

## **Socio-demographical variables effects on perceived parenting styles among Adolescents—a demographical study in Andhra Pradesh.**

Subhashini Akurathi (ICSSR) PDF\*Department of Applied psychology. GITAM (Deemed to be University) Visakhapatnam.-530045  
[Akurathipsy23@gmail.com](mailto:Akurathipsy23@gmail.com)

### **To Cite this Article**

Subhashini Akurathi “Socio-demographical variables effects on perceived parenting styles among Adolescents—a demographical study in Andhra Pradesh”, *Journal of Science and Technology*, Vol. 07, Issue 02, Mar-April 2022.

### **Article Info**

Received: 01-04-2022

Revised: 15-04-2022

Accepted: 20-04-2022

Published: 30-04-2022

### **Abstract**

The objective of the present study is to find the effects of socio-demographic context on perceived parenting styles among Adolescents—a demographical study in Andhra Pradesh. The current study participant's sample number was 1208 adolescents of both genders within the age range of 12 to 18 years, studying in 8th and 9th standard, SSC, and Intermediate of English and Telugu medium schools those who belong to Rural and urban living population with joint and nuclear family system in Andhra Pradesh.

Background of the study: The rural population is more homogenous in social, racial, and psychological traits that negatively correlate with heterogeneity. (Most agriculturists are directly connected with agriculture). More heterogeneous than rural. Urbanity and heterogeneity are positively co-related (Different population types are seen in cities, places, religions, caste, class, race, community, economic and cultural differences, occupations, and behavioral patterns are also different). Family structure is in the form of two types. Nuclear and joint families differ in the support each inherently offers, affecting adolescents' behavior.

Method: In the present study, the proportionate stratified random sampling method has been followed to collect the data from the sample. A demographic survey gathered family structure information and the number of disciplinary incidents from rural and urban living places for middle adolescents in Andhra Pradesh. They also completed a parenting style tool that measured adolescents' perceived parenting modes—R.L.Bharadwaj eight modes of parenting styles. There was applied SPSS-21 to analyse the adolescents' perceived parenting styles on

study variables. The analysis was used based on objectives framed for the particular hypotheses. t-test and way ANOVA was administered to test the hypotheses. The results indicated a significant difference between rejection vs. acceptance neglect vs. indulgence parenting styles among middle adolescents. The other results found that socioeconomic status showed substantial differences in Middle adolescents' perceived parenting styles on rejection vs. Acceptance, carelessness vs. Protection, and lenient standards vs. moralism parenting styles.

The study found that adolescents from urban and rural semi-urban showed a significant difference in lenient standards and moralism practices. Analysis revealed that adolescents living with joint and nuclear families using a neglecting parenting style were less likely to receive disciplinary incidents compared to adolescents living with joint family structure. Previous research suggested that an authoritative parenting style tends to benefit adolescents regardless of the family structure. Implications Present study results summarize that areas of residence (Rural, Urban, and Semi-urban) showed significant differences in Andhra Pradesh middle adolescents' perceived parenting styles. The study implies that nuclear family middle adolescents perceiving parenting style significantly differed on neglecting a parent than joint family respondents perceiving parenting style.

**Keywords:** Middle adolescents, Parenting style, Area of residence, family structure. Age, Socioeconomic Status.

### ***Introduction***

The adolescent stage is operationally defined as the children from (12 to 19). Perceived parenting styles can be defined as the children's opinions about their parent's behaviors throughout their childhood (Anli & Karsli, 2010). Parenting style is an attitude expressed toward the child through specific situations. Parenting style may be defined as a global set of parenting practices. It is hypothesized that Adolescents are generally defined as human beings with the manner of a standing extrude from formative years to maturity. In other words, the adolescent is a boy or a woman who's present within the human improvement transitional length from formative years to maturity between 12 and 19 years. As Mensah, Bruce, and Greene (1998) positioned it, youth is a productive time of transition to adulthood, kind of concurrent with the second decade of life. Other developmental psychologists describe youth

because the developmental length of change from formative years to early maturity entered about 10 to twelve years of age and finished at 18 to 22 years of age (Santrock, 2003).

Adolescence, the transitional degree of improvement among formative years and maturity, represents the length during which a person experiences various biological, social, and psychological changes and encounters several Emotional issues (Udry, 1998). Physical changes, cognitive improvement, and social improvement during identification formation in adolescence improve. The individual can type thru and synthesize formative years' identities and identifications to construct a possible pathway toward personal maturity (Kroger, 2004). Even though developing a healthful identification makes one flexible, adaptive, and open to adjustments in society, relationships, and careers, this stability does not hold throughout one's life (Santrock, 2003) due to the fact identities are advanced in bits and pieces as we must make selections repeatedly: whom to date, whether or not or now no longer to break up, and whether or not to examine or play. The domestic is a critical component of adolescent psychology.

Home environment and family have a considerable effect on the developing minds of teenagers, and these developments might also reach a climax for the duration of adolescence. In most Ghanaian societies, adults expect the youth to have an emotional climate for parent-child relationships (Williams et al., 2009). Socioeconomic status (SES) is an essential determinant of an individual's health, nutritional status, mortality, and morbidity. They vary from 42% and 26% in rural and urban India. They also differ based on the different committees formed to examine the problem. There is a need to identify the beneficiaries who have benefitted from the government programs/subsidies. One of the tools available to measure the problem is the identification of the SES of the family by applying the SES scales.

A joint family consists of a family living under an identical roof, and conversely, a family unit is simply a single family. There are some genuine differences between the two concepts, and each system has merits and demerits of its own. On the opposite hand, joint families have been a crucial faction of society since the genesis of humanity. Relations In the modern world, a clan, is solely defined as an organization with a mother, father, and youngsters and a pet (optional) being the fundamental constituents. The family, as described above, has specific subsets, like live-in relations, dating individuals, individuals living alone, or living with their pets. This idea is principally based upon the emotion of parental love and sibling bonding.

Hence, structural-functionalism (relationship mechanism) is simple, yet the psychology involved becomes quite complex. In conclusion, family characteristics, namely family conflict, strongly influence children's development and outcome. However, this needs the parents and other parties to work hand to protect the adolescents from deviant behavior; These results are supported by research conducted by Riany et al. (2016) found that children who live in areas that still uphold their traditional (rural) cultural values will be required to obey their parents. If they do not follow, they will suffer or get karma in the future due to their behavior.

Toslina Sultana Begum et al., (2018), Perception of parents and adolescents on parenting: A sociocultural study. The study found that the mother and father perceived their parenting style as authoritative, with the highest mean scores of 33.68 (SD= 5.68). Like their parents, adolescents also perceived their parent's parenting as an authoritarian style, with the highest mean score of 33.22(SD=5.4). There has been a non-significant difference shown between urban and rural adolescents' perceptions of their parents' parenting styles. Urban and rural parents also do not significantly differ in their perception of all four types of parenting styles, i. e, authoritative, authoritarian, uninvolved, and permissive. Differences between adolescents who live in urban areas and adolescents who live in rural areas are influenced by parenting. Parenting patterns applied by parents to children during the developmental period will affect the formation of their child's regulation of emotions and behaviors.

According to Santrock (in Nurkholida & Hakim, 2020), husband and wife have different family parenting perspectives because other parents and cultures raise them. Video (in Wisnawati et al., 2020) said two common and dominant parenting patterns found in societies in various cultures: autonomy, which reflects authoritative parenting, and conformity, which reflects authoritarian parenting. Aspects of aggressiveness (Magdalena, Hasanah & Rusilanti, 2016) and the level of resilience (Sunarti, Islamia, Rochimah & Ulfa, 2018). This difference can also be seen in how they dress. The approach that makes the child the center, high parental warmth, structure, and support for parental autonomy are the main characteristics of authoritative parenting.

Freudenthal (in Pasaribu, 2020) said that mobility is usually related to the dynamics of the people's economy, society, culture, environment, and psychology. Urban communities live in areas where most of the population works in the non-agricultural sector. Institutions in this

Area are very developed because of easy access to education and information so that individualism becomes an understanding that tends to be embraced by urban communities.

According to Davis (in Jamaludin, 2015), urban districts have high social tolerance because their social supervision is looser. Collective culture tends to be embraced by rural communities, and this is because rural communities emphasize interdependent and harmonious relationships between communities in their daily lives.

Pasaribu (2020) said that the relationship between communities would foster stereotypes that shape the shared values and attitudes of the broader community. Taslima Sultana Begum, Minoti Phukan, and Barsha Neog (2018) Perception of parents and adolescents on parenting: A sociocultural study results revealed that No significant difference was observed between urban and rural adolescents' perception of their parents' parenting style. Urban and rural parents also do not significantly differ in their perception of all four parenting styles, I. e, authoritative, authoritarian, uninvolved, and permissive.

### ***Methodology***

Sample Sizes of Public Schools / Junior College Children 732 Private Schools / Junior Colleges 486. Subjects were selected from rural, urban, and semi-urban populations. Data were collected from 2018–to 19 during regular school hours. Andhra Pradesh state is divided into three regions. Rayalaseema, Coastal Andhra, and North Coast areas of Andhra. The sample was collected from Chittoor, Rayalaseema district, Guntur from the coastal Andhra region, Visakhapatnam, and Vijayanagaram from the northern coastal region from three regions. Participants from the population of schools at two different levels of secondary and higher secondary education.

### ***Data collection:***

The research design adopted for this study is the probability random sampling technique and survey method. Adolescent students aged 14 – 17 years of teenage students in private and government schools. The Sampling Technique selected a simple random sampling method where 1216 students were administered a parenting styles scale.

***Aim:*** To understand the socio-demographic context on perceived parenting styles among Adolescents. A demographical study in Andhra Pradesh. Objectives of the Study

### ***Objective:***

To find the descriptive results for adolescents' perceived parenting styles as on demographic variables (Area of residence, family structure, Age, Socio economic status)

### ***Hypotheses***

1. There is a significant difference in Adolescents' perceived parenting styles as a function of the Area of residence.
2. There is a significant difference in Adolescents' perceived parenting styles as a function of the family structure.
- 3, there is a significant difference in parenting styles as a function of the age of the middle adolescents.
4. There is a significant difference between the Respondent's parents' annual income and the parenting styles they perceive

### ***The design of the study***

The present study adopted the survey design with a detailed and quantitative analysis using survey research methods to achieve its objectives. The subjects of the present study are children aged 14-18 years, tenth grade, inter first year and second year of various schools—method in secondary and senior secondary schools and from urban and rural areas of Andhra Pradesh. In the present study, the sampling method, namely stratified proportionate random sampling, was used to obtain a more representative and unbiased sample from a less homogeneous population consisting of different categories of schools. There have been select proportional models from all types of schools/strata as children from other school sections differed widely on the study variables. The method of choosing the children included in the sample is as follows.

### ***Variables***

Independent variables- Area of residence, Three groups (Rural, Urban, Semi-Urban) Second independent variable for the present study included Family structure of two groups of participants (Joint, Nuclear), the third demographic independent variable was Adolescents age (Group 1:14 -15years: Group 15 -16 years: Group 3:16-17 years Group 4:17-18 years) and annual parental income to assess the Socioeconomic Status.

The considered dependent variables for the present study were seven parenting styles rejection vs. Acceptance, careless vs. Protection, neglect vs. indulgence, utopian expectation vs. realism, lenient standard vs. moralism, freedom vs. discipline, false role expectation vs. realistic role expectation.

### ***Tool***

Scales of parenting styles the scale was developed by R.L.Bharadwaj et al. This scale has forty items of parent rearing questions constructed to measure the seven parenting styles Mode of parenting with 0.72 coefficient reliability and 0.75 validity. Scores compute on the Likert scale five-point rating scale.

### ***Procedure for Data Collection***

There have been approached three area types (Rural, urban and semi-urban). Schools from government and private who belong to joint and nuclear families have explained the purpose and importance of the study after obtaining permission from the principal for collecting the data. The desired participants were administered the parenting styles questionnaire. The selected students for the study were assigned to rural, urban, and semi-urban groups.

### ***Results and Discussion***

***Table-1: Detailed Statistical Results for Adolescents perceived Parenting Styles as on Area of Residence.***

Area of Residence	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	F- value	p-value
EPM	Rural	632	1.2057	5.089**	0.006
	Urban	327	1.2936		
	Semi urban	259	1.2664		

\*. P< 0.05 level, \*\*. P<0.01

The above table shows the detailed statistical results for Lenient Standards vs. Moralism Parenting in living areas. Urban area respondents (M = 1.2936, SD = .45610) found slightly higher scores than semi-urban residence respondents (M = 1.2664, SD = 0.44294) least scores for Rural residence respondents (M = 1.2057, SD. = 40453). Calculated Mean Differences at (f =5.089 \*\*, P =. 006 <0.01). Hence null hypothesis was rejected, and the research hypothesis accepted that there is a significant difference in Moralism versus Lenient Standards parenting as a function of the Area of residence.

***Table-2: ANOVA outcomes for Adolescents perceiving lenient standards versus moralism parenting model as a function of Area of residence***

Area of residence	SS	Def.	MS	F	P
Between groups	1.857	2	0.929	5.089**	0.006
Within groups	221.694	1216	0.182		
Total	223.551	1218			

P < 0.05 level, \*\*.

The above table shows the analysis of variance for lenient standards vs. Moralism parenting as a function of the Area of residence. The participants were divided into three groups according to their Area of Residence (Group 1: rural: Group 2: urban: Group 3 semi-urban). There was a statistically significant difference at the  $p < .05$  levels in Lenient standards vs. Moralism for the Area of Residence:  $F(2, 1216) = 5.089^{**}$   $p = .006 < 0.01$ . Besides reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was relatively moderate. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Group 2 ( $M = 1.2936$ ,  $SD = .45610$ ) was significantly different from Group 1 ( $M = 1.2057$ ,  $SD = .40453$ ). There is a significant difference for lenient standards vs. Moralism Parenting style as a function of Area of residence.

**Table- 3.: Results of Group Statistics post hoc for adolescents perceived lenient standards vs. Moralism Parenting Mode as a function of Area of residence**

Parenting mode	(I)Area residence	(J) Area Residence	of Mean Difference (I- J)	Std. Error	p-value
(E)Lenient standards vs. Moralism Parenting Mode	Urban	Rural	-0.087**	0.029	0.007

\*.P < 0.05 level, \*\*. P < 0.01



The above Table shows the post hoc *for* lenient standards vs. Moralism parenting as a Function of the Area of residence. The participant was divided into three groups according to their Area of Residence (Group 1: rural: Group 2: urban: Group 3 semi-urban). There was a statistically significant difference at the  $p < .05$  levels in Lenient standards vs. Moralism for the Area of Residence: Mean Difference (I-J) (-.08788\*)  $p = .007 < 0.01$ . Hence the null hypothesis accepted that there would be a significant difference in parenting style as a function of the Area of residence.

**Table -4: Results of Independent sample t-test for lenient standard vs. Moralism parenting as on area of residence among adolescents.**

	Lenient standards			Moralism			95%C.I	t-value	p-value	df.
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N				
Area of residence	1.793	.796	923	1.66	.797	295	-.23586,-.02663	2.461*	.014	1216

\*.  $P < 0.05$  level, \*\*.  $P < 0.01$

The above shows the independent-samples t-test for lenient standards vs Moralism parenting style as a function of Area of Residence. There was a significant difference in Lenient standards (M =1.793, SD=0.796) and Moralism (M 1.662, SD= .797);  $t(1216) = 2.461$   $p = .014 < 0.05$  (two-tailed). The magnitude Mean difference among groups (-.23586 -.02663) Hence there is a significant difference among lenient standards vs. moralism parenting style as a function of Area of Residence.

**Table-5: Results of Descriptive statistics for adolescents perceived Neglect versus indulgence parenting as a function of the family structure**

Parenting Mode	Family structure	N	Mean	SD	t-value	P- value
(C) Neglect vs. Indulgence Parenting	Joint Family	353	1.284	0.45163	-2.246*	0.025
	Nuclear Family	865	1.352	0.47860		

\*.  $P < 0.05$  level, \*\*.  $P < 0.01$

The above table shows the independent sample t-test for (C) Neglect versus indulgence parenting as a function of family structure. The nuclear family (M=1.3528, SD=.47860) is higher than the Joint family (M = 1.2849, SD=0. 45163). The calculated mean differences were (t=. 2.246\*, P=. 025<0.05). The nuclear family significantly differs from the joint family as on Neglect v's indulgence Parenting Styles.

**Table-6: results of Independent sample t-test for Neglect v's Indulgence parenting as a function of family structure**

Family structure	Neglect			Indulgence			95%C.I	t-value	p-value	Def.
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N				
	1.764	0.424	850	1.703	0.457	368	0.007,.114	2.246	0.025	1216

\*. P< 0.05 level, \*\*. P<0.01

The above table depicts that independent sampled t-test for parenting model as a function of the family structure. It has been observed that a neglected parenting score (M = 1.7647, SD. = 424) is higher than that of Indulgence parenting (M = 1.703, SD = .457); t (1216) = 2.246, p = .025 <0.05) (two-tail) is the average difference between size groups (. 0077.1141). Thus null hypothesis accepted that there was neglecting parenting differs as on joint and nuclear family.

**Table-7: Independent sample t-test for parenting styles as a function of student age.**

Independent rejecting parenting variable	Acceptance parenting			Rejecting parenting			95%C.I	t-Value	P-Value	def.
	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD	N				
Student age	2.6927	0.983	833	2.800	1.02266	385	-0.22778. .01313	-1.748*	0.018	1216

\*.p<0.05, \*\*.p<0.01

The table above shows the independent-sampled t-test for Reject vs. Acceptable Parenting as a function of student age. Rather than rejecting the parenting mode (M = 2.6927. SD = 0.983) t (1216) = -1.748, p = 0 .018 (two-tail). The magnitude difference is in the group (-.0.22778,

0.01313). This is significant at less than 0.05. Therefore there is a significant difference in the Reject vs. Acceptance Parenting mode at the participating age groups.

**Table-8: Post-hoc result for parenting styles as a function of student age.**

Dependent Variable			Mean Difference		Std. Error	p-value
	(I) Age	(J)Age	(I-J)			
Rejection vs. acceptance	17-18 years	14 -15 years	-0.22517*		.08191	.048
Neglect vs. indulgence	17-18 years	14 -15 years	-0.15007*		0.5162	0.030

\*. P< 0.05 level, \*\*. P< 0.01 level.

The above table depicted that the Interpretation means the difference between age groups. Participants were divided into four groups according to age (Group 1:14 -15years: Group 15 - 16 years: Group 3:16-17 years Group 4:17-18 years). (A) Group 4 significantly differs from group1 perceiving rejection vs. Acceptance at (I-J= -0.22517\*, p<0.05 0.05) and Neglect vs. indulgence parenting Mean Difference (I-J= -0.15007\*, p<0.05). Results show that the 17-18 years age group differs from than 14-15 years age group as on perceived rejection vs. Acceptance, Neglect vs. indulgence parenting.

**Table -9: post hoc results for parenting mode as a function of parental annual income**

Parenting, SES	Sum of Squares	Def.	Mean Square	F	P-Value	
APM	Between Groups	1.310	2	.655	3.038	.048
	Within Groups	261.994	1215	.216		
	Total	263.305	1217			
BPM	Between Groups	1.209	2	.604	3.775	.023
	Within Groups	194.510	1215	.160		
	Total	195.718	1217			
EPM	Between Groups	1.202	2	.601	3.285	.038
	Within Groups	222.349	1215	.183		
	Total	223.551	1217			

\*.  $P < 0.05$ , \*\*.  $P < 0.01$ .

The above table shows that scores of one-way between-groups analysis of variance were conducted to explore the impact of parenting styles on socioeconomic status. Participants were divided into three groups according to their Socioeconomic status (Group 1: Below one lakh: Group 2: 1-5 lakh: Group 3: 5 lakh and above). There was a statistically significant difference for below one lakh group and 1-5 lakh group considerable difference at the  $p < .05$  levels in Rejecting v's Acceptance as a function of the Socioeconomic status group:  $F(2, 16) = 3.038$ ,  $p = .048 < 0.05$ . There was a statistically significant difference for the Below one lakh group and 1- 5 lakh group considerable difference at the  $p < .05$  levels in Carelessness v's Protection, Parenting for the Socioeconomic status group:  $F(2, 16) = 3.775$ ,  $p = .023 < 0.05$ . There was a statistically significant difference for below one lakh group and 1-5 lakh group with  $F(2, 16) = 3.285$ ,  $p = .038 < 0.05$  level in Lenient standards vs. Moralism as a function of Socioeconomic status. Besides reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was relatively moderate. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Below one lakh SES Group scores ( $M = 1.3293$ ,  $SD = .47020$ ) was significantly different from Group 3 (1-5 lakh and above) ( $M = 1.2308$ ,  $SD = .42268$ ) for Rejecting v's Acceptance as a function of the Socioeconomic status group: Besides reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was relatively moderate. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for that 1-5 lakh SES Group scores ( $M = 1.1346$ ,  $SD = .34241$ ) differ from 5 lakh and above Group ( $M = 1.2879$ ,  $SD = .45624$ ) for Carelessness v's Protection Parenting for the Socioeconomic status group. Post- hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score below one lakh Group ( $M = 1.2540$ ,  $SD = .43553$ ) differs from 5 lakh and above SES Group scores ( $M = 1.2576$ ,  $SD = .44065$ ) for Carelessness v's Protection Parenting for the Socioeconomic status group. Hence the null hypothesis accepted that. There will be a significant difference in the Group Mean scores on Parental annual income among adolescent students on parenting styles.

**Table-10: Post Hoc results for parenting mode as a function of parental annual income.**

Dependent Variable	(I) SES	(J) SES	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	p-value
Rejection vs. acceptance	Below 1-Lakh	1-5 lakh	.09855*	.03998	.037
Carelessness vs. Protection	Below 1-lakh	5 lakh and above	-.15326*	.05875	.025

Lenient standards vs. Moralism	Below one lakh	1-5 lakh	.09376*	.03684	.030
--------------------------------	----------------	----------	---------	--------	------

\*. P<0.05, \*\*. P< 0.01.

Table-10 interpreting mean the difference between parenting annual income groups below one lakh and one to five lakh group respondents perception on perceiving rejection vs. Acceptance, Lenient standards vs. Moralism Mean Difference (I-J)= .09855, .09376\*which is significant at 0.05 level and below one lakh and five lakh above group respondents perception on Carelessness vs. Protection Mean Difference (I-J)= -.15326\*, which is significant at 0.05. Hence there was a significant difference between below one lakh parenting style and one to five lakh or above one lakh. The results indicated that Parenting Modes (rejecting parenting vs. Acceptance parenting, Lenient standards vs. Moralism parenting style showed significant differences in the source of economic status.

**Table-11: Independent sample t-test for rejection vs. acceptance as on parental annual income**

	Reject			Acceptance			95% C.I	t-value	p-value
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
Parental annual income	1.2521	.54493	833	1.202	.5209	1385	.01548, .11449	1.495	.010
Parental annual income	Lenient standards			Moralism			95% C.I	t-Value	P-Value
	M	SD	N	M	SD	N			
	1.2481	.54133	923	1.200	.525	295	.11864, -.02243	5.102*	.024

\*. P<0.05, \*\*. P< 0.01.

The above table compares the rejection vs. acceptance parenting on the Respondent's parent's annual income with a significant difference in the scores for parental rejection (M = 1.2521, SD = .54493). SD = .52091); t (1216) = 1.495, p = .010 (two tails). Magnitude is the difference between groups (-.01548, 11449). This is significant at less than 0.05. Therefore a significant difference in the Acceptance vs. rejection as a function of the parent's annual income. An independent-sampled t-test was conducted to compare parenting with Lenient Standards vs.

Moralism on parents' annual income performance. There are a significant difference in the moralism Parenting (M = 1.2481, SD = . 54133) scores. M = 1.2000, SD = . 52554); t - value (1216) = 5.104, p = . 024 (two tail) Magnitude means difference in group. (C.I=11864, -. 02243, p < 0.05).

### ***Findings of the present study***

The present study found that Nuclear family respondents perceived Neglect of parents significantly different from joint family respondents' perceived indulgence parenting style. Gupta et al. (2008) reported that social isolation and reward for the nuclear family contribute considerably to the emotional maturity of female adolescents. While protectiveness and permissiveness for the joint family contribute significantly to the emotional maturity of female adolescents, similar findings were observed in the present study. The other results of the present study showed a significant difference between urban and rural living adolescent respondents' perceived lenient standards and moralistic parenting styles. Urban participants demonstrated substantial differences in lenient standards practices from their parents due to urbanization. There is, therefore, a significant difference between lenient standards versus moralism parenting on the socioeconomic status. Hence the null hypothesis accepted that Parental annual income could vary significantly in perception scores among adolescent students' Acceptance vs. rejection and lenient standards vs. moralism parenting styles.

Some more findings from the present study revealed that Parental below 1 lakh annual income group students perceiving lenient standard parenting style and carelessness vs. protection parenting styles found significantly different from other yearly income groups. (S Kaur, S Verma 2015) the study suggested lower socioeconomic status family backgrounds and whose own parents were controlling, restrictive, and overprotective (Horwood et al. 2007). In contrast, middle-income parents show more warmth and indulgence (Singh & Khokhar 2005). National Research Council (1993) revealed that children whose fathers are unemployed or work part-time are more likely to be neglected than children of fathers with full-time jobs.

Those in the lowest income groups have 2 or 3 times greater rates of Neglect parental behavior than an upper-income group of families because people with poor economic backgrounds tend to have large families. Consequently, children in these families are deprived of basic minimum facilities and adequate nutrition, education, health services and care, and a loving environment.

Due to economic constraints, they are brought up in hostile and unhealthy environments and are usually a target for parental stress.

Conclusions: The present study concluded that the Area of living affects various parenting modes adopted by the parents. It depends on cultural variations and adaptation to the environment. Urban adolescents perceived lenient standards of parenting style, and rural living adolescent's perceived moralism parenting style from their parents. The other finding from the present study concluded that indulgence in parenting from joint family structure and neglect in parenting from nuclear family structure. Parental annual income could vary significantly in perception scores among adolescent students' Acceptance vs. rejection and lenient standards vs. moralism parenting styles.

## **References**

Abubakar, A., Van de Vijver, F. J. R., Suryani, A. O., Handayani, P., & Pandia, W. S. (2014). Perceptions of parenting styles and their associations with mental health and life satisfaction among urban Indonesian adolescents. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 24 (9), 2680-2692. DOI 10.1007/s10826-014-0070.

- Abdullah Fathur Rasyid , Alfia Maulina Sandry Parenting Style of Urban Versus Rural Communities in Indonesia. [https://www.academia.edu/50950046/Parenting\\_Style\\_of\\_Urban\\_Versus\\_Rural\\_Communities\\_in\\_Indonesia](https://www.academia.edu/50950046/Parenting_Style_of_Urban_Versus_Rural_Communities_in_Indonesia).
- Ali, H., & Purwandi, L. (2016). Indonesia 2020: The urban middle class millennial. Alvara Research Center. Badan Pusat Statistik. (2021). Hasil sensus penduduk 2020. Badan Pusat Statistik. Diakses 16 Juni 2021 dari [https:// www.bps. go.id/press release /2021 /0 1/21/1854/hasil-sensuspenduduk-2020.html](https://www.bps.go.id/press_release/2021/01/21/1854/hasil-sensuspenduduk-2020.html).
- Bryce Summers (2006) the effects of family structure and parenting style on school disciplinary incidents of high school seniors. Submitted to the Department of Counseling, Educational Psychology and School Psychology and the faculty of the

Graduate School of Wichita State University In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education.

- Jamaludin, A. N. (2015). Sosiologi pedesaan. CV Pustaka Setia Nestya, M. (2013). Perbandingan Representasi Gaya Hidup Remaja Perkotaan Dalam Film “Catatan Si Boy 1987” Dan “Catatan Harian Si Boy 2011”. *Jurnal e-Komunikasi*, 1(3). Diakses 16 Juni 2021 dari <http://publication.petra.ac.id/index.php/ilmu-komunikasi/article/view/932>.
- Magdalena, K., Hasanah, U., & Ruslianti, R. (2016). Perbandingan sikap agresivitas remaja pedesaan dan perkotaan. *JKKP (Jurnal Kesejahteraan Keluarga dan Pendidikan)*, 3(1), 44-49. <http://doi.org/10.21009/JKKP>.
- Mohd Nawi Azmawati, Abdul Hamid Siti Hazariah, Azhar Shah Shamsul, Ahmad Norfazilah, Noor Aizuddin Azimatun & Hod Rozita(2015) Risk taking behavior among urban and rural adolescents in two selected districts in Malaysia. *South African Family Practice* ISSN: 2078-6190 (Print) 2078-6204 (Online) Journal homepage: <https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ojfp20>.
- Nurkholida, E., & Hakim, M. L. (2020). Assessing parenting education: Parenting style of adolescents in rural and urban society. *Indonesian Journal Of Educational Studies (IJES)*, 23 (1), 72-80. Diakses 16 Juni 2021 dari <http://ojs.unm.ac.id/index.php/Insani/index> Pasaribu, Y. M. (2020). Kota dan budaya urban. *Prosiding Dari Dialog Budaya Nasional*, Bandung: 16-19 Oktober 2018. Diakses dari 10 Juni 2021 <https://www.researchgate.net>.
- Toslima Sultana Begum, Minoti Phukan and Barsha Neog (2019) Perception of parents and adolescents on parenting: A sociocultural study. *International Journal of Home Science* 2019; 5(1): 85-89 ISSN: 2395-7476 *IJHS* 2019; 5(1): 85-89 © 2019 *IJHS* [www.homesciencejournal.com](http://www.homesciencejournal.com) Received: 21-11-2018.