)	Standard Error (S.E.)	t-value
Father	Protecting	0.053	0.093	0.565
	Symbolic punishment	0.051	0.087	0.582
	Rejecting	0.072	0.089	0.806
	Object punishment	-0.039	0.087	-0.444
	Demanding	0.133	0.086	1.544*
	Indifferent	0.038	0.020	1.900*
	Symbolic reward	-0.085	0.093	-0.917
	Loving	-0.102	0.101	-1.012
	Object reward	-0.091	0.077	-1.178
	Neglecting	0.051	0.080	0.636
	Constant	45.348	3.721	12.188***
	R-Square	0.159		
Mother	Protecting	-0.056	0.088	-0.632
	Symbolic punishment	0.088	0.077	1.143
	Rejecting	0.024	0.042	0.575
	Object punishment	0.032	0.087	0.372
	Demanding	0.061	0.079	0.776
	Indifferent	-0.094	0.081	-1.165
	Symbolic reward	-0.125	0.091	-1.375
	Loving	0.005	0.095	0.056
	Object reward	-0.089	0.072	-1.239
	Neglecting	0.076	0.077	0.997
	CONSTANT	50.284	3.246	15.493***
	R-SQUARE	0.152		

*** $p<0.01$, ** $p<0.05$, * $p<0.10$

adolescents' emotional autonomy followed by demanding nature of father. The contribution of all the other dimensions of father adolescent relationship was found to be non-significant. In similar stance, none of the dimensions of mother adolescent relationship were found to be significantly contributing to emotional autonomy. Though non-significant, the dimensions of mother adolescent relationship such as protecting, indifferent, symbolic reward and object reward were found to negatively affect the emotional autonomy of adolescents. The finding is in contrast to Sandhu (2004) who had shown that adolescent psychosocial development is promoted within the context of a progressive mutual redefinition of the parent-adolescent relationship, one that continues a sense of connectedness and an emotional being while simultaneously encouraging autonomy.

CONCLUSION

The present study contributed useful insights to the overall literature of emotional autonomy procured so far. Mother was perceived to be more protecting and loving and less rejecting by girls as compared to boys. An interesting finding is that parent's behaviour pattern such as protecting, symbolic reward, loving and object reward were associated with decreased emotional autonomy among adolescents. On the contrary, symbolic punishment, rejecting, object punishment, demanding, indifference and neglecting behaviour were observed to positively influence emotional autonomy. Highly autonomous boys considered their father to be more rejecting and neglecting and less loving than their mother. Highly autonomous girls perceived their father to be demanding and their mother to be less rewarding symbolically as well as objectively and less loving. The transition of Indian family system due to modernization can be assumed to have influenced the mindset of adolescents as they become less dependent on their parents for seeking emotional autonomy.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- ♦ Study can also be planned around comparison of adolescents from rural and urban families.
- ♦ Difference in parent-adolescent relationship and peer relationship across different parts of the country can be studied and compared.

- The school environment can also be included for further study as adolescents stay most part of the day at school.

REFERENCES

- Allen JP, Boykin K, Elhaney MC, Deborah JL, Gabriel PK, Moore CW, Kelly HB, Kilmer SI 2003. A secure bases in adolescence: Markers of attachment security in the mother adolescent relationship. *Child Dev*, 7: 292-307.
- Allen JP, Hauser ST, Eickholt C, Bell KT, O'Connor TG 1994. Autonomy and relatedness in family interactions as predictors of expressions of negative adolescent affect. *J Res Adolescence*, 4: 535-552.
- Allen JP, Moore CM, Kuperminc GP 1995. Developmental approaches to understanding adolescent deviance. In: SS Luthar, JA Burack, D Cicchetti, J Weitz (Eds.): *Developmental Psychopathology: Perspectives on Risk and Disorder*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 125-142.
- Cassidy J, Kobak RR 1988. Avoidance and its relation to other defensive processes. In: J Belsky, T Newzworski (Eds.): *Clinical Implications of Attachment*. New Jersey: Hillsdale, pp. 300-323.
- Chan SM 2013. Adolescents' susceptibility to peer pressure: relations to parent-adolescent relationship and adolescents' emotional autonomy from parents. *Youth Society*, 45(2): 286-302 doi:10.1177/0044118X11417733.
- Dotterer AM, Lowe K, McHale SM (in press). Academic growth trajectories and family relationships among African American youth. *J Res Adolescence*, doi: 10.1111/jora.12080.
- Gadeyne E, Ghesquiere P, Onghena P 2004. Longitudinal relations between parenting and child adjustment in young children. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*, 22: 347-358.
- Griffin KW, Botvin GJ, Scheier LM, Diaz T, Miller NL 2000. Parenting practices as predictors of substance use, delinquency, and aggression among urban minority youth: Moderating effects of family structure and gender. *Psychol Addict Behav*, 14: 174-184.
- Grotevant HD, Cooper CR 1986. Patterns of interaction in family relationships: A perspective on individual differences in the development of identity and role taking in adolescence. *Hum Dev*, 29: 82-100.
- Grundman JK (2013) Does Parenting Style Predict Identity and Emotional Outcomes in Emerging Adulthood? From <URL <https://gustavus.edu/psychology/documents/JennyGrundman.pdf>> (Retrieved February 7, 2014).
- Johnson BM, Shulman S, Collins W 1991. A systematic patterns of parenting as reported by adolescents: Developmental differences and implications for psychosocial outcomes. *J Adol Res*, 6: 235-252.
- Kandel D, Lesser GS 1972. *Youth in Two World*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Karabanova OA, Psokrebysheva NN 2013. Adolescent autonomy in parent-child relations. *Procedia-Social Behav Sc*, 86: 621-628.

- Parra A, Oliva A 2009. A longitudinal research on the development of emotional autonomy during adolescence. *Span J Psychol*, 12: 66-75.
- Rao N 1986. *Manual for Parent Child Relationship Scale*. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
- Ryan RM, Lynch JH 1989. Emotional autonomy versus detachment: Revisiting the vicissitudes of adolescence and young adulthood. *Child Dev*, 60: 340-356.
- Sandhu D 2004. *Psycho-social Correlates of Identity Formation in Adolescence*. PhD Thesis, Unpublished. Amritsar: Guru Nanak Dev University.
- Sessa FM, Steinberg L 1991. Family structure and the development of autonomy during adolescence. *J Early Adolescence*, 11: 38-55.
- Shaban S, Mattoo NH 2012. A comparative study on adolescent parent relationship among boys and girls in a rural setting. *Stud Home Com Sci*, 6: 121-125.
- Stanik CE, Riina EM, McHale SM 2013. Parent adolescent relationship qualities and adolescent adjustment in two-parent African American families. *Family Relations*, 62: 597-608.
- Steinberg L, Silverberg SB 1986. The vicissitudes of autonomy in early adolescence. *Child Dev*, 57: 841-851.
- Tinkew JB, Moore KA, Carrano J 2006. The father-child relationship, parenting styles and adolescent risk behaviors in intact families. *J Fam Issues*, 1: 298-307.
- Weymouth BB 2013. *Parent-adolescent Hostility: A Family Systems Approach*. MSc Thesis, Unpublished. Greensboro: The University of North Carolina.
- Youniss J 1980. *Parents and Peers in Social Development: A Sullivan-Piaget Perspective*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.